

1 **Viral Molecular Mimicry Influences the Antitumor Immune Response in** 2 **Murine and Human Melanoma**

3
4 **Authors:** Jacopo Chiaro^{1,2†}, Henna H. E. Kasanen^{2,3,4†}, Thomas Whalley⁵, Cristian Capasso^{1,}
5 ², Mikaela Grönholm^{1,2}, Sara Feola^{1,2}, Karita D. Peltonen^{1,2}, Firas S. Hamdan^{1,2}, Micaela M.
6 Hernberg^{2,6}, Siru Mäkelä^{2,6}, Hanna Karhapää^{2,6}, Paul E. Brown⁷, Beatriz Martins^{1,2}, Manlio
7 Fusciello^{1,2}, Erkkö Ylösmäki^{1,2}, Anna S. Kreutzman^{1,2,3,4‡}, Satu M. Mustjoki^{2,3,4,8,9‡},
8 Barbara Szomolay^{4‡}, Vincenzo Cerullo^{1,2,8,10*}

9 **Affiliations:**

10 ¹ Laboratory of Immunovirotherapy, Drug Research Program, Faculty of Pharmacy, University
11 of Helsinki, Viikinkaari 5E, 00790 Helsinki, Finland.

12 ² TRIMM, Translational Immunology Research Program, University of Helsinki, Finland.

13 ³ Hematology Research Unit Helsinki, Department of Hematology, University of Helsinki and
14 Helsinki University Hospital Comprehensive Cancer Center, Haartmaninkatu 8, 00290, Helsinki,
15 Finland.

16 ⁴ Department of Clinical Chemistry, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.

17 ⁵ Systems Immunity Research Institute, Cardiff University School of Medicine, Cardiff, United
18 Kingdom.

19 ⁶ Department of Oncology, Comprehensive Cancer Center, Helsinki University Hospital and
20 Helsinki University.

21 ⁷ Warwick Systems Biology Centre, University of Warwick.

22 ⁸ iCAN Digital Precision Cancer Medicine Flagship, University of Helsinki.

23 ⁹ HiLIFE Helsinki Institute of Life Science.

24 ¹⁰ Department of Molecular Medicine and Medical Biotechnology and CEINGE, Naples
25 University Federico II, 80131, Naples, Italy.

26
27
28 * Corresponding Author: Cerullo Vincenzo, postal address: University of Helsinki, Viikinkaari
29 5E, 00790 Helsinki, Finland, email: vincenzo.cerullo@helsinki.fi

30 †,‡ These authors contributed equally to the work.

31
32 **One Sentence Summary:** Molecular mimicry can play a role in anti-tumor immune responses
33 and should thus be further exploited in the development of novel cancer treatments.

36 **Abstract**

37 Molecular mimicry is known to be one of the leading mechanisms by which infectious agents
38 may induce autoimmunity. However, whether a similar mechanism triggers anti-tumor immune
39 response is unexplored, and the role of anti-viral T-cells infiltrating the tumor has remained
40 anecdotal. To address this question, we first developed a bioinformatic tool to identify tumor
41 peptides with high similarity to viral epitopes. Using peptides identified by this tool, we showed
42 that, in mice, viral pre-existing immunity enhanced the efficacy of cancer immunotherapy via
43 molecular mimicry. Specifically, when treated with a cancer vaccine consisting of peptides with
44 a high degree of homology with specific viral peptides, the mice with induced pre-existing
45 immunity to these viral peptides showed significantly better anti-tumor response.

46 To understand whether this mechanism could partly explain immunotherapy-response in
47 humans, we analyzed a cohort of melanoma patients undergoing PD1 treatment with high IgG
48 titer for Cytomegalovirus (CMV). In this cohort of patients, we showed that high level of CMV-
49 antibodies was associated with a prolonged progression free survival, and found that in some
50 cases PBMCs could cross-react with both melanoma and CMV homologous peptides. Finally, T
51 cell TCR sequencing revealed expansion of the same CD8+ T-cell clones, when PBMCs were
52 pulsed with tumor- or homologous viral peptides.

53 In conclusion, we have demonstrated that pre-existing immunity and molecular mimicry could
54 explain part of the response observed in immunotherapy. Most importantly, we have developed a
55 tool able to identify tumor antigens and neoantigens based on their similarity to pathogen
56 antigens, in order to exploit molecular mimicry and cross-reactive T-cells in cancer vaccine
57 development.

