

# Mixed immunotherapy and chemotherapy of tumors: modeling, applications and biological interpretations

L.G. de Pillis<sup>a,\*</sup>, W. Gu<sup>a</sup>, A.E. Radunskaya<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, CA 91711, USA

<sup>b</sup>Pomona College, Claremont, CA 91711, USA

Received 28 October 2004; received in revised form 31 May 2005; accepted 28 June 2005

Available online 8 September 2005

## Abstract

We develop and analyze a mathematical model, in the form of a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs), governing cancer growth on a cell population level with combination immune, vaccine and chemotherapy treatments. We characterize the ODE system dynamics by locating equilibrium points, determining stability properties, performing a bifurcation analysis, and identifying basins of attraction. These system characteristics are useful not only to gain a broad understanding of the specific system dynamics, but also to help guide the development of combination therapies. Numerical simulations of mixed chemo-immuno and vaccine therapy using both mouse and human parameters are presented. We illustrate situations for which neither chemotherapy nor immunotherapy alone are sufficient to control tumor growth, but in combination the therapies are able to eliminate the entire tumor.

© 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Mathematical modeling; Chemotherapy; Immunotherapy; Vaccine; Cancer; Tumor

## 1. Introduction and background

### 1.1. The importance of the immune system and immunotherapy

Immunotherapies are quickly becoming an important component in the multi-pronged approaches being developed to treat certain forms of cancer. The goal of immunotherapy is to strengthen the body's own natural ability to combat cancer by enhancing the effectiveness of the immune system. The importance of the immune system in fighting cancer has been verified in the laboratory as well as with clinical experiments. See, for example, Farrar et al. (1999), O'Byrne et al. (2000), Morecki et al. (1996), Muller et al. (1998), Stewart (1996). Additionally, it is known that those with weakened immune systems, such as those suffering from AIDS, are

more likely to contract certain rare forms of cancer. This phenomenon can be interpreted as providing further evidence that the role played by the immune response in battling cancer is critical. See, for example, Dalglish and O'Byrne (2002), Cancer Research Institute (2000).

Through the mathematical modeling of tumor growth, the presence of an immune component has been shown to be essential for producing clinically observed phenomena such as tumor dormancy, oscillations in tumor size, and spontaneous tumor regression. The mathematical modeling of the entire immune system can be an enormously intricate task, as demonstrated in Perelson and Weisbuch (1997), so models that describe the immune system response to a tumor challenge must necessarily focus on those elements of the immune system that are known to be significant in controlling tumor growth. In the work of de Boer and Hogeweg (1986), a mathematical model of the cellular immune response was used to investigate such an immune reaction to tumors. It was found that initially small doses of antigens do lead to tumor dormancy. The

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +909 621 8975; fax: +909 621 8366.

E-mail addresses: [depilllis@hmc.edu](mailto:depilllis@hmc.edu) (L.G. de Pillis), [gu@math.hmc.edu](mailto:gu@math.hmc.edu) (W. Gu), [aradunskaya@pomona.edu](mailto:aradunskaya@pomona.edu) (A.E. Radunskaya).

mathematical model of Kirschner and Panetta (1998), which also focuses on the tumor–immune interaction, indicates that the dynamics among tumor cells, immune cells, and the cytokine interleukin-2 (IL-2) can explain both short-term oscillations in tumor size as well as long-term tumor relapse. The model developed by Kuznetsov (Kuznetsov and Makalkin, 1992; Kuznetsov et al., 1994), in which the nonlinear dynamics of immunogenic tumors are examined, also exhibits oscillatory growth patterns in tumors, as well as dormancy and “creeping through”: when the tumor stays very small for a relatively long period of time, and subsequently grows to be dangerously large. In these mathematical models, the cyclical behavior of the tumor is directly attributable to the interaction of the tumor with the immune system. There is a host of literature that addresses the development of various mathematical descriptions of cancer and the immune response, among which we mention just a few: (Bellomo et al., 2004; Bellomo and Preziosi, 2000; Chandawarkar and Guyton, 2002; Chester et al., 2000; Derbel, 2004; De Angelis and Jabin, 2003; Cui, 2002; Kolev, 2003; Dalglish, 1999; De Angelis and Mesin, 2001; Delitala, 2002; Ferreira et al., 2002; Friedrich et al., 2002; Garcia-Penarrubia et al., 2002; Gatenby and Gawlinski, 2003; Gatenby and Maini, 2002; Hardy and Stark, 2002; Keil et al., 2001; Kuznetsov and Knott, 2001; Lucia and Maino, 2002; Marincola et al., 2003; Nani and Freedman, 2000; Owen and Sherratt, 1999; Sharma et al., 2003; Sotolongo-Costa et al., 2003; Stengel et al., 2002; Takayanagi and Ohuchi, 2001; Wallace et al., 2003; Webb et al., 2002; Wein et al., 2003; Wodarz, 2001; Wodarz and Jansen, 2003). In de Pillis and Radunskaya (2001) we also demonstrate the critical role the immune system plays in giving rise to cyclical behavior. This model also highlights the crucial role the immune system plays in the process of tumor elimination.

The clear importance of the immune system in controlling cancer growth, both clinically and mathematically, indicates that models incorporating tumor growth and treatment would do well to include an immune system component. Once this component is in place, it is then possible to model how various immunotherapies may affect the system, either singly or in combination with one another. Recent clinical data have shown there is potential benefit in harnessing the power of the immune system in combination with traditional chemotherapy. For example, in Wheeler et al. (2004), it is demonstrated that vaccine therapy in combination with chemotherapy more effectively extends patient survival times than either chemotherapy or vaccine therapy alone.

### 1.2. Immunotherapy

The clinical evidence for the potential of immune system control of certain malignancies has motivated new

research into the development of immunotherapies and vaccine therapies for cancers (see, for example Blattman and Greenberg, 2004; Couzin, 2002; Donnelly, 2003; Pardoll, 1998; Rosenberg et al., 2004; Wheeler et al., 2004). Immunotherapy falls into three main categories: immune response modifiers, monoclonal antibodies, and vaccines (see, for example, Rosenbaum and Rosenbaum, 2005). The first category contains substances that affect immune response, such as interleukins (including IL-2), interferons, tumor necrosis factors (TNF), colony-stimulating factors (CSF), and B-cell growth factors. In the next category, monoclonal antibodies are currently being developed to target specific cancer antigens. These monoclonals can distinguish between normal and cancer cells, and they can then be used to diagnose cancer, as well as to treat tumors by “guiding” anticancer drugs toward the malignant cells (see, e.g., Qu et al., 2005; Hadj, 2005; Li et al., 2005). In the third category are vaccines, which are generally used therapeutically, and are created from tumor cells. These work by helping the immune system to recognize and attack specific cancer cells. In this work, we implement treatment from the first category in the form of mathematical terms that represent IL-2 and tumor infiltrating lymphocyte (TIL) injections, and additionally incorporate treatment from the third category: new mathematical forms that distinguish between specific and nonspecific immune responses, allowing for the incorporation of a vaccine component into the model. Although monoclonal antibody treatments are considered promising, they are currently not considered in this work.

### 1.3. Cancer vaccines

There are fundamental differences between the use and effects of antiviral vaccines and anticancer vaccines. While many vaccines for infectious diseases are preventative, cancer vaccines are designed to be used therapeutically, treating the disease after it has begun, and preventing the disease from recurring. Cancer vaccines are still considered to be highly experimental as compared with other forms of cancer immunotherapy, but early clinical trials are showing increasing promise in their ability to improve the immune response to certain forms of cancer (see, e.g., Rosenbaum and Rosenbaum, 2005; Wheeler et al., 2004).

Since cancer vaccines and antiviral vaccines differ in their application, mathematical models of these vaccines should exhibit different dynamics. The goal of this paper is to build on existing models of tumor growth, incorporating an immune system response and expanding these models to include the effect of anti-tumor vaccination and immunotherapies in conjunction with chemotherapies. In another work, the authors will extend this model into a larger framework that incorporates spatial and geometric components.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we present the set of assumptions incorporated into our tumor growth model, and develop the system of ODEs that form the mathematical model. In Section 3, we discuss how parameter values for the model are chosen. In Section 4, we carry out an analysis of the non-dimensionalized model, finding equilibrium points, stability criteria, bifurcation points, and basins of attraction. Section 5 presents numerical experiments based on parameters representing data collected from laboratory mice, and includes contrasts between immunotherapies and chemotherapies. In Section 6, we present numerical experiments that reflect parameter values gathered from human clinical trials, again contrasting immunotherapies with chemotherapies, and simulating combinations of these. In Section 7, we present theoretical simulations highlighting the potential effect of vaccine therapy on a patient, as well as vaccine therapy in combination with chemotherapy. In Section 8, we summarize and discuss our conclusions.

## 2. Model formulation

One goal for a mathematical model is to allow for sufficient complexity so that the model will qualitatively generate clinically observed *in vivo* tumor growth patterns, while it simultaneously maintains sufficient simplicity to admit analysis. The model we present in this paper can exhibit the following behaviors in the absence of medical interventions:

- (1) Tumor dormancy and sneaking through. There is clinical evidence that a tumor mass may disappear, or at least become no longer detectable, and then for reasons not yet fully understood, may reappear, growing to lethal size.
- (2) Uncontrolled growth of tumor cells due to accelerated growth rates.
- (3) Detrimental effects of immune cells on tumor cells through normal immune function.
- (4) Inactivation of cytotoxic immune cells through interaction with tumor cells.
- (5) Global stimulatory effect of tumor cells on the immune response.
- (6) Both nonspecific and specific immune responses to the presence of tumor cells.

Additionally, since we wish to determine improved combination therapy treatment protocols, we include the following mathematical model components that represent tumor response to medical interventions.

- (1) System response to chemotherapy (direct cytotoxic effects on tumor and immune cell populations).

- (2) System response to direct immunotherapy (such as IL-2 and TIL injections).
- (3) System response to vaccine therapy (including direct stimulatory effects on the immune system through injection of modified autologous tumor cells).

The model is a system of ordinary differential equations whose state variables are populations of tumor cells, specific and nonspecific immune cells, and concentrations of therapeutic interventions. The assumptions that were used to determine the model equations are outlined below, followed by a discussion of the model equations themselves.

### 2.1. Model assumptions

The ODE model is based on that originally developed by de Pillis and Radunskaya (2003b), and is now extended by adding new cell interaction terms as well as terms describing chemotherapy and immunotherapy. For the sake of completeness, we outline the assumptions of the original model here. We should note that there is not universal agreement as to the underlying dynamics or precise cascades of events that take place in the immune response process. Our assumptions, therefore, are based on published statements and conjectures as well as reasonable suppositions.

