



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Workshop Report for Cancer Research: Defining the Shades of Gy: Utilizing the Biological Consequences of Radiotherapy in the Development of New Treatment Approaches-Meeting Viewpoint

Ahmed, M. M., Coleman, C. N., Mendonca, M., Bentzen, S., Vikram, B., Seltzer, S. M., Goodhead, D., Obcemea, C., Mohan, R., Prise, K. M., Capala, J., Citrin, D., Kao, G., Aryankalayil, M., Eke, I., Buchsbaum, J. C., G S Prasanna, P., Liu, F-F., Le, Q-T., ... Mitchell, J. (2018). Workshop Report for Cancer Research: Defining the Shades of Gy: Utilizing the Biological Consequences of Radiotherapy in the Development of New Treatment Approaches-Meeting Viewpoint. *Cancer Research*, 78(9). <https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-17-3760>

Published in:

Cancer Research

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:

[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

© 2018 American Association for Cancer Research. This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

WORKSHOP REPORT FOR CANCER RESEARCH**Defining the Shades of Gy: Utilizing the Biological Consequences of Radiation Therapy in the Development of New Treatment Approaches**

Mansoor M Ahmed^{1‡}, C. Norman Coleman^{1, 8‡}, Marc Mendonca², Soren Bentzen³, Bhadrasain Vikram¹, Stephen M. Seltzer⁴, Dudley Goodhead⁵, Ceferino Obcemea¹, Radhe Mohan⁶, Kevin M. Prise⁷, Jacek Capala¹, Deborah Citrin⁸, Gary Kao⁹, Molykutty Aryankalayil⁸, Iris Eke⁸, Jeffrey C. Buchsbaum¹, Pataje Prasanna¹, Fei-Fei Liu¹⁰, Quynh-Thu Le¹¹, Beverly Teicher¹², David G. Kirsch¹³, DeeDee Smart⁸, Joel Tepper¹⁴, Silvia Formenti¹⁵, Daphne Haas-Kogan¹⁶, David Raben¹⁷, James Mitchell¹⁸.

¹Radiation Research Program, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD; ²Department of Radiation Oncology, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN; ³Department of Epidemiology, University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD; ⁴Radiation Physics Division, NIST, Gaithersburg, MD; ⁵Medical Research Council, Harwell, Didcot, UK; ⁶Department of Radiation Physics, Division of Radiation Oncology, The University of Texas, MD Anderson Cancer Centre, Houston, TX; ⁷Centre for Cancer Research & Cell Biology, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK; ⁸Radiation Oncology Branch, Centre for Cancer Research, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD; ⁹Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; ¹⁰Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Toronto, Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, Toronto, Canada; ¹¹Department of Radiation Oncology, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA; ¹²Development Therapeutics Program, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD; ¹³Department of Radiation Oncology, Duke University School of Medicine; Durham, NC; ¹⁴Department of Radiation Oncology, University of North Carolina School of Medicine; Chapel Hill, NC; ¹⁵Department of Radiation Oncology, Weill Cornell Medical College, NY; ¹⁶Department of Radiation Oncology, Harvard Medical School, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA; ¹⁷Department of Radiation Oncology; University of Colorado Cancer Center, Aurora, CO and ¹⁸Radiation Biology Branch, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD.

‡Drs. Coleman and Ahmed had equal contribution in the conceptualization of the workshop and preparation of the report.

Short title: Shades of Gy: dose effects for novel combination therapies

Address correspondence and reprints to:

C. Norman Coleman, M.D.
Radiation Research Program
Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis
National Cancer Institute, National Institutes
of Health, 9609 Medical Center Drive
Rockville, MD 20850-7440
240-276-5690 (Phone)
240-276-5827 (Fax)
E-mail: ccoleman@mail.nih.gov

Mansoor M. Ahmed, Ph.D.
Radiation Research Program
Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis
National Cancer Institute, National Institutes
of Health, 9609 Medical Center Drive
Rockville, MD 20850-7440

Word count 2706

Introduction- 249, Report text- 2457

Conflict of interest statement:

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.