58

59

60 **Introduction**

61 CD8⁺ T-cells have a key role in the detection and elimination of cells that present abnormal
62 peptides on their surface as a result of viral infection or malignant transformation. Due to the
63 promiscuity of the T-cell receptor (TCR), T-cells recognize a large variety of different targets
64 allowing a relatively small number of T cells to recognize multiple pMHC (peptide:Major
65 Histocompatibility Complex) molecules that can represent a threat^{1, 2}. However, a downside of
66 this mechanism is that the immune response directed against a pathogen might result in a
67 potential recognition of self-antigens. This, consequently, can cause a deleterious off-target
68 effect mediated by cross-reactive T-cells, a process known as molecular mimicry³. The result of
69 such homology between peptides is a well-established process in the field of autoimmunity,
70 however, it has thus far not been explored in cancer.

71 It has been thought that the best prognostic marker for successful outcome of
72 immunotherapeutic treatment is the high mutational burden of the tumor and abundant T-cell
73 infiltration, according to the rationale that a tumor that has a high number of mutations will have
74 a higher chance of being recognized and eliminated by infiltrating T-cells^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8}. Nevertheless,
75 pivotal studies have shown that qualitative properties of tumor neoantigens might be more
76 important than their quantity. It has been proposed that tumor antigens are more likely to be
77 immunogenic if they resemble infectious-disease-associated antigens, because they are more
78 likely to be recognized by a T-cell^{4, 8}. Furthermore, it has been observed that anti-viral T-cells
79 populate the tumor microenvironment⁹, however whether their role is active or not is still
80 unclear.

81 We have hypothesized that tumors might present peptides that share a high degree
82 of homology with viral peptides and thus might enable cross-reactive T-cells to recognize and

83 kill tumor cells via molecular mimicry. To assess whether the molecular mimicry is involved in
84 anti-tumor T cell response, we developed a bioinformatic tool called HEX (Homology
85 Evaluation of Xenopeptides) to identify tumor-specific peptides highly similar to viral-derived
86 peptides.

87 Using several sets of murine and human tumor-specific peptides highly
88 homologous to viral peptides identified by HEX, we herein examine the role of viral pre-existing
89 immunity in cancer anti-tumor T cell response through molecular mimicry.

90

91


92 Results

93 *Development of Homologous Evaluation Xenopeptides (HEX) for identification of viral- and* 94 *tumor-derived peptides with high molecular mimicry*

95 Molecular mimicry is known to be one of the leading mechanisms by which infectious
96 agents may induce autoimmunity³, however, whether a similar mechanism drives anti-viral T
97 cells to the tumor and triggers anti-tumor immune response is unexplored and anecdotal. In fact,
98 a tool for a systematic analysis of molecular mimicry between tumor and viral antigens is
99 lacking.

100 To address this problem and study whether molecular mimicry between viruses and
101 tumors could impact the anti-tumor immune response, we developed HEX, a software that
102 compares the input sequences to a custom database of pathogen-derived protein sequences and
103 selects highly homologous candidate pairs of peptides based on the three following criteria: 1) B-
104 score, that corresponds to the likelihood of the peptides being recognized by a given TCR; 2) the
105 positional weighted alignment score in order to prioritize the similarity in the area of interaction
106 with the TCR; 3) the prediction of the MHC class I binding affinity (Figure 1).

107



108

109 **Figure 1. Flowchart of the HEX algorithm.**


110 A matrix is generated based on the amino acid composition of a tumor peptide (reference peptide). This matrix is then used to scan the viral
111 database and resulting viral peptides are ranked in order of log-likelihood of recognition (B-score). To each viral peptide is assigned an alignment
112 score and a score for MHC-I binding prediction. The candidate viral peptides are ranked based on the following criteria: MHC-I binding
113 prediction score > alignment score > B-score, and the highest scoring peptides are analyzed experimentally.

114

115 To validate the efficiency of the software in selecting homologous peptides with real
116 biological mimicry, we designed an experiment where the tumor growth was followed in mice
117 pre-immunized with viral peptides similar to known tumor antigens. For this experiment, we
118 considered three murine melanoma-associated antigens, that have been applied successfully in a
119 number of vaccination studies: TRP2₁₈₀₋₁₈₈ (tyrosinase-related protein 2), GP100₂₅₋₃₃ (PMEL;
120 premelanosome protein) and TYR1₂₀₈₋₂₁₆ (tyrosinase 1)^{10, 11, 12, 13}. The selected TYR1 sequence
121 was not predicted to bind murine C57BL/6 MHCs, and thus, was considered an “irrelevant
122 peptide”. By HEX analysis, we identified viral peptides that shared high degree of homology
123 with the input tumor epitopes. Pools of 4 viral-derived peptides per each original tumor epitope
124 (Supplementary Table S1) were chosen for further evaluation *in vivo*.