- A tumor grows logistically in the absence of an immune response. This is one accepted growth model for tumors (Britton, 2003), and is also based on fittings of the data in Diefenbach et al. (2001).
- Both NK and CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells are capable of killing tumor cells (see, for example, Diefenbach et al., 2001; Kwarada et al., 2001; Germain, 2004).
- Both NK and CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells respond to tumor cells by expanding and increasing cytolytic activity (see, for example, Osada et al., 2004; Kieper et al., 2001).
- NK cells are normally present in the body, even when no tumor cells are present, since they are part of the innate immune response (see, for example, Roitt et al., 1993).
- As part of the specific immune response, active tumor-specific CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells are only present in large numbers when tumor cells are present (see, for example, Roitt et al., 1993; Kirschner and Panetta, 1998).
- NK and CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells become inactive after some number of encounters with tumor cells (see, for example, Adam and Bellomo, 1997).

The following additional assumptions are used in the development of therapeutic terms.

- Circulating lymphocyte levels can be used as a measure of patient health (see, e.g., Mustafa et al., 1998; Melichar et al., 2001; Glas et al., 2000).

Components of the lymphocyte population are involved in the production of antibody and in stimulating B-cells. NK cells kill cells to which antibody has attached (in addition to killing cells lacking MHC-I surface molecules). In this model, the source of the NK cell population is represented as a fraction of the circulating lymphocyte population, a simplification meant to represent the complex cascade of biological events that leads to NK cell stimulation (see, e.g., Cooper et al., 2001).

- The fraction of the tumor population killed by chemotherapy depends on the amount of drug in the system. The fraction killed has a maximum less than one, since only tumor cells in certain stages of development can be killed by chemotherapy (Pazdur et al., 2004).
- A fraction of NK cells, CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells, and circulating lymphocytes are also killed by chemotherapy, according to a similar fractional kill curve (Gardner, 2000).
- NK and T cells are components of the process of stimulation and elimination of activated effector cells, a model simplification meant to reflect the self-regulatory nature of the immune system (see, e.g., Dudley et al., 2002; Germain, 2004; Jiang and Chess, 2004).

## 2.2. ODE model: general form of equations

The model describes the kinetics of four populations (tumor cells and three types of immune cells), as well as two drug concentrations in the bloodstream, using a series of coupled ordinary differential equations based on the model developed by de Pillis and Radunskaya (2003b). The populations at time  $t$  are denoted by:

- $T(t)$ , tumor cell population,
- $N(t)$ , total NK cell population,
- $L(t)$ , total CD8<sup>+</sup>T cell population,
- $C(t)$ , number of circulating lymphocytes (or white blood cells),
- $M(t)$ , chemotherapy drug concentration in the bloodstream,
- $I(t)$ , immunotherapy drug concentration in the bloodstream.

The equations governing the population kinetics must take into account a net growth term for each population ( $G_T$ ,  $G_N$ ,  $G_L$ ,  $G_C$ ,  $G_M$ ,  $G_I$ ), the fractional cell kill ( $F_N$ ,  $F_L$ ,  $F_{MT}$ ,  $F_{MN}$ ,  $F_{ML}$ ,  $F_{LI}$ ,  $F_{CM}$ ), per cell recruitment ( $R_N$ ,  $R_L$ ), cell inactivation ( $I_N$ ,  $I_L$ ) and external intervention with medication ( $H_L$ ,  $H_M$ ,  $H_I$ ). We attempt to use the simplest expressions for each term that still accurately reflect experimental data and population interactions.

Note that the population levels of NK and CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells actually represent immune cell “effectiveness” in

the sense that an increase in the total population count in the mathematical model may actually be evidenced biologically either as a greater number of total cells, or as each individual immune cell becoming more efficient at killing the target tumor cells.

The functional forms that we choose for each cell–interaction term are discussed below. We have chosen to represent parameters by lower case letters always assumed to be positive, and state variables or functions of state variables by upper case letters.

### 2.2.1. Growth and death terms

We adapt the growth terms for tumor and CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells from de Pillis and Radunskaya (2003b). Tumor growth is assumed to be logistic, based on data gathered from immunodeficient mice (Diefenbach et al., 2001). Therefore  $G_T = aT(1 - bT)$ . Cell growth for CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells consists only of natural death rates, since no CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells are assumed to be present in the absence of tumor cells, so  $G_L = -mL$ .

The model in de Pillis and Radunskaya (2003b) assumed a constant NK cell production rate. In the new model, this growth term is tied to the overall immune health levels as measured by the population of circulating lymphocytes. This allows for the suppression of stem cells during chemotherapy, which lowers circulating lymphocyte counts and affects the production rate of NK cells. Therefore,  $G_N = eC - fN$ . We assume that circulating lymphocytes are generated at a constant rate, and that each cell has a natural lifespan. This gives us the term  $G_C = \alpha - \beta C$ . We assume that the chemotherapy drug, after injection, will be eliminated from the body over time at a rate proportional to its concentration, giving an exponential decay:  $G_M = -\gamma M$ . Similarly, we assume the immunotherapy drug, IL-2, decays exponentially:  $G_I = -\mu_I I$ .

### 2.2.2. Fractional cell kill terms

The fractional cell kill terms for  $N$  and  $L$  are taken from de Pillis and Radunskaya (2003b). These fractional cell kill terms represent negative interactions between two populations. They can represent competition for space and nutrients as well as regulatory action and direct cell population interaction. The interaction between tumor and NK cells takes the form  $F_N(T, N) = -cNT$ . Tumor lysis by CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells, on the other hand, has the form:

$$F_L(T, L) = d \frac{(L/T)^l}{s + (L/T)^l} T.$$

Letting

$$D(T, L) = d \frac{(L/T)^l}{s + (L/T)^l}$$

we have  $F_L(T, L) = DT$ .



The model includes a chemotherapy drug kill term in each of the cell population equations. Certain chemotherapeutic drugs, such as doxorubicin, are only effective during certain phases of the cell cycle, and pharmacokinetics also indicate that the effectiveness of chemotherapy is bounded. We therefore use a saturation term  $1 - e^{-M}$  to represent the chemotherapy fractional cell kill. Note that at relatively low concentrations of drug, the kill rate is nearly linear, while at higher drug concentration, the kill rate plateaus. The mathematical term we use reflects the dose–response curves suggested by the literature (Gardner, 2000). We therefore let  $F_{M\phi} = K_{\phi}(1 - e^{-M})\phi$ , for  $\phi = T, N, L, C$ .

Additionally, we include CD8<sup>+</sup>T activation by IL-2 immunotherapy. This “drug” is actually a naturally occurring cytokine in the human body, and its effect on the immune system’s efficacy is described mathematically with a Michaelis–Menten interaction term in the equation for  $L$ . The presence of IL-2 stimulates the production of CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells, so we let  $F_{LI} = p_I LI/(g_I + I)$ . This is the activation term developed in Kirschner’s tumor–immune model (Kirschner and Panetta, 1998).

### 2.2.3. Recruitment

The recruitment of NK cells takes on the same form as the fractional cell kill term,  $D$ , for CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells, with  $l$  equal to two, as described by de Pillis and Radunskaya (2003b). Hence the NK cell recruitment term is

$$R_N(T, N) = g \frac{T^2}{h + T^2} N.$$

This is a modified Michaelis–Menten term, commonly used in tumor models to govern cell–cell interactions (Kuznetsov et al., 1994; de Pillis and Radunskaya, 2003b; Kirschner and Panetta, 1998).

CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells are thought to be activated by a number of triggers, including fragments of tumor cells that have been lysed by other CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells (Huang et al., 1994). The CD8<sup>+</sup>T cell recruitment term has a form similar to that for the NK cell recruitment, except that the tumor population is replaced with the lysed tumor population from the tumor–CD8<sup>+</sup>T cell interaction term,  $D(T, L)$ . Thus the new recruitment term is

$$R_L(T, L) = j \frac{D^2 T^2}{k + D^2 T^2}.$$

CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells may also be recruited by the debris from tumor cells lysed by NK cells (see, e.g., Huang et al., 1994). This recruitment term is proportional to the number of cells killed:  $R_L(N, T) = r_1 NT$ . The immune system is also stimulated by the presence of tumor cells to produce more CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells. Recognition of the presence of the tumor is proportional to the average

number of encounters between circulating lymphocytes and the tumor:  $R_L(C, T) = r_2 CT$ .

### 2.2.4. Inactivation terms

Inactivation of cytolytic potential occurs when an NK or CD8<sup>+</sup>T cell has interacted with tumor cells several times and ceases to be effective. We use the inactivation terms developed by de Pillis and Radunskaya (2003b):  $I_N = -pNT$  and  $I_L = -qLT$ . The parameters in the inactivation terms represent mean inactivation rates.

The third inactivation term,  $I_{CL} = -uNL^2$ , describes regulation and suppression of CD8<sup>+</sup>T cell activity, which occurs when there are very high levels of activated CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells without responsiveness to cytokines present in the system (see, e.g. Gilbertson et al., 1986; Gett et al., 2003). This term comes into play when the amount of CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells in the body is high, and experimental data document that these cells can become rapidly inactivated even with a tumor present (Rosenberg and Lotze, 1986). The cytokine IL-2 aids in the resistance of the CD8<sup>+</sup>T cell population to this inactivation (Antony and Restifo, 2005).

### 2.2.5. Drug intervention terms

The TIL drug intervention term,  $H_L$ , for the CD8<sup>+</sup>T cell population represents an immunotherapy in which the immune cell levels are boosted by the addition of antigen-specific cytolytic immune cells.  $H_L$  is a function of time denoted by  $v_L = v_L(t)$ . Similarly, the drug intervention terms in the equations for  $dM/dt$  and  $dI/dt$  reflect the amount of chemotherapy and immunotherapy drug given over time. Therefore, drug intervention terms  $H_M$  and  $H_I$  are also functions of time denoted, respectively, by  $v_M = v_M(t)$  and  $v_I = v_I(t)$ .

## 2.3. ODE model: specific terms in equations

Bringing together the specific forms for each cell growth and interaction term leads to the full system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dT}{dt} = & aT(1 - bT) - cNT - DT \\ & - K_T(1 - e^{-M})T, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dN}{dt} = & eC - fN + g \frac{T^2}{h + T^2} N - pNT \\ & - K_N(1 - e^{-M})N, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dL}{dt} = & -mL + j \frac{D^2 T^2}{k + D^2 T^2} L - qLT \\ & + (r_1 N + r_2 C)T \\ & - uNL^2 - K_L(1 - e^{-M})L \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$+ \frac{p_I LI}{g_I + I} + v_L(t), \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = \alpha - \beta C - K_C(1 - e^{-M})C, \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = -\gamma M + v_M(t), \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = -\mu_I I + v_I(t), \quad (7)$$

$$D = d \frac{(L/T)^l}{s + (L/T)^l}. \quad (8)$$

### 3. Experimental data and parameter derivation

While a general model with non-specific parameters is useful in studying the qualitative dynamics of cancer growth, it is also necessary to study parameter sets meant to reflect specific cancer types (such as melanoma). System parameters can vary greatly from one individual to another, so multiple data sets can be used in order to obtain acceptable parameter ranges. In this work, we use the data made available from both the murine experimental studies of Diefenbach et al. (2001) and the human clinical trials of Dudley et al. (2002). When necessary, we also use previous model parameters that have been fitted to experimental curves (de Pillis et al., 2003; de Pillis and Radunskaya, 2003a, b; Kuznetsov et al., 1994). Simulations with several sets of parameters were performed in order to evaluate the qualitative behavior of the model.<sup>1</sup> Parameters which were estimated specifically for this investigation are described in the sections below.