INTRODUCTION:

The ability to physically target radiotherapy using image-guidance is continually improving with photons and particle therapy that include protons and heavier ions such as carbon. The unit-of-dose deposited is the Gy (gray), however, particle therapies produce different patterns of ionizations and there is evidence that the biological effects of radiation depend on dose size, schedule and type of radiation. This NCI-sponsored workshop addressed the potential of using radiation-induced biological perturbations in addition to physical dose, Gy, as a transformational approach to quantifying radiation.

New directions included:

- Radiation effects on the cell, tumor and normal tissue can be exploited so that schedules beyond the conventional and still useful 2 Gy fraction can be utilized. Different radiation dose, type and schedule (multi-fraction) can potentially act "as a drug" with unique and exploitable mechanism of action. This concept pertains to radiation alone and with molecular-targeted therapy and immunotherapy.
- Utilizing biomarkers of radiotherapy in precision medicine to assess both treatment efficacy and normal tissue damage, potentially including organ-specific biomarkers of tissue damage.

Controversies to:

- Defining the most resistant subpopulation within a tumor, particularly at higher fractional doses. Ameliorating resistance could include targeting tumor cells and/or the vasculature.
- Rethinking the target and extent of tumor volume irradiated as potential new strategies for enhancing curative benefit and avoiding normal tissue toxicity with preservation of organ function.

Current challenges in:

- Defining radiation parameters for selected target induction, such as a survival pathway, tumor antigen, enhanced immune response or change in vasculature.

- Determining the duration in the change of radiation-inducible phenotype to be exploited.
- Eventually modifying the treatment from the “time-honored” approaches.

Altogether, these approaches can facilitate the incorporation of radiation technology and biology into treatment strategies for personalized medicine, including molecular and immune-targeted therapies.

REPORT:

The National Cancer Institute’s Radiation Research Program hosted the workshop “Shades of Gy (gray): Biological Consequences of Radiation Therapy” on September 11-12, 2017 (Agenda) [1]. The focus is a novel concept of defining radiation dose both in energy deposition (Gy) and biologically meaningful perturbations in the tumor and normal tissue. This is intended to broaden the application of radiotherapy in precision medicine. The workshop's long-term goal is to build from a combination of well-known reliable models, new cancer biology and clinical experience to develop new paradigms for clinical cancer care.

Norman Coleman (NCI) opened the Workshop stressing the potential use of radiation as a drug with radiation dose described in appropriate units similar to drug therapy such as pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics (PK/PD). This requires returning to fundamental processes including the mechanism(s) of radiation damage, biophysics, stress and adaptive responses and tumor microenvironment effects under the umbrella of “Precision Radiation Medicine”. The importance of physical dose remains paramount. Emphasizing ambiguous terminology in use is that the unit “gray” used in biodosimetry is actually a biological change (a “biodose”) and not the physical dose. The new paradigm for biological dose in addition to physical dose uses modern molecular endpoints that can improve cancer care.

