ARTICLE IN PRESS

Journal of Controlled Release xxx (2013) xxx-xxx



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Controlled Release



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jconrel

1 Review

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

² Systemic tumor-specific gene delivery

Q1 Max Kullberg, Ryan McCarthy, Thomas J. Anchordoquy

Q2 Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Colorado Denver, 12850 Montview Boulevard, Aurora, 80045, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Keywords:

Systemic

Non-viral Dendrimer

Viral

Gene therapy

Delivery system

Received 13 May 2013

Available online xxxx

Accepted 22 August 2013

ABSTRACT

The objective of a systemically administered cancer gene therapy is to achieve gene expression that is isolated to 21 the tumor tissue. Unfortunately, viral systems have strong affinity for the liver, and delivery from non-viral cat-22 ionic systems often results in high expression in the lungs. Non-specific delivery to these organs must be over-23 come if tumors are to be aggressively treated with genes such as IL-12 which activates a tumor immune 24 response, and TNF-alpha which can induce tumor cell apoptosis. Techniques which have led to specific expres-25 sion in tumor tissue include receptor targeting through ligand conjugation, utilization of tumor specific pro-26 moters and viral mutation in order to take advantage of proteins overexpressed in tumor cells. This review 27 analyzes these techniques applied to liposomal, PEI, dendrimer, stem cell and viral gene delivery systems in 28 order to determine the techniques that are most effective in achieving tumor specific gene expression after 29 systemic administration. 30

© 2013 Published by Elsevier B.V. 31

02

35 34 Contents 36 38 0 1. 39 2. Non-viral systems 0 21 40 0 Polyethylenimines (PEIs) 41 2.2. 0 422.3 Dendrimers 0 2.4 430 Viral systems 44 3. 0 • • • Vaccinia virus 453.1. 0 3.2 46 0 Lentivirus 47 3.3. 0 4. 48 0 49 5. Comment on endosomal escape mechanism 0 506. Concluding remarks Ω 0 5152Acknowledgments 0 53 References 0

54

55

1. Introduction

The vast majority of reported viral and non-viral gene delivery systems do not preferentially target tumor tissue. Viral systems including vaccinia virus, adenovirus, and lentivirus deliver their payload primarily to the liver, while non-viral systems such as cationic liposomes and polymers principally deliver to lung tissue [1–4]. Researchers take advantage of the innate targeting of these systems, using viral and non-viral vectors to target hepatocellular carcinomas and non-small cell 62 lung carcinomas respectively [5–8]. However, when targeting other can- 63 cers or metastases not resident in the liver and lung, accumulation in 64 these organs hinders effective cancer therapy. 65

Methods for locally administering gene delivery systems include in- 66 tracranial, intratumoral and intravenous injection as well as inhalation. 67 Localized delivery techniques have been shown to be effective in 68 treating primary tumors [9]. Intratumoral delivery of viral gene delivery 69 systems targets the tumor tissue and while there is some distribution of 70 the virus outside of the tumor, the toxicity and immunogenicity are 71 tolerable. Inhalation of nanoparticles results in the payload selectively 72

E-mail address: max.kullberg@ucdenver.edu (M. Kullberg).

^{0168-3659/\$ –} see front matter © 2013 Published by Elsevier B.V. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/i.jconrel.2013.08.300

2

ARTICLE IN PRESS

reaching the lungs, while intracranial tumor injection is effective for 73 74 circumventing the blood-brain barrier [10,11]. Although some of these localized methods of administration may be sufficient for primary tumor 7576 targeting, undetected metastases will need to be targeted with an intravenous injection of a delivery system that can home to tumor cells system-03 ically. As primary tumors can often be removed surgically, metastases 78 should be the priority when developing a delivery system for treating 79 cancer. A tumor-specific, systemically-delivered vector would be able to 80 81 capitalize on the growing number of genes that have been shown to hin-82 der the growth of metastatic cancer cells.

Many of the genes that could be used to aggressively promote cancer 83 84 cell apoptosis or stimulate an immune response to a tumor will result 85 in unacceptable toxicity if delivered primarily to the lungs and liver 86 [12,13]. Two cytokines that have been shown to deter metastasis and effectively treat already established metastases are IL-12 and IL-2 [14-16]. 87 When delivered to the microenvironment of a metastatic tumor, IL-12 88 can polarize T helper cells towards a TH1 phenotype, which produces 89 90 IFN-gamma and activates a cytotoxic T-cell response. IL-2 has been shown to illicit a response from natural killer and cytotoxic T-cells. 91 While both of these cytokines can prevent metastatic tumor growth 92when delivered locally, systemic delivery that is non-specific has signif-93 icant toxicity [12,17]. It is largely because of this dose-dependent toxic-94 95ity that clinical trials using systemic delivery of IL-12 have had limited 96 success.

Other attractive genes for delivery encode ligands that target death 97 receptors leading to apoptosis, including tumor necrosis factor-alpha 98 (TNF-alpha), CD95/FAS and tumor necrosis factor-related apoptosis-99 100 inducing ligand (TRAIL) [13,18,19]. The appeal of a suicide protein being delivered to tumor cells is undeniable, but as with immune-stimulating 101 cytokines, the non-specific systemic delivery of a suicide gene is not 102well tolerated [20]. Considering recent concerns of hepatotoxicity, even 103 104 the relatively non-toxic TRAIL must be dosed conservatively as it moves 105into the clinic [21]. Herpes simplex virus thymidine kinase (HSV/tk) is 106 another gene commonly chosen for delivery [22]. Accumulation of thymidine kinase within a target cell is toxic upon administration of a py-107 rimidine or purine analog drug, converting the drug to its active form 108 in the cytoplasm [23]. As with the other genes mentioned above, non-109110 specific delivery of HSV/tk will result in death of bystander cells. Whether specificity is incurred by targeting of tumor tissue, selective internali-111 zation into tumor cells or use of tumor-specific promoters, selective gene 112 expression must be achieved if we are to aggressively target tumor 113 metastases with genes that promote cell death. 114