#### 3.1. Chemotherapy parameters

Chemotherapy strength was assumed to be one log-kill, as described in Perry (2001), and the values of the kill parameters  $K_T, K_N, K_L$  were chosen accordingly. Certain chemotherapy drugs, such as doxorubicin, kill cells by disrupting the process of division and growth. Rapidly dividing cells, like those of the hair, the stomach lining, and the bone marrow where immune cells are produced, are preferentially damaged by chemotherapy (see, e.g., National Cancer Institute, 2005; Holland and Emil III, 1973). High doses of drug can also damage other tissues in the body (Holland and Emil III, 1973). Ideally, chemotherapy should more effectively kill tumor cells than immune cells. Therefore,  $K_N, K_L$ , and  $K_C$  are assumed to be smaller than  $K_T$ , but of the same order of magnitude.

The drug decay rate,  $\gamma$ , was calculated from the drug half-life and the relation  $\gamma = \ln 2/t_{1/2}$ . The drug half-life,  $t_{1/2}$ , was estimated to be about 18 h, based on

experimental data for the chemotherapeutic drug doxorubicin (Calabresi and Schein, 1993).

#### 3.2. Additional CD8<sup>+</sup>T cell regulation parameters

In addition to chemotherapy, we introduce immunotherapy into the system of differential equations. The cytokine IL-2 is known to stimulate CD8<sup>+</sup>T cell recruitment and proliferation (see, e.g., Roitt et al., 1993). IL-2 is produced naturally by the body, and is also administered therapeutically to boost immune system function. IL-2 has been used in clinical trials on its own, in combination with chemotherapy, and in conjunction with TIL injections, in which a large number of highly activated CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells are injected into the system (Rosenberg and Lotze, 1986; Curti et al., 1996; Hara et al., 1996; Lumsden et al., 1996).

The three parameters,  $p_I, g_I, \mu_I$ , mirror those of Kirschner's model (Kirschner and Panetta, 1998) with minor alterations to reflect the fact that we are only concerned with the amount of IL-2 that is not naturally produced by the immune system. The half-life,  $\ln 2/\mu_I$  is taken from Kirschner's model.

The values of  $r_2$  and  $u$  are chosen to allow for reasonable simulation outcomes of the model.

### 4. Non-dimensionalization and analysis

To allow for analysis, we now consider the system of Eqs. (1)–(8) in the absence of treatment. When chemotherapy and immunotherapy are eliminated, the model is reduced to a four-population system of ordinary differential equations. To further clarify the dependence of the system on parameters, and to improve the performance of numerical methods, we non-dimensionalize the system as follows. Let the non-dimensionalized state variables be

$$C^* = \frac{a}{\alpha} C, \quad T^* = bT, \quad N^* = \frac{a^2}{\alpha e} N, \\ L^* = bL, \quad D^* = \frac{1}{a} D, \quad t^* = at$$

and the corresponding parameters be

$$c^* = \frac{c\alpha e}{a^3}, \quad d^* = \frac{d}{a}, \quad f^* = \frac{f}{a}, \quad g^* = \frac{g}{a}, \quad h^* = hb^2, \\ j^* = \frac{j}{a}, \quad k^* = (kb^2)/a, \quad m^* = \frac{m}{a}, \\ p^* = \frac{p}{ab}, \quad q^* = \frac{q}{ba}, \quad r_1^* = \frac{r_1 \alpha e}{a^3}, \quad r_2^* = \frac{r_2 \alpha}{a^2}, \\ s^* = s, \quad u^* = \frac{u\alpha e}{a^3 b}, \quad \beta^* = \frac{\beta}{a}.$$

Leaving the other parameters unchanged, and dropping the stars for notational clarity, the non-dimensionalized

<sup>1</sup>See Tables 1 and 2 for a full listing all of the parameters with their units and descriptions.

system is given by

$$\frac{dT}{dt} = T(1 - T) - cNT - DT, \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = C - fN + g \frac{T^2}{h + T^2} N - pNT, \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dL}{dt} = & -mL + j \frac{D^2 T^2}{k + D^2 T^2} L \\ & + (r_1 N + r_2 C)T - qLT - uNL^2, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = 1 - \beta C, \quad (12)$$

$$D = \frac{d(L/T)^I}{s + (L/T)^I}. \quad (13)$$

#### 4.1. Determination of equilibria and their stability

In order to study the equilibria of the system and their stability, we note first that Eq. (12) decouples from Eqs. (9)–(11), so that at equilibrium, we have  $C_E = 1/\beta$ . This leaves a system of three equations, (9)–(11), which we set simultaneously equal to zero in order to find the equilibria.

Eq. (9) has one zero at the “tumor-free” equilibrium at  $T_E = 0$ , and possibly several non-zero tumor equilibria. The tumor-free equilibrium for all four state variables is given by  $(T_E, N_E, L_E, C_E) = (0, 1/\beta f, 0, 1/\beta)$ . Let  $E_0$  represent the point  $(0, 1/\beta f, 0, 1/\beta)$ .

In the case where  $T_E \neq 0$ , the equilibria are still determined by finding the simultaneous solutions of Eqs. (9)–(11), but in this case, values of equilibrium points for a non-zero tumor must be found numerically.

In particular, setting Eq. (10) to zero and solving for  $N$  yields

$$N_E = \frac{C_E(h + T^2)}{fh + (f - g)T^2 + pT + pT^3}. \quad (14)$$

Similarly, requiring that Eq. (9) equal zero gives

$$D_E = 1 - T - N_E. \quad (15)$$

Using this expression in Eq. (13) gives an expression for  $L$ :

$$L_{E1} = \left( \frac{D_E s T^I}{d - D_E} \right)^{1/I}. \quad (16)$$

Finally, setting Eq. (11) to zero gives

$$\begin{aligned} L^2(uN_E) + \left( m - \frac{jD_E^2 T^2}{k + D_E^2 T^2} + qT \right) L \\ - (r_1 N_E + r_2 C_E)T = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

which is quadratic in  $L$ . Equilibrium points of system (9)–(13) are found by intersecting Eqs. (16) and (17).

Observe from Eqs. (14)–(17) that there can be multiple non-zero tumor equilibrium points. For the estimated set of mouse parameters, although there are two solutions, there is only one positive (biologically relevant) solution to Eqs. (14)–(17). These solutions are graphed in Fig. 1. As a system parameter is changed, other non-zero equilibria can appear (see Fig. 2), or negative equilibria can become positive, and therefore biologically feasible.

Stability of the equilibria are determined by linearizing the system about the calculated values, and by determining the stability of the linearized system. The stability of equilibria is important from a physiological viewpoint. If the system is in equilibrium, but the




Fig. 1. The nonzero equilibria are the intersections of the graphs of the functions  $L(T)$  obtained by finding the equations of the null surfaces. There is only one nonzero positive equilibrium for the estimated parameter set.




Fig. 2. Bifurcation diagram showing the effect of varying the NK-kill rate,  $c$ . Other parameters for this diagram are from Table 1.

equilibrium point is *unstable*, a small perturbation from equilibrium will cause the system to move away from that point and evolve toward the stable equilibrium. This effect is illustrated in Fig. 3. At the estimated parameter values, the tumor-free equilibrium is unstable, while the high-tumor equilibrium is stable. The stability of the high-tumor equilibrium implies that, if treatment is stopped, the system will inevitably return to the high-tumor state, i.e. the tumor will escape immune surveillance *unless every single tumor cell is killed*. Thus, in a case such as ours for which there are only two equilibria, if the tumor-free equilibrium is unstable, then in order to realistically effect a cure, any treatment must not only reduce the tumor burden, but it must also change the parameters of the system itself. The role of immunotherapy, therefore, might be interpreted in this context as a treatment which changes system parameters by, for example, permanently raising the cytolytic potential of the natural killer cells. We note that if the

system were one that admitted a very small but stable tumor, then another “healthy” state might be one for which it is possible to maintain the system at this low tumor level.

#### 4.2. Bifurcation analysis

At the tumor-free equilibrium,  $E_0 = (0, 1/\beta f, 0, 1/\beta)$ , the Jacobian matrix becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{c}{\beta f} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{p}{\beta f} & -f & 0 \\ \frac{r_1}{\beta f} + \frac{r_2}{\beta} & 0 & -m \end{bmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues of the system linearized about the tumor-free equilibrium are therefore:

$$\lambda_1 = 1 - \frac{c}{\beta f}, \quad \lambda_2 = -f, \quad \lambda_3 = -m.$$

Since  $f, m > 0$ ,  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_3$  are always negative, the tumor-free equilibrium  $E_0$  is stable if and only if  $\lambda_1 = 1 - c/\beta f < 0 \Leftrightarrow c > \beta f$ .

The bifurcation diagram in Fig. 2 shows the disappearance of two unstable non-zero tumor equilibria and the stabilization of the tumor-free equilibrium as the parameter  $c$  is increased. Recall that the parameter  $c$  represents the effectiveness of the NK cells in lysing the tumor cells. Fig. 2 shows a bifurcation point near  $c = 1.4 \times 10^{-6}$ , after which the progression of the disease is very sensitive to the initial tumor size. This sensitivity is shown in Fig. 3, Top, which displays two different scenarios for initial tumor sizes that differ by 1 cell. In one case, the tumor grows to the high equilibrium, and in the other case the tumor population goes to the zero equilibrium. Fig. 3, Bottom, shows two simulations. The dotted line illustrates the case in which  $c$  is smaller than the bifurcation value, so that the zero equilibrium is unstable. In this case, one tumor cell can grow to a large tumor mass greater than  $2 \times 10^{15}$  cells in 60 days. However, as illustrated by the solid line, if  $c$  is larger than the bifurcation value, the zero tumor equilibrium becomes stable and a single tumor cell will die.

Similar analyses can be performed using any of the system parameters in order to determine conditions for the appearance or disappearance of equilibria and to determine equilibrium stability. For example, Fig. 4 shows a bifurcation diagram for the CD8<sup>+</sup> recruitment parameter,  $j$ . In this case, the mouse parameters are again used, except that all the tumor-specific immune-cell recruitment terms are initially set to zero (that is,  $g = r_1 = r_2 = 0$ ), in order to isolate the effect of the antigen-specific CD8<sup>+</sup> response influenced




Fig. 3. Simulations illustrating system behavior for three values of parameter  $c$ . The bifurcation point is  $c \approx 1.4 \times 10^{-6}$ . Top: After the bifurcation point, at  $c = 4 \times 10^{-6}$ , the system shows sensitivity to initial conditions. In this simulation, a one cell difference in the initial number of tumor cells,  $T_0$ , results in very different outcomes. Initial values for the state variables are  $T_0 \approx 6.89 \times 10^6$ ,  $N_0 \approx 3.97 \times 10^9$ ,  $L_0 \approx 7.15 \times 10^3$ ,  $C_0 \approx 1.65 \times 10^9$ . All parameters besides  $c$  are from Table 1. Bottom: Before the bifurcation, at  $c = 1 \times 10^{-6}$ , one tumor cell grows to the high-tumor equilibrium of approximately  $2.1 \times 10^{15}$  in 60 days. After the bifurcation, at  $c = 2 \times 10^{-6}$ , an initial value of one tumor cell is drawn to the now stable zero tumor equilibrium. Immune recruitment parameters,  $g, j, r_1$  and  $r_2$  are set to zero. With the exception of the values for  $c$  and the immune recruitment parameters, all other parameters are from Table 1. Initial values for the state variables are  $T_0 = 1$ ,  $N_0 = 1.73 \times 10^{10}$ ,  $L_0 = 0$ ,  $C_0 \approx 1.65 \times 10^9$ .



by  $j$ . The parameter  $j$  is then gradually increased from 0 to 7.