Several challenging issues on current radiation “Dose-Effect models” were discussed in Session I. Søren Bentzen’s (University of Maryland) stressed the importance of a normalized dose-response gradient that would allow the Tumor Control Probability/Normal Tissue Complication Probability percentage versus total radiation dose when given as 1.8 Gy per fraction to be predicted for radiation plus chemotherapy or immunotherapy and all three treatments combined. He suggested the use of the Linear Quadratic $EQD_2\alpha/\beta$ to predict actual clinical outcome in patients with head and neck squamous cell cancer and compare the LQ model with treatment biomarkers ranging from biological to imaging markers that can provide integral effects of dose and time for tumor and normal tissue. This approach could provide lead time for changes in treatment thereby improving both cancer treatment outcomes and quality of life. Dr. Martin Brown (Stanford University) supported the use of LQ model and pointed out key exceptions to their use such as the role of the tumor stroma and tumor vasculature in determining tumor radiation sensitivity for which the endpoint TCD50 (dose to control 50% of the murine tumors irradiated) should be adopted. He asserted that radiosensitivity of tumors is only relevant to tumor control if the radiation damaged vasculature is restored by bone marrow derived cells [2]. Blocking the SDF-1/CXCR4 pathway would block the bone marrow derived cells recruitment and increase tumor control with the added benefit of protecting normal tissues. Philip Lambin (Maastricht University) discussed that the LQ models should be revisited to understand whether low or high α/β -ratio tumors can be explained with modern molecular biological endpoints and he also suggested to study whether a tumor is slowly or rapidly proliferating. He proposed that to help predict treatment response and overall survival Quantitative Imaging Radiomics (with 3D dose delivery and 4D radiomics) would enable the measure of proliferation signatures and other

tumor parameters that would help link classical α/β concepts with relevant biology such as DNA repair, proliferation and re-oxygenation.

That basic biophysics provides a great deal of information on radiation effects and also supports the need for biological assessment to enhance physical dose was discussed in Session II. The track structure patterns of ionization and excitation from various radiation particle types and their secondary charged particles in complex biological media (cells in suspension or in tissue and specific sub-cellular targets) is not clear particularly at low incident energies where the energy transfer is most pronounced. Dudley Goodhead (MRC, UK) and Jan Schuemann (MGH, Boston) discussed the latest progress in Monte Carlo simulations of track-structure interactions with biological structures and concluded that at the nanometer level of cellular targets, radiation dose, dose rates and fractions in radiation therapy would have to be so much higher than those used clinically to have overlaps of multiple primary tracks in the target volumes involved in the initial physical damage. Overall, track structure provides physical data that indeed informs micro-dosimetry, but cellular response requires much more knowledge of biological response functions (such as Relative Biological Effectiveness – RBE¹). Lisa Cornell (NASA) and Francis Cuccinota (University of Las Vegas) reviewed the importance of track structure coupled with biophysical models in space radiation protection in which heavy ions present the major biological threats to astronauts. In summary, track structure provides the qualitative understanding of the different RBEs from the variety of radiation modalities used in therapy and with the addition of biological-response models, track-structure results can be more realistically extrapolated to estimate the biological effects of any incident radiation.

¹ The relative biological effectiveness (RBE) is defined as the ratio of the doses required by two types of radiation to cause the same level of effect. Thus, the RBE depends on the dose and the biological endpoint.

Session III transitioned from physical dose to biological effects, focusing on the RBE of particles compared to photons. The rationale for defining RBE in this manner as a ratio is to allow extrapolation of the vast clinical experience with photon therapy to particle treatment. It is argued that the very concept of RBE is questionable since, biologically, protons and heavier ions are very different from photons. Kevin Prise (Queen's University Belfast, UK) stressed the fact that one of the sources of uncertainty of RBE is the biological effects of the reference photon. For protons, the clinically used RBE is assumed to have a fixed value of 1.1, mostly obtained from in-vitro and in-vivo measurements carried out under inconsistent and inadequately defined conditions. The use of a simple ratio is challenged. Cläre von Neubeck (German Cancer Consortium Partner Site Dresden and German Cancer Research Center) pointed out that analyses of clinical response to assess RBE should take into account inter-patient heterogeneity associated with the tumor (size, grade, location, infectious status and mutations) and also pre-existing medical conditions, life style habits and other factors. Jeffrey Buchsbaum (NCI) pointed out that a major concern in proton therapy is the unanticipated severe toxicities which may be attributable to higher RBE at the distal and lateral beam edges. The suggested approach is a "Continual Reassessment Model" to improve the understanding of the RBE variability based on data for populations of patients and with the help of artificial intelligence (AI) approaches to translate the knowledge continually into clinical applications. Roger Howell (Rutgers University) discussed that the RBE of targeted radionuclides that are widely used as standard-of-care to sterilize metastatic disease needs re-evaluation. An interesting proposal is to formulate RBE in terms of 2 Gy equivalent fraction (EQD2) to relate it to conventional radiotherapy but the type of radionuclide has great impact, for example, auger electron emitters can be more radiotoxic than alpha emitters (RBE as high as 8). Manjit Dosanjh (CERN, Geneva) emphasized the difference in protons and heavier ion with unique molecular and cellular responses compared to photons due to the complexity of DNA