This review focuses on viral and non-viral systems that have been 115 reported to achieve specific gene expression in tumor tissue. Unless 116 stated otherwise, the delivery system was administered via tail vein in-117 jection. The type of delivery system is introduced in each section with a 118 119 description of its natural targets, followed by an analysis of studies that have manipulated the system so that gene expression is greater in the 120 tumor than in other major organs. In addition, we discuss gene delivery 121 using stem cells which have been reported to naturally migrate to 122tumor tissue. 123

124 **2. Non-viral systems**

125 2.1. Lipoplex

126Cationic lipoplexes are composed of a cationic lipid and a neutral lipid or cholesterol [2,24]. The negatively-charged DNA is compacted 127 and forms a complex with the positively-charged lipid, resulting in the 128 formation of a lipoplex. Lipoplexes interact with the cell membrane 129and internalize into the cell through endocytosis. It is thought that the 130lipid components, once internalized, lead to destabilization of the lipid 131 complex, fusion with the endosomal membrane, and cytoplasmic deliv-132ery of the DNA. DNA can reach the nucleus when the nuclear membrane 133 breaks down during cell division, and thus rapidly-dividing cells are 134 135 generally more easily transfected. When compared with viral delivery systems, the non-viral cationic lipoplex is considered less immuno- 136 genic, and able to hold a larger payload. The drawbacks include tox- 137 icity of cationic lipids and relatively inefficient and non-specific 138 delivery [25]. 139

Cationic lipoplexes deliver genes primarily to the lungs and secondarily to the liver [26]. Luciferase expression is observed in the liver and lungs with relatively low expression in flank tumors of a mouse model. Coating of the cationic lipoplex with polyethylene glycol (PEG) can be employed to increase circulation time with the hope of enhancing delivtry to the leaky capillary bed of tumor tissue [1,27]. However, several groups have reported that increased levels of PEG do not improve distribution to the tumor tissue, and delivery is predominantly to the lungs and liver [1,28].

To increase the tumor specificity of systemically-delivered cationic 149 lipoplexes, one group used both PEG shielding and integrin targeting 150 [27,29,30]. These cationic lipoplexes have a short triethylene glycol coat- 151 ing and a peptide targeted to integrins, which are overexpressed in many 152 neuroblastoma cell lines. The PEG and integrin-targeting peptides 153 are connected to the liposome through linkages that are cleavable 154 by endosomal furin, cathepsin B, or esterases. After binding and inter- 155 nalization into tumor cells, the peptides and PEG are cleaved from the 156 liposome, allowing for destabilization and delivery of the nucleic acid. 157 This technique has resulted in highly specific tumor targeting upon sys- 158 temic administration. Tissue analysis showed that accumulation of lu- 159 ciferase DNA was at least two-fold greater in the tumor tissue when 160 compared to the lung, liver and spleen, but more importantly, expres- 161 sion of the luciferase gene was 130-fold greater in the tumor tissue 162 than in the other organs. When this system was used to deliver IL-2/163 IL-12 cytokines to subcutaneous neuroblastoma tumors in a mouse 164 model, 1/3 of the tumors were eradicated and 2/3 of the tumors had 165 markedly decreased growth. It is important to mention that the expres- 166 sion data took into account the entire tumor and organ. When measur- 167 ing expression, data is usually presented as per organ, per mg protein, or 168 per mg tissue. Since the liver certainly weighs much more than the 169 tumor in any realistic clinical scenario, presenting data as per organ is 170 often the least impressive and possibly the most relevant reporting 171 method. However, data reported as "per organ" can be misleading if tu- 172 mors are allowed to achieve grotesque proportions in animal models. 173 Therefore, it is preferable to include both measurements to allow 174 comparison with published studies. 175

Wang et al. were able to achieve good tumor specificity using a cat- 176 ionic lipid system consisting of DOTAP and cholesterol [31]. Messenger 177 RNA for luciferase is condensed with protamine which then associates 178 with the cationic liposome. The resulting complex is PEGylated, and 179 anisamide is attached so that the particles will target cancer cells 180 overexpressing the sigma receptor. This system results in at least 181 10-fold greater expression per mg of tumor tissue compared to liver tis- 182 sue. When the suicide gene thymidine kinase from Herpes simplex 183 virus is delivered systemically using this system, the tumors show a 184 marked decrease in growth [31]. To assess if the delivery system was 185 causing toxicity, serum concentrations of liver enzymes, alanine trans- 186 aminase and aspartate transaminase were assayed along with blood 187 urea nitrogen levels which can reveal kidney damage. After repeated 188 treatment with the liposomes, all of these toxicity indicators fell within 189 their normal range, suggesting that this therapy could be tolerable at 190 clinical dosages. 191

To target prostate cancer, lkegami et al. used a monoclonal antibody 192 that binds to prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA) [32]. This 193 membrane protein is present in prostate cancers and is not expressed 194 in normal tissue. The antibody is coupled to polylysine, which is then 195 used to condense DNA. The targeted polylysine is mixed with cationic 196 liposomes and the resulting complex is used to deliver luciferase and 197 HSV/tk to prostate tumors. With this system, luciferase expression was 198 at least 17-fold higher per mg prostate tumor than in lung, liver and 199 kidneys. When the HSV/tk gene was delivered to treat tumors, tumor 200 mass was reduced by approximately 50% [32]. 201 Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/10612771

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/10612771

Daneshyari.com