Two bifurcations are evident in the diagram: the first is a *transcritical* bifurcation, where the negative equilibrium becomes positive, and the zero-tumor equilibrium changes its stability. Before the bifurcation, the zero-tumor equilibrium is strictly unstable: even one tumor cell will result in the system moving toward the high-tumor equilibrium. After the bifurcation, the immune system is able to control small initial tumor populations, as long as there is some antigen-specific immune response. Only when the tumor-specific CD8<sup>+</sup> population is zero does a very small initial tumor population escape immune surveillance. Initial tumor populations that are controlled are said to be in the *basin of attraction* of the zero-tumor equilibrium. On the other hand, those which escape immune surveillance, leading the system toward the high-tumor equilibrium, are said to be in the basin of attraction of the high-tumor equilibrium. These basins are shown in Fig. 5. Note that since the state-space of the system is actually four-dimensional, what is depicted in Fig. 5 is the projection of the basins onto the Tumor–CD8<sup>+</sup> plane, where the values of  $N$  and  $C$  are kept at their zero-equilibrium values. Fig. 5 highlights the fact that even if the tumor is very small, extremely low CD8<sup>+</sup>T levels will allow the tumor to escape immune surveillance. The location of the basin boundary is therefore crucial in determining the outcome of the disease. In the case of a patient who has undergone chemotherapy which reduces both tumor and CD8<sup>+</sup>T cell levels, if these levels place the system below the basin boundary then even an undetectable tumor will regrow. However, if the patient is given immunotherapy subsequent to chemotherapy, thereby




Fig. 4. As the parameter representing the strength of the antigen-specific immune response is varied, system equilibria appear and change their stability.




Fig. 5. Basins of attraction of the zero-tumor and high-tumor equilibria when the CD8<sup>+</sup> T-cell recruitment parameter,  $j = 4.5$ .

boosting CD8<sup>+</sup>T levels above the basin boundary, the system will evolve toward the stable zero-tumor equilibrium, and the tumor will not regrow. This hypothetical scenario emphasizes the potential importance of combination therapy.

## 5. Numerical experiments: mouse data with immunotherapy, chemotherapy and combination treatments

In this section, we test the behavior of our model using the data and results from a set of murine experiments presented in Diefenbach's work (Diefenbach et al., 2001). These data have also been employed in the simulations of de Pillis and Radunskaya's model (2003b). We examine cases for which the immune system cannot fight a growing tumor on its own as well as cases for which neither chemotherapy nor immunotherapy alone can kill the tumor. We also present a case for which the administration of a combination of both chemotherapy and immunotherapy is necessary in order to cause a large tumor to die. For the following *in silico* experiments, we use the mouse parameters provided in Table 1.

### 5.1. Immune system response to tumor: mouse data

In the first set of experiments for the mouse model, we present a situation in which the tumor escapes immuno-surveillance. The tumor reaches carrying capacity, and we assume the mouse dies under this extreme tumor burden. The initial conditions for this situation are chosen to be a tumor of size  $10^6$  cells, a circulating lymphocyte population of  $1.1 \times 10^7$ , a natural killer cell

population of  $5 \times 10^4$ , and a population of 100 CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells. With the set of parameters in Table 1, the outcome of the simulation is sensitive to the initial conditions chosen. This set of initial conditions is meant to reflect a laboratory mouse experiment, in which an initial tumor challenge of  $10^6$  cells is directly implanted into the mouse, and then the progression of the tumor is observed. Simulation results are presented in Fig. 6, Top Left.

### 5.2. Chemotherapy or immunotherapy: mouse data

As seen, with parameters as currently set, a tumor challenge of size  $10^6$  cells is too large for the innate immune system to control. The following set of experiments is useful for testing simulated treatment options.

The first treatment approach employs seven pulsed doses of chemotherapy, each dose represented by setting  $v_M(t) = 1$  in Eq. (6) for 1 day, and given in a 14 day cycle. The second treatment approach employs immunotherapy in the form of an injection of  $8 \times 10^8$  highly activated CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells from day 7 to day 8. This CD8<sup>+</sup> injection is meant to represent the TIL treatments used for certain patients (see, for example, Dudley et al., 2002).

For an initial tumor challenge of  $10^6$  cells, the tumor survives despite either method of intervention. These experiments are pictured in Fig. 6, Top Right and Bottom Left.

### 5.3. Combination therapy: mouse data

Some laboratory experiments have indicated the potential benefits of combining chemotherapy with immunotherapy (see, for example, Machiels et al., 2001). In light of this, we next present the results of an *in silico* experiment simulating combination therapy, displayed in the Bottom Right image in Fig. 6. In this experiment, the chemotherapy and immunotherapy treatments outlined above are given simultaneously. Initial population sizes are set to the same values as in the previous experiments.

According to our model, combination therapy is far more effective at killing a tumor than either individual treatment alone. We note that the drop in tumor population for this case is extremely steep. It is currently not clear whether the time-scale for this tumor decline in response to combination therapy reflects realistic dynamics. However, the qualitative result highlights the synergistic effect of combination treatment, which does reflect the outcomes of certain studies (see, e.g. Machiels et al., 2001; Wheeler et al., 2004).

In some cases, if chemotherapy alone or immunotherapy alone are to be used effectively against tumor growth, it is thought that very high or more frequent

doses must be employed. Higher medication levels can sometimes cause undesirable side-effects. Heavy chemotherapy will harm other tissues in the body, and too many TILs administered over a short period of time may be attacked and killed by suppressor immune cells before the TILs have a chance to significantly impact tumor cell growth. It seems reasonable that combination therapy that can employ lower doses of each therapy element has the potential to allow for faster tumor elimination with milder side-effects. The circulating lymphocyte level in the combination therapy experiment can be used to indicate that the immune health of the mouse has not suffered too greatly during treatment.

## 6. Numerical experiments: human data with immunotherapy, chemotherapy and combination treatments

In this section, we test the behavior of our model using parameters taken from experimental results of two patients from Rosenberg's study on metastatic melanoma (Dudley et al., 2002). In Dudley et al. (2002), both patients responded to treatment, so the *in silico* simulations here are experiments meant to explore various scenarios using human parameters.

First we examine the model with the set of parameters representing patient 9 in Table 2. We present a case for which a certain tumor burden can be controlled by a healthy immune system, but not by a slightly weakened immune system. We also present a case for which either chemotherapy alone or immunotherapy alone can kill a tumor, and a case for which combination therapy is essential to the survival of the patient. We then compare the results using parameters from patient 9 of Dudley et al. (2002) to the simulated behavior of the model using patient 10 parameters of Dudley et al. (2002). This patient comparison provides insight into patient-specific parameter sensitivity.

### 6.1. Immune system response to tumor: human data, patient 9

In the first set of human experiments, we examine an initial tumor burden of  $10^6$  cells. This experiment represents a situation in which the immune system has not become activated against the tumor cell population until the population has reached  $10^6$  cells, a size which in many cases is still considered to be below the threshold of clinical detectability in a human. For this tumor, immune system strength is very important in determining whether or not the body alone can kill a tumor. The first experiment specifies what we will denote as an initially "healthy" immune system with  $1 \times 10^5$  natural killer cells,  $1 \times 10^2$  CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells, and  $6 \times 10^{10}$




Fig. 6. Mouse data. Top Left: *No treatment*. Immune system without intervention where the tumor reaches carrying capacity and the mouse “dies”. Top Right: *Chemotherapy*. The immune system response to high tumor with chemotherapy administered for 1 day in a 14 day cycle. Bottom Left: *Immunotherapy*. Immune system response to high tumor with the administration of immunotherapy from days 7 to 8. Bottom Right: *Combination therapy*. Chemotherapy and immunotherapy as previously described given simultaneously effectively. control of the tumor. Parameters for all simulations are provided in Table 1.

circulating lymphocytes. As seen in Fig. 7, Left, the innate immune response is sufficiently strong to control the tumor. However, when the immune system is weakened, a tumor of the same size grows to a dangerous level in the absence of treatment interventions. Simulated results for this weakened immune case, with initial conditions set to  $1 \times 10^6$  tumor cells,  $1 \times 10^3$  NK cells,  $10$  CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells, and  $6 \times 10^8$  circulating lymphocytes, are pictured in Fig. 7, Right.

## 6.2. Chemotherapy: human data

For cases in which the tumor would grow to a dangerous level if left untreated (such as in the depleted

immune system example shown in Fig. 7, Right), we model pulsed chemotherapy administration into the body, but only after the tumor is large enough to be considered potentially detectable. Examining the tumor’s response to pulsed chemotherapy given over different time courses, we determined that for a tumor burden of  $2 \times 10^7$  cells, chemotherapy pulses administered once every 5 days are effective at killing the tumor, which dies by day 50 (see Fig. 8, Top Left). The system is clearly sensitive to the chemotherapy dosing regimen. A treatment with the same total chemotherapy, but administered less frequently, once every 10 days (see Fig. 8, Bottom Left) will allow the tumor to regrow.




Fig. 7. Human data, Patient 9. Left: A healthy immune system effectively kills a small tumor. Initial Conditions:  $1 \times 10^6$  tumor cells,  $1 \times 10^5$  NK cells, 100  $CD8^+$ T cells,  $6 \times 10^{10}$  circulating lymphocytes. Right: A depleted immune system fails to kill a small tumor when left untreated. Initial Conditions:  $1 \times 10^6$  tumor cells,  $1 \times 10^3$  NK cells, 10  $CD8^+$ T cells,  $6 \times 10^8$  circulating lymphocytes. Parameters for these simulations are provided in Table 2.

### 6.3. Immunotherapy: human data

In addition to pure chemotherapy treatments, we examine pure immunotherapy treatments. One of the major advantages of mathematical modeling is that while we can model therapies for which clinical trials have been performed (e.g. chemotherapy alone) thereby validating our model, we can also use our model to simulate theoretical treatment strategies, such as immunotherapy alone, a treatment approach not yet employed in most clinical trials. Our model parameters have been calibrated by comparing simulated outcomes to results from chemotherapy and combination therapy trials. Clinical trials for melanoma, against which we might at a future point directly compare simulations, are currently underway (see, for example, National Cancer Institute, 2005, for a current list of ongoing trials).