damage, differential gene expression, epigenetic modulation and effect on cell cycle. Such differences will have profound clinical consequences.

Clearly, biomarkers and response predictors are needed to measure “radiation effects”. The discussion in Session IV reviewed key issues including: optimal timing and source of the marker (tumor, biofluid, and imaging) and the need for reproducibility, standardization and validation techniques including FDA approval. Biomarkers for organ injury may benefit from biodosimetry studies done for radiation incidents although there are obvious differences in exposure. In both settings, predictive assays that accurately estimate the risk of injury to specific organ systems is of particular importance. Cytogenetic assays, including assessment of micronuclei and dicentric chromosomes and γ H2AX expression in lymphocytes are used. Newer biodosimetry approaches include metabolomics and quantifying circulating markers such as long non-coding RNA and microRNA may provide tumor response and organ-specific injury prediction [3-6]. For therapeutic interventions, the goal is integration of biomarkers of tumor and normal tissue response into a predicted biologic outcome that allows personalization of the radiation treatment plan and dose appropriate to each patient based on the probability of individual organ toxicity and tumor control. Careful consideration should be given to circulating tumor cells (CTCs) as a biomarker of tumor response, particularly in reference to local versus systemic recurrence but also the use of other markers within the field of “liquid biopsy” such as ctDNA or exosomes.

Session V discussed the clinician’s perspective on “dose” with outcomes and next generation of standard-of-care. Four speakers describing topics of: stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT)/hypofractionation (Bob Timmerman, UTSW), RBE of proton therapy

(Harald Paganetti, MGH), novel role of radiation for chemopotentiators (Iris Eke, NCI) and next-generation of personalized radiation medicine (Quynh Le, Stanford). Maximizing the therapeutic index was a key focus of these innovative strategies. With the delivery of high dose radiation in a hypofractionated manner for photons and particle therapy, the quality assurance of physical dose delivery-precision in imaging, motion control and dose modulation are of paramount importance since such high doses delivered in just a few fractions cannot depend on repair of normal tissues to maximize the therapeutic index. The potential role of SBRT in managing oligo-metastasis or oligo-progression exists but must be evaluated in a randomized trials in order to understand its indications, limitations and biological effects [7]. New preclinical data were presented demonstrating that multi-fractionated RT was particularly effective in upregulating integrin and mTOR/AKT signaling, leading to enhanced sensitivity to drugs induced by radiation, a proof-of-concept for the use of understanding the biological impact of radiation beyond dose [8]. The use of patient-derived xenograft models to predict sensitivity to molecular-targeted therapies in combination with RT should be interrogated in a systematic manner in order to better understand their roles and limitations. Finally, there are trials evaluating personalized radiation using imaging, biology and circulating biomarkers such as ctDNA, and radiogenomics to maximize tumor control and/or identify patients at risk for normal tissue toxicity [9, 10]. To date none can be applied in routine clinical practice.