In this section we present *in silico* experiments with a TIL injection followed by short doses of IL-2. This mirrors the treatment that was given to patients 9 and 10 in Rosenberg's experiments (Dudley et al., 2002), the difference being that the patients in the clinical trial were first administered immuno-depleting chemotherapy before the administration of TIL therapy.

In Fig. 9, we investigate a  $10^6$  cell tumor, a tumor level that the *in silico* innate immune system as specified cannot control on its own. However, as we have seen in our previous *in silico* experiments, a chemotherapy regimen can effectively handle this tumor challenge in patient 9. Fig. 9, Left, shows the effect of immunotherapy alone against this tumor. The dosing of TILs and IL-2 administered here are the same as those shown in

Fig. 10. One advantage of this treatment approach is that the immune system is directly strengthened, and not depleted as it is with chemotherapy.

We note that immunotherapy effectiveness may be limited to smaller tumor sizes. Fig. 9, right, shows that immunotherapy alone is not effective at treating the tumor of size  $10^7$ . This size tumor could, instead, be eliminated by combination therapy, as is shown in Fig. 10.

### 6.4. Combination therapy

While we have presented cases for which chemotherapy alone or immunotherapy alone can kill a tumor, there are situations in which these treatments in isolation are not sufficient to eliminate the tumor. We measure the patient's immunological health by the number of circulating lymphocytes in the body and do not allow the circulating lymphocytes to drop below a threshold where risk of infection may be too high. In our experiments, we chose that threshold to be on the order of  $10^8$  cells. This amount reflects a fraction of approximate normal white blood cell levels in an adult human (normal levels are about  $5 \times 10^9$  per liter of blood, see, e.g. Roitt et al., 1993).

For the case in Fig. 10, Left, combination treatment is now able to eliminate a tumor of  $10^7$  cells. The combination treatment given is simply a superposition of the separate chemotherapy and immunotherapy regimens (unsuccessfully) applied in the previous experiments (see Fig. 8, Bottom Left and Fig. 9, Right). All initial conditions and parameter values remain the same as in






Fig. 8. Human data, Patient 9. Top Left: A case for which nine doses of chemotherapy over 45 days are sufficient to eliminate a tumor. Initial Conditions:  $2 \times 10^7$  tumor cells,  $1 \times 10^3$  NK cells,  $10$  CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells,  $6 \times 10^8$  circulating lymphocytes. Top Right: Drug administration pattern. Nine doses, strength  $v_M(t) = 5$ , 1 day per dose on a 5 day cycle. Bottom Left: A case where nine doses over 90 days is given and the tumor shows regrowth. Initial Conditions:  $2 \times 10^7$  Tumor cells,  $1 \times 10^3$  NK cells,  $10$  CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells,  $6 \times 10^8$  circulating lymphocytes. Bottom Right: Drug administration pattern: Nine doses, strength  $v_M(t) = 5$ , 1 day per dose on a 10 day cycle. Parameters for these simulations are presented in Table 2.

these previous experiments. IL-2 and chemotherapy concentrations are provided in Fig. 10, Right.

The simulation shown in Fig. 10, Left, is consistent with the Rosenberg data (Dudley et al., 2002) for patient 9, in the sense that patient 9 responded to treatment, and our simulation also reflects a positive response to combination therapy.

We performed multiple additional experiments, including those for which we examined the same combination therapy for tumors of sizes  $10^8$  and larger. In these cases, the tumors were not controlled, except in certain cases for which additional doses of chemotherapy and IL-2 were given in varying combinations (figures not included).

### 6.5. Comparison with patient 10

In order to examine whether these treatment simulations vary from patient to patient, we change patient-specific parameters extracted from Rosenberg's study, and run similar simulations with the parameters for patient 10 (Dudley et al., 2002). These parameters are given in Table 2.

First we repeat the experiment simulated in Fig. 7 (no intervention) for a tumor of size  $10^6$ . In this case, the immune system conditions that killed the tumor in patient 9 are ineffective at managing the same size tumor in patient 10 (see Fig. 11, Left). However, patient 10's immune system is able to handle a smaller tumor of size  $10^5$  given the same initial immune cell count, as we show




Fig. 9. Human data, Patient 9. Left: Immunotherapy is able to kill a tumor of size  $10^6$  cells.  $10^9$  TILs are administered from day 7 through 8. IL-2 is administered in 6 pulses at strength  $5 \times 10^6$  from day 8 to day 11. Right: Immunotherapy is unable to kill a tumor of size  $10^7$  cells.  $10^9$  TILs are administered from day 7 through 8. IL-2 is administered in 6 pulses from day 8 to day 11. Parameters for these simulation are provided in Table 2.




Fig. 10. Human data, Patient 9. Combining the separately unsuccessful therapies for a  $10^7$  size tumor (see Fig. 8, Bottom Left and Fig. 9, Right) succeeds in eliminating the tumor. Left: A  $10^7$  cell tumor is successfully eliminated by combining nine 1-day chemotherapy doses of strength  $v_M(t) = 5$  every 10 days, with a boost of TILs and IL-2.  $10^9$  TILs are administered from day 7 through 8. IL-2 is administered in 6 pulses from day 8 to day 11 at concentration  $v_I(t) = 5 \times 10^5$  per pulse. Initial conditions are as in previous simulations:  $2 \times 10^7$  Tumor cells,  $1 \times 10^3$  NK cells,  $10$   $CD8^+T$  cells,  $6 \times 10^8$  circulating lymphocytes. Patient 9 parameters for these simulations are in Table 2. Right: Drug concentrations for IL-2 and chemotherapy.

in Fig. 11, Right. Clearly, the immune system's tumor handling capacity is patient specific. This is not surprising, since the combination therapy administered to 13 patients in Rosenberg's study (Dudley et al., 2002) gave rise to objective clinical responses in only six of the thirteen patients.

In addition to the differing results of the immune system alone, we examine the conditions under which

combination therapy can control a  $10^7$  size tumor in patient 10 with a compromised immune system (as specified by initial conditions). As opposed to the positive outcome for patient 9 (see Fig. 10), the parameter set for patient 10 leads to the growth of the tumor, as seen in Fig. 12, Top Left.

In this case, one treatment approach is to administer additional immunotherapy in the form of IL-2 doses.




Fig. 11. Human data, Patient 10. Left: Patient 10 cannot kill a  $10^6$  cell tumor with a healthy immune system of  $10^5$  NK cells, 100  $CD8^+T$  cells, and  $6 \times 10^{10}$  circulating lymphocytes. Right: Patient 10 kills a  $10^5$  cell tumor with a healthy immune system of  $10^5$  NK cells, 100  $CD8^+T$  cells, and  $6 \times 10^{10}$  circulating lymphocytes. Patient parameters for these simulations are provided in Table 2.

This expansion in treatment does lead to tumor death *in silico*, as shown in Fig. 12, Top Right. We note in this case tumor behavior seems to reflect tumor dormancy followed by relapse. The tumor appears to have completely died out by day 22. However, around day 79, the tumor begins to re-emerge. Without the additional IL-2 treatment given at day 80, the tumor would regrow. We also ran the simulation for 2000 days, and the tumor did re-emerge, but at levels generally considered below detectability thresholds. The tumor subsequently died out again and did not reappear. See Fig. 12, Bottom Left. This leads us to believe that the tumor population has been drawn into the stable zero-tumor equilibrium at this point. Such a case in the clinic would likely be viewed as a successful case of complete remission.

## 7. Numerical experiments: human data with vaccine and combination treatments

In addition to T-cell boosts and IL-2 injections, we now simulate cancer vaccines. Cancer vaccines are a special case of immunotherapy for treating cancer. With a vaccine, the body is challenged with some modified form of the cancer, consequently sensitizing the immune system to the presence of the cancer, allowing the immune system more effectively to find and lyse cancer cells.

### 7.1. Vaccine therapy and a change of parameters

In order to simulate vaccine therapy for human patients, we change the values of five parameters at the

time of vaccination. These parameter changes are documented by the experimental data found in Diefenbach's results on mouse vaccine trials (Diefenbach et al., 2001) and the experimental curves produced by these data are fitted to de Pillis's model (de Pillis and Radunskaya, 2001). According to these laboratory experiments in the context of our model, the parameters that would change to reflect the administration of a therapeutic vaccine are  $c$ , the fractional tumor cell kill by natural killer cells,  $g$ , the maximum NK-cell recruitment rate by tumor cells,  $j$ , the maximum  $CD8^+T$  cell recruitment rate,  $s$ , the steepness coefficient of the tumor- $CD8^+T$  competition term,  $d$ , the saturation level of fractional tumor cell kill by  $CD8^+T$  cells, and  $l$ , the exponent of fractional tumor cell kill by  $CD8^+T$  cells. Of these six parameters,  $l$  is the only one for which there is no clear relationship between its magnitude and the response of the system to vaccine, since this relationship is highly nonlinear and non-monotonic. We therefore leave  $l$  unchanged, and focus on modifications to the remaining five parameters.

For this set of experiments, we use the patient 9 parameter set to simulate theoretical *in silico* vaccine therapy by altering parameters in the same direction as they change in Diefenbach's murine model (Diefenbach et al., 2001; de Pillis and Radunskaya, 2003b). We increase the values of  $c$ ,  $g$ ,  $j$ , and  $d$  and decrease the value of  $s$ .

### 7.2. Vaccine and chemotherapy combination experiments

We first present a theoretical case in which a patient has a detectable tumor of size  $2 \times 10^7$  and a "healthy" immune system of  $3 \times 10^5$  NK cells,  $10^2$   $CD8^+T$  cells,




Fig. 12. Human data, Patient 10. Top Left: Combination therapy fails to eliminate the  $10^7$  cell tumor in patient 10 with a compromised immune system of  $10^3$  NK cells,  $10$   $CD8^+T$  cells, and  $6 \times 10^8$  circulating lymphocytes.  $10^9$  TILs are administered from days 7 through 8. IL-2 is administered in 6 pulses from day 8 to day 11 at concentration  $v_I(t) = 5 \times 10^6$  per pulse. Top Right: Combination therapy kills the  $10^7$  cell tumor in patient 10. Treatment is identical to that in the Top Left panel, with the exception that pulses of IL-2 are administered from days 8 through 13, 20 through 25 and 80 through 90. Bottom Left: The same effective combination therapy as given in the Top Right panel and as shown in the Bottom Right panel, but viewed over 2000 days. Bottom Right: Concentrations for IL-2 and chemotherapy implemented in the simulations shown in the Top Right and Bottom Left panels. Patient 10 parameters are provided in Table 2.

and  $10^{10}$  circulating lymphocytes. This is a case in which the patient's immune system is not strong enough to handle a  $10^7$  size tumor on its own (not pictured). As shown in Fig. 13, Left, the body cannot handle this size tumor even when treated with aggressive pulsed chemotherapy for 50 days. Additionally, vaccine therapy, represented by changes to the original parameter set after 10 days, fails to control the tumor. This simulation is pictured in Fig. 13, Middle. Only the combination of both treatments can kill a tumor of this magnitude, as shown in Fig. 13, Right.

Such dramatic tumor regression is still uncommon among most patients, and sensitive to the choice of tumor and patient parameters, as well as to the timing of the treatments (see the next section). It has been noted, however, in the clinical studies of Wheeler et al. (2004), that over a period of 50 days, combination therapy provoked a drastic (50%) tumor regression in three of 13 glioma patients. Wheeler points out that these tumor regression outcomes are rare in the literature. However, our model is able to describe these positive clinical responses to emerging combination therapies.






Fig. 13. Human data, Patient 10. Left: Chemotherapy alone cannot kill a  $2 \times 10^7$  tumor with an immune system of  $3 \times 10^5$  NK cells, 100 CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells, and  $10^{10}$  circulating lymphocytes. Chemotherapy at strength  $v_M(t) = 2$  is administered for 3 consecutive days in a 10 day cycle. The parameters for this simulation are provided in Table 2. Middle: Vaccine therapy alone cannot control the tumor with the same initial conditions as given in Left figure. The parameters for this simulation are provided in Table 2, with parameters, modified after 10 days to reflect vaccine therapy, given by  $c = 7.131 \times 10^{-9}$ ,  $g = 0.5$ ,  $j = 1$ ,  $s = .0019$ ,  $d = 15$ . Right: Combination therapy effectively controls the tumor.

### 7.3. Vaccine therapy time dependence

There are cases for which vaccine therapy alone is able to control a growing tumor, but our simulations indicate that timing is an important factor in determining the effectiveness of the vaccine treatment. Since we model vaccine therapy as a change in parameters, and not as a drug population, the amount of vaccine cannot be altered, but the timing of administration can be controlled. In the case for which an initial tumor is set to be half the size as that in the previous experiments ( $10^7$  cells), and the immune system initial conditions are set to be the same, vaccine therapy effectively eliminates a tumor. However, this successful tumor elimination happens only if the vaccine is administered to the patient no more than 13 days after the tumor is hypothetically detected at  $10^7$  tumor cells. If the vaccine is administered any later than that, it is ineffective. We show how the timing of vaccine therapy affects the final outcome in Fig. 14.

## 8. Discussion and conclusion

We have extended previous mathematical models that govern cancer growth with chemotherapy treatments to include immunotherapy and vaccine therapy. This structure can be used to test combination treatment approaches. The model is formulated as a system of ordinary differential equations that describe the global stimulatory effect of tumor cells on the immune response in conjunction with chemotherapies.

Through an analysis of the system of equations in the absence of chemotherapy or immunotherapy, we determined the equilibrium points of the system along with the criteria for stability. For a specific parameter set, we found two equilibria. One was a tumor-free equilibrium, which was shown to be unstable, and the other was a high-tumor equilibrium, shown to be stable. The instability of the tumor-free equilibrium implies that

any successful treatment must be able to change the system parameters in order to force this desirable equilibrium point to become stable. The stability of the high-tumor equilibrium, on the other hand, implies that reducing the tumor burden through chemotherapy alone is not sufficient to drive the tumor level to zero. Once chemotherapy is stopped, a system with even an undetectable tumor remaining will eventually return to the high-tumor state. However, system parameters may be altered through treatments such as vaccination, thereby changing the stability nature of the zero-tumor equilibrium, and allowing a combination treatment protocol to eliminate the patient's tumor. We note that in Gatenby and Vincent (2003), a similar conclusion is reached through a different modeling approach: in this case, too, it is shown that unless system parameters are altered in some way, cytotoxic drugs alone are often not sufficient to control even a very small tumor.

A bifurcation analysis was performed for two of the system parameters. These analyses show that for certain parameter values, the long-term behavior of the system can be very sensitive to the initial conditions. One important implication of this result for tumor treatment is that if both the zero- and high-tumor equilibrium points are stable then for cell populations that are close to the boundary separating the basins of attraction of these equilibria, very small changes in either the initial tumor size or the antigen-specific CD8<sup>+</sup>T levels can have drastic consequences on the outcome of the disease. This would indicate that combination immuno-chemo therapies which push the system into the tumor-free basin of attraction should be employed to achieve a stable disease-free state.

Results of our model simulations have been validated by comparing the outcomes both to mouse (Diefenbach et al., 2001) and to human (Dudley et al., 2002) data. Simulations using parameter sets from two different patients show that treatment efficacy depends strongly




Fig. 14. Human data, Patient 10. Left: Vaccine administered after 13 days. The parameters for this simulation are provided in Table 2 with parameters modified on day 13 to reflect vaccine therapy given by  $c = 7.131 \times 10^{-9}$ ,  $g = 0.5$ ,  $j = 1$ ,  $s = .0019$ ,  $d = 15$ . Right: Vaccine administered on day 14, parameters modified as indicated.

on patient-specific characteristics. This observation may actually be used to our advantage: it is already possible to measure some of the significant patient-specific parameters. In particular, through chromium release assays we can measure patient-specific immune-tumor lysis rates, while tumor growth rates can also be measured in the laboratory. We have seen that changes in these measurable parameters clearly affect system outcomes. As a result, although not all system parameters are yet measurable, those that are help to provide a good start in designing customized treatment protocols for each patient.

The development of combination immunotherapy–chemotherapy protocols for treating certain forms of cancer is an exciting new strategy in cancer treatment research. In some preliminary clinical studies, immunotherapy has been found to be most effective when administered in conjunction with chemotherapy (Machiels et al., 2001), and this qualitative result has been borne out in our mathematical simulations. In this work, we have contributed to the emerging body of cancer modeling research by developing and analysing a new mathematical model of cancer growth, immune response, and treatment that includes vaccine therapy,

activated anticancer-cell transfer (TIL injections), and activation-protein injections (IL-2 injections) in combination with chemotherapy. The mathematical model presented in this paper should serve to enrich the study of cancer treatments and aid in guiding the development of new patient-specific combination treatment protocols.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following Harvey Mudd College students for their contributions to this work: Lindsay Crowl, Lorraine Thomas and Michael Vrable. This work was supported in part by the W.M. Keck Foundation and the National Science Foundation NSF-0414011.

Appendix A. Nomenclature and parameter values

Here we list all of the parameters used in the model, their meaning and their estimated values. Table 1 reflects the experiments run to simulate the mouse experiments from Diefenbach et al. (2001). Table 2 reflects human data from Dudley et al. (2002).

Table 1  
Estimated mouse parameter values

Parameter	Units	Description	Estimated value	Source
$a$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Tumor growth rate	$4.31 \times 10^{-1}$	Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$b$	cells <sup>-1</sup>	1/ $b$ is tumor carrying capacity.	$2.17 \times 10^{-8}$	Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$c$	cell <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	Fractional (non)-ligand-transduced tumor cell kill by NK cells	$7.13 \times 10^{-10}$	Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$d$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Saturation level of fractional tumor cell kill by CD8 <sup>+</sup> T cells. Primed with ligand-transduced cells, challenged with ligand-transduced cells.	8.17	Diefenbach et al. (2001)

Table 1 (continued)

Parameter	Units	Description	Estimated value	Source
$l$	None	Exponent of fractional tumor cell kill by CD8 <sup>+</sup> T cells. Primed with ligand-transduced cells, challenged with ligand-transduced cells.	$6.57 \times 10^{-1}$	Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$s$	None	Steepness coefficient of the tumor-(CD8 <sup>+</sup> T cell) lysis term $D$ . Primed with ligand-transduced cells, challenged with ligand-transduced cells. (Smaller $s \Rightarrow$ steeper curve)	$6.18 \times 10^{-1}$	Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$e$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Fraction of circulating lymphocytes that become NK cells.	$1.29 \times 10^{-3}$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994)
$f$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Death rate of NK cells.	$4.12 \times 10^{-2}$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994)
$g$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Maximum NK cell recruitment rate by ligand-transduced tumor cells.	$4.98 \times 10^{-1}$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994); Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$h$	cell <sup>2</sup>	Steepness coefficient of the NK cell recruitment curve.	$2.02 \times 10^7$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994)
$p$	cell <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	NK cell inactivation rate by tumor cells.	$1.0 \times 10^{-7}$	Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$m$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Death rate of CD8 <sup>+</sup> T cells.	$2.0 \times 10^{-2}$	Yates and Callard (2002)
$j$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Maximum CD8 <sup>+</sup> T cell recruitment rate. Primed with ligand-transduced cells, challenged with ligand-transduced cells.	$9.96 \times 10^{-1}$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994); Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$k$	cell <sup>2</sup>	Steepness coefficient of the CD8 <sup>+</sup> T cell recruitment curve.	$3.03 \times 10^5$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994); Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$q$	cell <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	CD8 <sup>+</sup> T cell inactivation rate by tumor cells.	$3.42 \times 10^{-10}$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994)
$r_1$	cell <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	Rate at which CD8 <sup>+</sup> T cells are stimulated to be produced as a result of tumor cells killed by NK cells.	$1.1 \times 10^{-7}$	Yates and Callard (2002); Lanzavecchia and Sallusto (2000)
$r_2$	cell <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	Rate at which CD8 <sup>+</sup> T cells are stimulated to be produced as a result of tumor cells interacting with circulating lymphocytes.	$3.0 \times 10^{-11}$	No data found.
$u$	cell <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	Regulatory function by NK-cells of CD8 <sup>+</sup> T-cells.	$1.80 \times 10^{-8}$	No data found.
$K_T$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Fractional tumor cell kill by chemotherapy.	$9.00 \times 10^{-1}$	Perry (2001)
$K_N, K_L, K_C$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Fractional immune cell kill by chemotherapy.	$6.00 \times 10^{-1}$	Perry (2001)
$\alpha$	cell day <sup>-1</sup>	Constant source of circulating lymphocytes.	$1.21 \times 10^5$	Bannock (2002); Hauser (2001)
$\beta$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Natural death and differentiation of circulating lymphocytes.	$1.20 \times 10^{-2}$	Bannock (2002); Hauser (2001)
$\gamma$	day <sup>-1</sup>	Rate of chemotherapy drug decay.	$9.00 \times 10^{-1}$	Calabresi and Schein (1993)

Table 2  
Estimated human parameter values

Patient 9	Patient 10	Source
$a = 4.31 \times 10^{-1}$	$a = 4.31 \times 10^{-1}$	Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$b = 1.02 \times 10^{-9}$	$b = 1.02 \times 10^{-9}$	Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$c = 6.41 \times 10^{-11}$	$c = 6.41 \times 10^{-11}$	Dudley et al. (2002); Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$d = 2.34$	$d = 1.88$	Dudley et al. (2002)
$e = 2.08 \times 10^{-7}$	$e = 2.08 \times 10^{-7}$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994)
$l = 2.09$	$l = 1.81$	Dudley et al., 2002
$f = 4.12 \times 10^{-2}$	$f = 4.12 \times 10^{-2}$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994)
$g = 1.25 \times 10^{-2}$	$g = 1.25 \times 10^{-2}$	Dudley et al. (2002); Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$h = 2.02 \times 10^7$	$h = 2.02 \times 10^7$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994)
$j = 2.49 \times 10^{-2}$	$j = 2.49 \times 10^{-2}$	Dudley et al. (2002); Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$k = 3.66 \times 10^7$	$k = 5.66 \times 10^7$	Dudley et al. (2002); Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$m = 2.04 \times 10^{-1}$	$m = 9.12$	Yates and Callard (2002)
$q = 1.42 \times 10^{-6}$	$q = 1.59 \times 10^{-6}$	Kuznetsov et al. (1994)
$p = 3.42 \times 10^{-6}$	$p = 3.59 \times 10^{-6}$	Diefenbach et al. (2001)
$s = 8.39 \times 10^{-2}$	$s = 5.12 \times 10^{-1}$	Dudley et al. (2002)
$r_1 = 1.10 \times 10^{-7}$	$r_1 = 1.10 \times 10^{-7}$	Yates and Callard (2002); Lanzavecchia and Sallusto (2000)