With the general agreement that the biological description is critical in addition to physical dose, biological consequences of clinical relevance were discussed in Session VI. David Kirsch (Duke University) summarized several technologies for the application of genetically engineered mouse models and described the importance of fully immune-competent models to

the understanding of radiation therapy, immunotherapy, radiation-induced carcinogenesis, normal tissue injury and the cell-autonomous and non-cell-autonomous mechanisms that contribute to normal and tumor tissue response to radiation. Phuoc Tran (Johns Hopkins) highlighted mechanisms by which radiation can enhance anti-tumor immune response including increased expression of immune mediators and the development of micronuclei. Centrosome clustering can result in the selective killing of cancer cells with supernumerary centrosomes and increase in micronuclei by forcing cells into multipolar divisions. Drugs may enhance the cytotoxic effects of radiation while concurrently potentiating radiation-induced antitumor immunity through generation of micronuclei. Amit Maity (University of Pennsylvania) focused on combinations of molecular targeted agents with radiation therapy. Agents targeting PI3K/Akt pathway affected EGFR and VEGF function to restore radiation sensitivity. Radiation combination clinical trials involving agents in DNA damage repair pathway inhibitors were noted including inhibitors of ATM, ATR, DNA-PK, RAD51, WEE1 and PARP. Joanne Weidhaas (UCLA) discussed the genetics and biologic consequences of microRNA germ-line mutations in radiation response. Genetic mutations in microRNA can alter radiation response. MicroRNAs can inhibit oncogene signaling or enhance tumor suppressor targeting. MicroRNA profiles can provide immunotherapy and radiation therapy biomarkers of toxicity and response.

Treating limited tumor volume and its impact on clinical outcome including immunological consequences were discussed in Session VII. There are preclinical data and clinical experience regarding the possibility to only treat a limited amount of the tumor or to use heterogenous doses as a means of protecting normal tissue and eliciting intra-tumoral and systemic immune attack. The actual delivered radiation dose accounting for tumor motion and dose scatter must be fully understood. Chandan Guha (Albert Einstein) emphasized that small field radiation therapy may be sufficient to stimulate robust antigen presentation allowing the host to develop an immune response and at the same time protect the T-cell recruitment process.

Sylvia Formenti (Cornell) presented data that dsDNA is sensed by cGAS which is needed to activate the IFN-1 pathway via STING, but the complexity of the entire sensing-response system is critical with 3 x 8 Gy being more effective in developing an immune response when combined with checkpoint immunotherapy, compared to a higher single dose of 30 Gy. The mechanism was mediated by Trex1 induced by the highest doses of RT that then reduces IFN γ 1 activation. Robert Griffin (Arkansas) reviewed some of the early approaches using “grid” therapy (heterogeneous dose distribution) demonstrating in preclinical models, alterations in gene expression and cell signaling presumably related to a bystander effect. He pointed out that cell killing in this approach is reduced by hypoxia and that anti-angiogenic agents might enhance cell killing. Xiadong Wu (Miami) also discussed how partial tumor irradiation could alter the stromal components of the tumor and thus impact immunotherapy or other tumor effects. However, many of the stromal changes induced by partial or whole volume tumor irradiation are not well defined, and it is unclear how to best utilize these changes. In contrast to the work of Griffin, Wu suggested that it might be important to enhance, rather than suppress, angiogenesis.

The closing discussions in Session VIII focused on how to build on the experience and success from radiation therapy and biology using the current and rapidly emerging tools of precision medicine. New paradigms in radiation biology promise to transform the use of radiation in cancer therapy. One of the new paradigms (in some ways an old paradigm) is hypofractionation in which biological equivalent dose escalation can improve outcomes for certain cancers. With the ability to target lesions precisely, hypofractionation is paving a new path for combined modality therapy. It has become almost routine using stereotactic techniques for disease sites such as lung, pancreas and prostate and offers an intriguing opportunity with immunotherapy. Delivering less total dose than extended conventional radiotherapy using larger dose fractions, perhaps smaller volumes and short-courses of treatment have sparked interest in immunotherapy.