Table 2 (continued)

Patient 9	Patient 10	Source
$r_2 = 6.50 \times 10^{-11}$	$r_2 = 6.50 \times 10^{-11}$	No data found.
$u = 3.00 \times 10^{-10}$	$u = 3.00 \times 10^{-10}$	No data found.
$K_T = 9.00 \times 10^{-1}$	$K_T = 9.00 \times 10^{-1}$	Perry (2001)
$K_N = K_L = K_C = 6 \times 10^{-1}$	$K_N = K_L = K_C = 6 \times 10^{-1}$	Perry (2001)
$\alpha = 7.50 \times 10^8$	$\alpha = 5.00 \times 10^8$	Bannock (2002); Hauser (2001)
$\beta = 1.20 \times 10^{-2}$	$\beta = 8.00 \times 10^{-3}$	Bannock (2002); Hauser (2001)
$\gamma = 9.00 \times 10^{-1}$	$\gamma = 9.00 \times 10^{-1}$	Calabresi and Schein (1993)
$p_I$ : Maximum CD8 <sup>+</sup> T-cell recruitment rate by IL-2. Units: day <sup>-1</sup>		
$p_I = 1.25 \times 10^{-1}$	$p_I = 1.25 \times 10^{-1}$	Kirschner and Panetta (1998)
$g_I$ : Steepness of CD8 <sup>+</sup> T-cell recruitment curve by IL-2. Units: cell <sup>2</sup>		
$g_I = 2.00 \times 10^7$	$g_I = 2.00 \times 10^7$	Kirschner and Panetta (1998)
$\mu_I$ : Rate of IL-2 drug decay. Units: day <sup>-1</sup> .		
$\mu_I = 1.00 \times 10^1$	$\mu_I = 1.00 \times 10^1$	Kirschner and Panetta (1998)

## References

- Adam, J.A., Bellomo, N. (Eds.), 1997. A Survey of Models for Tumor–Immune System Dynamics, Chapter, Basic Models of Tumor–Immune System Interactions—Identification, Analysis and Predictions. Birkhauser, Basel.
- Antony, P.A., Restifo, N.P., 2005. CD4+CD25+ T regulatory cells, immunotherapy of cancer, and interleukin-2. *J. Immunother* 28 (2), 120–128.
- Bannock, L., 2002. Nutrition. Found at <http://www.doctorbannock.com/nutrition.html>.
- Bellomo, N., Preziosi, L., 2000. Modelling and mathematical problems related to tumor evolution and its interaction with the immune system. *Math. Comput. Model.* 32, 413–452.
- Bellomo, N., Bellouquid, A., Delitala, M., 2004. Mathematical topics on the modelling of multicellular systems in competition between tumor and immune cells. *Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. S.* 14, 1683–1733.
- Blattman, J.N., Greenberg, P.D., 2004. Cancer immunotherapy: a treatment for the masses. *Science* 305, 200–205.
- Britton, N.F., 2003. Essential Mathematical Biology. Springer, Berlin.
- Calabresi, P., Schein, P.S. (Eds.), 1993. Medical Oncology: Basic Principles and Clinical Management of Cancer, second ed. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Cancer Research Institute, 2000. Cancer and the immune system: the vital connection. Web page publication of the Cancer Research Institute, available at <http://www.cancerresearch.org/immunology/immuneindex.html>, accessed May 2005.
- Chandawarkar, R.Y., Guyton, D.P., 2002. Oncologic mathematics—evolution of a new specialty. *Arch. Surg.* 137, 1428–1434.
- Chester, K.A., Mayer, A., Bhatia, J., Robson, L., Spencer, D.I.R., Cooke, S.P., Flynn, A.A., Sharma, S.K., Boxer, G., Pedley, R.B., Begent, R.H.J., 2000. Recombinant anti-carcinoembryonic antigen antibodies for targeting cancer. *Cancer Chemother. Pharmacol.* 46, S8–S12.
- Cooper, M.A., Fehniger, T.A., Caligiuri, M.A., 2001. The biology of human natural killer-cell subsets. *Trends Immunol.* 22 (11), 633–640.
- Couzin, J., 2002. Select T cells, given space, shrink tumors. *Science* 297, 1973.
- Cui, S.B., 2002. Analysis of a mathematical model for the growth of tumors under the action of external inhibitors. *J. Math. Biol.* 44, 395–426.
- Curti, B., Ochoa, A., Urba, W., Alvord, G., Kopp, W., Powers, G., Hawk, C., Creekmore, S., Gause, B., Janik, J., Holmlund, J., Kremers, P., Fenton, R., Miller, L., Sznol, M., Smith II, J., Sharfman, W., Longo, D., 1996. Influence of interleukin-2 regimens on circulating populations of lymphocytes after adoptive transfer of anti-CD3-stimulated T cells: results from a phase I trial in cancer patients. *J. Immunother. Emphasis Tumor Immunol.* 19 (4), 296–308.
- Dalglish, A., 1999. The relevance of non-linear mathematics (chaos theory) to the treatment of cancer, the role of the immune response and the potential for vaccines. *QJM* 92, 347–359.
- Dalglish, A.G., O'Byrne, K.J., 2002. Chronic immune activation and inflammation in the pathogenesis of AIDS and cancer. *Adv. Cancer Res.* 84, 231–276.
- De Angelis, E., Jabin, P.E., 2003. Qualitative analysis of a mean field model of tumor–immune system competition. *Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. S.* 13, 187–206.
- De Angelis, E., Mesin, L., 2001. Modelling of the immune response: conceptual frameworks and applications. *Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. S.* 11, 1609–1630.
- de Boer, R.J., Hogeweg, P., 1986. Interactions between macrophages and T-lymphocytes: tumor sneaking through intrinsic to helper T cell dynamics. *J. Theor. Biol.* 120 (3), 331–351.
- Delitala, M., 2002. Critical analysis and perspectives on kinetic (cellular) theory of immune competition. *Math. Comput. Model.* 35, 63–75.
- de Pillis, L.G., Radunskaya, A.E., 2001. A mathematical tumor model with immune resistance and drug therapy: an optimal control approach. *J. Theor. Med.* 3, 79–100.
- de Pillis, L.G., Radunskaya, A.E., 2003a. The dynamics of an optimally controlled tumor model: a case study. *Math. Comput. Model.* 37, 1221–1244.
- de Pillis, L.G., Radunskaya, A.E., 2003b. Immune response to tumor invasion. In: Bathe, K. (Ed.), *Computational Fluid and Solid Mechanics*, vol. 2. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 1661–1668.
- de Pillis, L.G., Radunskaya, A.E., Wiseman, C.L., 2003. A validated mathematical model of cell-mediated immune responses to tumor