There are many biological factors that might reasonably be expected to offer insights into how a course of radiation should be altered from traditional paradigms to improve local control rates. These include, a) pretreatment next-generation sequencing to estimate the probability of local control after radiotherapy, b) real-time assessment of DNA repair using measurement of circulating tumor cell γ H2AX, c) hypoxia-related resistance prediction during a course of therapy using serum HIF1 α and CAIX, as well as imaging with oxygen-enhanced MRI or other contrast agents that can be used in PET, d) real time assessment of radiation response using periodic measurement of CTCs and ctDNA, and e) pre-therapy miRNA assessment attempting to define patterns of radiation sensitivity and prognosis. Essentially the goal of such a program is to “surround” the course of therapy with the assessment of multiple biological parameters that, over time, would provide the clinician with key information regarding appropriate dose, dose per fraction, fractionation scheme and radiation target volume, thus allowing them to personalize therapy and adapt to the dynamically changing tumor biology before and during therapy in order to obtain better outcomes.

The “Shades of Gy” paradigm offers unique opportunities and also requires rigorous assessment of the dose delivered as the dose in Gy is a physical “ground truth” to which biological changes must be related. Clinical radiation therapy is quite rigorous taking into account organ motion, especially with hypofractionation. Further improvement is necessary as noted for the approaches employing heterogeneous doses and extremes of dose rate and size. The NCI Radiation Research Program has workshops planned in 2018 for targeted radionuclide therapy and GRID/Flash techniques. A new NCI UO1 grant program to study combinations of drugs plus radiation is now being implemented. The paradigm of radiation-inducible molecular targets has recently been demonstrated and needs further study. The understanding of the biology of particle therapy has been limited by the availability of beam time, but with the new data on

immune modulation and toxicity serve as an incentive for preclinical research. The interest in adding radiation to immunotherapy (such as check-point inhibitors) needs to be coupled with pre-clinical mechanism studies and biomarkers as being developed by immune-oncologists. This workshop is the initial presentation of this concept with further dissemination forthcoming that proposes a “meta-strategic plan” for radiation oncology and biology.

REFERENCES:

1. Workshop,
https://dctd.cancer.gov/NewsEvents/biological_consequences_of_radiation_therapy_workshop_agenda.pdf. 2017.
2. Brown, J.M., *Vasculogenesis: a crucial player in the resistance of solid tumours to radiotherapy*. Br J Radiol, 2014. **87**(1035): p. 20130686.
3. Tyburski, J.B., et al., *Radiation metabolomics. 1. Identification of minimally invasive urine biomarkers for gamma-radiation exposure in mice*. Radiat Res, 2008. **170**(1): p. 1-14.
4. Cheema, A.K., et al., *Long-term differential changes in mouse intestinal metabolomics after gamma and heavy ion radiation exposure*. PLoS One, 2014. **9**(1): p. e87079.
5. John-Aryankalayil, M., et al., *Fractionated radiation alters oncomir and tumor suppressor miRNAs in human prostate cancer cells*. Radiat Res, 2012. **178**(3): p. 105-17.
6. Palayoor, S.T., et al., *Differential expression of stress and immune response pathway transcripts and miRNAs in normal human endothelial cells subjected to fractionated or single-dose radiation*. Mol Cancer Res, 2014. **12**(7): p. 1002-15.
7. Desai, N.B., A.M. Laine, and R.D. Timmerman, *Stereotactic ablative body radiotherapy (SABR) for oligometastatic cancer*. Br J Radiol, 2017. **90**(1070): p. 20160500.
8. Eke, I., et al., *Exploiting radiation-induced signaling to increase the susceptibility of resistant cancer cells to targeted drugs: AKT and mTOR inhibitors as an example*. Mol Cancer Ther, 2017.
9. Lee, N., et al., *Strategy of Using Intratreatment Hypoxia Imaging to Selectively and Safely Guide Radiation Dose De-escalation Concurrent With Chemotherapy for Locoregionally Advanced Human Papillomavirus-Related Oropharyngeal Carcinoma*. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 2016. **96**(1): p. 9-17.

10. Kerns, S.L., H. Ostrer, and B.S. Rosenstein, *Radiogenomics: using genetics to identify cancer patients at risk for development of adverse effects following radiotherapy*. *Cancer Discov*, 2014. **4**(2): p. 155-65.