- invasion and vaccine therapy in mice and humans, invited Poster, Society of Biological Therapy 17th Annual Meeting.
- Derbel, L., 2004. Analysis of a new model for tumor-immune system competition including long time scale effects. *Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. S.* 14, 1657–1681.
- Diefenbach, A., Jensen, E.R., Jamieson, A.M., Raulet, D., 2001. Rae1 and H60 ligands of the NKG2D receptor stimulate tumor immunity. *Nature* 413, 165–171.
- Donnelly, J., 2003. Cancer vaccine targets leukemia. *Nat. Med.* 9 (11), 1354–1356.
- Dudley, M.E., Wunderlich, J.R., Robbins, P.F., Yang, J.C., Hwu, P., Schwartzentruber, D.J., Topalian, S.L., Sherry, R., Restifo, N.P., Hubicki, A.M., Robinson, M.R., Raffeld, M., Duray, P., Seipp, C.A., Rogers-Freezer, L., Morton, K.E., Mavroukakis, S.A., White, D.E., Rosenberg, S.A., 2002. Cancer regression and autoimmunity in patients after clonal repopulation with antitumor lymphocytes. *Science* 298 (5594), 850–854.
- Farrar, J.D., Katz, K.H., Windsor, J., Thrush, G., Scheuermann, R.H., Uhr, J.W., Street, N.E., 1999. Cancer dormancy. VII. A regulatory role for CD8<sup>+</sup> T cells and IFN- $\gamma$  in establishing and maintaining the tumor-dormant state. *J. Immunol.* 162 (5), 2842–2849.
- Ferreira, S.C., Martins, M.L., Vilela, M.J., 2002. Reaction-diffusion model for the growth of avascular tumor. *Phys. Rev. E* 65.
- Friedrich, S.W., Lin, S.C., Stoll, B.R., Baxter, L.T., Munn, L.L., Jain, R.K., 2002. Antibody-directed effector cell therapy of tumors: analysis and optimization using a physiologically based pharmacokinetic model. *Neoplasia* 4, 449–463.
- García-Penarrubia, P., Lorenzo, N., Galvez, J., Campos, A., Ferez, X., Rubio, G., 2002. Study of the physical meaning of the binding parameters involved in effector-target conjugation using monoclonal antibodies against adhesion molecules and cholera toxin. *Cell Immunol.* 215, 141–150.
- Gardner, S.N., 2000. A mechanistic, predictive model of dose-response curves for cell cycle phase-specific and nonspecific drugs. *Cancer Res.* 60, 1417–1425.
- Gatenby, R.A., Gawlinski, E.T., 2003. The glycolytic phenotype in carcinogenesis and tumor invasion: insights through mathematical models. *Cancer Res.* 63, 3847–3854.
- Gatenby, R.A., Maini, P.K., 2002. Modelling a new angle on understanding cancer. *Nature* 410, 462.
- Gatenby, R.A., Vincent, T.L., 2003. Application of quantitative models from population biology and evolutionary game theory to tumor therapeutic strategies. *Mol. Cancer Ther.* 2 (9), 919–927.
- Germain, R.N., 2004. An innately interesting decade of research in immunology. *Nat. Med.* 10 (12), 1307–1320.
- Gett, A., Sallusto, F., Lanzavecchia, A., Geginat, J., 2003. T cell fitness determined by signal strength. *Nat. Immunol.* 4 (4), 355–360.
- Gilbertson, S.M., Shah, P.D., Rowley, D.A., 1986. NK cells suppress the generation of Lym-2<sup>+</sup> cytolytic T cells by suppressing or eliminating dendritic cells. *J. Immunol.* 136 (10), 3567–3571.
- Glas, R., Franksson, L., Une, C., Eloranta, M., Ohlen, C., Orn, A., Karre, K., 2000. Recruitment and activation of natural killer (NK) cells in vivo determined by the target cell phenotype: an adaptive component of NK cell-mediated responses. *J. Exp. Med.* 191 (1), 129–138.
- Hadj, T.A., 2005. Alemtuzumab for B-cell chronic lymphocytic leukemia. *Issues Emerg. Health Technol.* 66, 1–4.
- Hara, I., Hotta, H., Sato, N., Eto, H., Arakawa, S., Kamidono, S., 1996. Rejection of mouse renal cell carcinoma elicited by local secretion of interleukin-2. *Jpn. J. Cancer Res.* 87 (7), 724–729.
- Hardy, K., Stark, J., 2002. Mathematical models of the balance between apoptosis and proliferation. *Apoptosis* 7, 373–381.
- Hauser, B., 2001. Blood tests. Technical Report, International Waldenström's Macroglobulinemia Foundation. Available at [http://www.iwmf.com/Blood\\_Tests.pdf](http://www.iwmf.com/Blood_Tests.pdf), accessed May 2005.
- Holland, J.F., Emil III, F. (Eds.), 1973. *Cancer Medicine*. Lea and Febiger (Chapter II-3, XII, XV).
- Huang, A.Y.C., Golumbek, P., Ahmadzadeh, M., Jaffee, E., Pardoll, D., Levitsky, H., 1994. Role of bone marrow-derived cells in presenting MHC class I-restricted tumor antigens. *Science* 264 (5161), 961–965.
- Jiang, H., Chess, L., 2004. An integrated view of suppressor T cell subsets in immunoregulation. *J. Clin. Invest.* 114 (9), 1198–1208.
- Kawarada, Y., Ganss, R., Garbi, N., Sacher, B., ad Arnold, T., Hammerling, G., 2001. NK- and CD8<sup>+</sup> T cell-mediate eradication of established tumors by peritumoral injection of CpG-containing oligodeoxynucleotides. *J. Immunol.* 167 (1), 5247–5253.
- Keil, D., Luebke, R.W., Pruett, S.B., 2001. Quantifying the relationship between multiple immunological parameters and host resistance: probing the limits of reductionism. *J. Immunol.* 167, 4543–4552.
- Kieper, W.C., Prlic, M., Schmidt, C.S., Mescher, M.F., Jameson, S.C., 2001. IL-12 enhances CD8<sup>+</sup> T cell homeostatic expansion. *J. Immunol.* 166, 5515–5521.
- Kirschner, D., Panetta, J.C., 1998. Modeling immunotherapy of the tumor-immune interaction. *J. Math. Biol.* 37 (3), 235–252.
- Kolev, M., 2003. Mathematical modelling of the competition between tumors and immune system considering the role of the antibodies. *Math. Comput. Model.* 37, 1143–1152.
- Kuznetsov, V., Makalkin, I., 1992. Bifurcation-analysis of mathematical-model of interactions between cytotoxic lymphocytes and tumor-cells—effect of immunological amplification of tumor-growth and its connection with other phenomena of oncimmunology. *Biofizika* 37 (6), 1063–1070.
- Kuznetsov, V., Makalkin, I., Taylor, M., Perelson, A., 1994. Nonlinear dynamics of immunogenic tumors: parameter estimation and global bifurcation analysis. *Bull. Math. Biol.* 56 (2), 295–321.
- Kuznetsov, V.A., Knott, G.D., 2001. Modeling tumor regrowth and immunotherapy. *Math. Comput. Model.* 33, 1275–1287.
- Lanzavecchia, A., Sallusto, F., 2000. Dynamics of T-lymphocyte responses: intermediates, effectors, and memory cells. *Science* 290, 92–97.
- Li, J., Guo, K., Koh, V.W., Tang, J.P., Gan, B.Q., Shi, H., Li, H.X., Zeng, Q., 2005. Generation of PRL-3- and PRL-1-specific monoclonal antibodies as potential diagnostic markers for cancer metastases. *Clin. Cancer Res.* 11 (6), 2195–2204.
- Lucia, U., Maino, G., 2002. Thermodynamical analysis of the dynamics of tumor interaction with the host immune system. *Physica A* 313, 569–577.
- Lumsden, A., Codde, J., Van Der Meide, P., Gray, B., 1996. Immunohistochemical characterisation of immunological changes at the tumour site after chemo-immunotherapy with doxorubicin, interleukin-2 and interferon- $\gamma$ . *Anticancer Res.* 167 (7), 1145–1154.
- Machiels, J., Reilly, R.T., Emens, L.A., Ercolini, A.M., Lei, R.Y., Weintraub, D., Okoye, F.I., Jaffee, E.M., 2001. Cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, and paclitaxel enhance the antitumor immune response of granulocyte/macrophage-colony stimulating factor-secreting whole-cell vaccines in HER-2/*neu* tolerized mice. *Cancer Res.* 61 (9), 3689–3697.
- Marincola, F.M., Wang, E., Herlyn, M., Seliger, B., Ferrone, S., 2003. Tumors as elusive targets of T-cell-based active immunotherapy. *Trends Immunol.* 24, 335–342.
- Melichar, B., Dvorak, J., Jandik, P., Tuskova, M., Solichova, D., Megancova, J., Voboril, Z., 2001. Intraarterial chemotherapy of malignant melanoma metastatic to the liver. *Hepatogastroenterology* 48 (42), 1711–1715.
- Morecki, S., Pugatsch, T., Levi, S., Moshel, Y., Slavin, S., 1996. Tumor-cell vaccination induces tumor dormancy in a murine model of B-cell leukemia/lymphoma (BCL1). *Int. J. Cancer* 65 (2), 204–208.

- Muller, M., Gounari, F., Prifti, S., Hacker, H.J., Schirmacher, V., Khazaie, K., 1998. EblacZ tumor dormancy in bone marrow and lymph nodes: active control of proliferating tumor cells by CD8+ immune T cells. *Cancer Res.* 58 (23), 5439–5446.
- Mustafa, M.M., Buchanan, G.R., Winick, N.J., McCracken, G.H., Tkaczewski, I., Lipscomb, M., Ansari, Q., Agopian, M.S., 1998. Immune recovery in children with malignancy after cessation of chemotherapy. *J. Pediatr. Hematol. Oncol.* 20 (5), 451–457.
- Nani, F., Freedman, H.I., 2000. A mathematical model of cancer treatment by immunotherapy. *Math. Biosci.* 163, 159–199.
- National Cancer Institute, 2005. National cancer institute clinical trials web site. Available at <http://www.nci.nih.gov/clinicaltrials>, accessed May 2005.
- National Cancer Institute, 2005. Understanding chemotherapy. Available at <http://www.nci.nih.gov/cancertopics/chemotherapy-and-you/page2>, accessed May 2005.
- O'Byrne, K.J., Dalglish, A.G., Browning, M.J., Steward, W.P., Harris, A.L., 2000. The relationship between angiogenesis and the immune response in carcinogenesis and the progression of malignant disease. *Eur. J. Cancer* 36, 151–169.
- Osada, T., Nagawa, H., Shibata, Y., 2004. Tumor-infiltrating effector cells of  $\alpha$ -galactosylceramide-induced antitumor immunity in metastatic liver tumor. *J. Immune Based Ther. Vaccines* 2 (7), 1–9.
- Owen, M.R., Sherratt, J.A., 1999. Mathematical modelling of macrophage dynamics in tumours. *Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. S.* 9, 513–539.
- Pardoll, D.M., 1998. Cancer vaccines. *Nat. Med.* 4 (5), 525–531.
- Pazdur, R., Hoskins, W., Wagman, L., Coia, L. (Eds.), 2004. *Cancer Management: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Chapter: Principles of Chemotherapy, eighth ed. Oncology Publishing Group of CMP Healthcare Media. Available at <http://www.cancernetwork.com/handbook/contents.htm>, accessed May 2005.
- Perelson, A.S., Weisbuch, G., 1997. Immunology for physicists. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 69 (4), 1219–1267.
- Perry, M.C. (Ed.), 2001. *The Chemotherapy Source Book*, third ed. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Qu, Z., Griffiths, G.L., Wegener, W.A., Chang, C.H., Govindan, S.V., Horak, I.D., Hansen, H.J., Goldenberg, D.M., 2005. Development of humanized antibodies as cancer therapeutics. *Methods* 36 (1), 84–95.
- Roitt, I.M., Brostoff, J., Male, D.K., 1993. *Immunology*. Mosby, St. Louis.
- Rosenbaum, E., Rosenbaum, I., 2005. *Everyone's Guide to Cancer Supportive Care: A Comprehensive Handbook for Patients and Their Families*. Andrews McMeel Publishing.
- Rosenberg, S., Lotze, M., 1986. Cancer immunotherapy using interleukin-2 and interleukin-2-activated lymphocytes. *Annu. Rev. Immunol.* 4, 681–709.
- Rosenberg, S.A., Yang, J.C., Restifo, N.P., 2004. Cancer immunotherapy: moving beyond current vaccines. *Nat. Med.* 10 (9), 909–915.
- Sotolongo-Costa, O., Molina, L.M., Perez, D.R., Antoranz, J.C., Reyes, M.C., 2003. Behavior of tumors under nonstationary therapy. *Physica D* 178, 242–253. doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2789(03)00005-8.
- Sotolongo-Costa, O., Molina, L.M., Perez, D.R., Antoranz, J.C., Reyes, M.C., 2003. Behavior of tumors under nonstationary therapy. *Physica D* 178, 242–253.
- Stengel, R.F., Ghigliazza, R., Kulkarni, N., Laplace, O., 2002. Optimal control of innate immune response. *Optim. Contr. Appl. Met.* 23, 91–104.
- Stewart, T.H., 1996. Immune mechanisms and tumor dormancy. *Medicina—Buenos Aire* 56 (1), 74–82.
- Takayanagi, T., Ohuchi, A., 2001. A mathematical analysis of the interactions between immunogenic tumor cells and cytotoxic t lymphocytes. *Microbiol. Immunol.* 45, 709–715.
- Wallace, R., Wallace, D., Wallace, R.G., 2003. Toward cultural oncology: the evolutionary information dynamics of cancer. *Open. Syst. Inf. Dyn.* 10, 159–181.
- Webb, S.D., Sherratt, J.A., Fish, R.G., 2002. Cells behaving badly: a theoretical model for the Fas/FasL system in tumour immunology. *Math. Biosci.* 179, 113–129.
- Wein, L.M., Wu, J.T., Kirn, D.H., 2003. Validation and analysis of a mathematical model of a replication-competent oncolytic virus for cancer treatment: implications for virus design and delivery. *Cancer Res.* 63, 1317–1324.
- Wheeler, C.J., Asha, D., Gentao, L., Yu, J.S., Black, K.L., 2004. Clinical responsiveness of glioblastoma multiforme to chemotherapy after vaccination. *Clin. Cancer Res.* 10, 5316–5326.
- Wodarz, D., 2001. Viruses as antitumor weapons: defining conditions for tumor remission. *Cancer Res.* 61, 3501–3507.
- Wodarz, D., Jansen, V.A.A., 2003. A dynamical perspective of ctl cross-priming and regulation: implications for cancer immunology. *Immunol. Lett.* 86, 213–227.
- Yates, A., Callard, R., 2002. Cell death and the maintenance of immunological memory. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. S.* 1 (1), 43–59.