125 C57BL6 mice were pre-vaccinated with selected viral peptide-pools followed by the
126 tumor engraftment (Figure 2A). Interestingly, all immunized mice showed a reduction in tumor
127 growth compared to mice non-pre-immunized and significant differences between the treatment
128 groups were observed. Particularly, the tumor growth was most reduced in mice immunized with
129 viral peptides homologous to TRP2 or gp100 (Figure 2B).

130 To further investigate the contribution of the selected viral peptides in the reduction of




131 tumor growth, we collected the splenocytes of the mice at the endpoint for ELISpot assay (Figure
132 2C). The splenocytes from mice immunized with viral peptide-pools homologous to TRP2 or
133 gp100 fostered higher IFN- γ release compared to the splenocytes from mice immunized with
134 control TYR1-homologous epitopes, in correlation with the outcome of the tumor growth.

135 **Figure 2. Immunization with viral peptides homologous to tumor antigens slows down tumor growth.** Scheme of the animal experiment: To
136 assess if viral peptides similar to tumor peptides can impact tumor growth, 4 groups of C57BL6 mice were formed. A group of naïve mice
137 was used as mock, the other three groups were each immunized with a different pool of viral peptides. The mice were immunized at 2 time
138 points, 14 and 7 days, before the engraftment of the tumor (A). After two weeks from the first immunization mice were injected
139 subcutaneously with 3×10^5 murine melanoma B16-OVA cells. After the engraftment, tumor growth was followed by measuring with digital
140 caliper every second day for nineteen days. P value was calculated using Two-Way ANOVA multiple comparison with Tukey's correction
141 (B). Mice were euthanized when the endpoint was reached. The splenocytes of the mice of each group were collected and pooled for an
142 ELISpot assay. Each pool was then pulsed with the respective viral peptides (viral peptides homologous to TYR1, viral peptides homologous
143 to TRP2, viral peptides homologous to GP100) to assess the response to the treatment. The dotted line shows the background produced by the
144 negative control (C). The range of p value was labeled with asterisks according to the following criteria: > 0.05 (ns), ≤ 0.05 (*), ≤ 0.01 (**), \leq
145 0.001 (***), ≤ 0.0001 (****).

146

147

148 We further investigated the reactivity of these splenocytes from the viral pre-immunized
149 mice towards their respective cognate tumor antigen (Figure 3A). When compared side by side
150 only the viral peptides homologous to TRP2 showed higher IFN- γ secretion compared to the
151 cognate tumor peptide (Figure 3B). In addition, we retrospectively assessed the affinities of each
152 tumor antigen and their homologous viral pools to the C57BL/6J MHC class I molecules (Figure
153 3C) and observed significant correlation with their respective ability to stimulate IFN- γ secretion
154 (Figure 3D). Following the guidelines of the Immune Epitope Database (IEDB) we divided the
155 peptides into High and Low affinity using the threshold of 50nM
156 (<http://tools.iedb.org/mhci/help/>) and observed that peptides with high MHC-I affinity fostered



157 the production of more IFN- γ compared to peptides with low MHC-I affinity (Figure 3E). Taken
158 together, all these results validate the predictive efficiency of HEX to identify homologous
159 peptides with a biologically relevant mimicry.

160


161 **Figure 3. Viral peptides with higher affinity for the MHC are more immunogenic and can elicit stronger cross-reactive response.** To
162 assess
163 the response toward the respective original tumor epitope, splenocytes from each group of immunization were pooled together and pulsed with
164 the corresponding tumor peptide (dotted line represent background signal) (A). Comparison between the responses elicited by pulsing the
165 splenocytes with the pooled viral peptides and the corresponding original tumor peptide (dotted line represent background signal) (B).
166 Predicted affinity of the original tumor and respective similar viral pool of peptides to the murine
167 MHC class I. 50nM was considered as threshold to define peptides with “High-” and “Intermediate/Low Affinity” according to the IEDB
168 guidelines (C). Correlation between data from IFN- γ response and predicted affinity (D). Stratification of peptides based on their affinity and
169 ability to stimulate IFN- γ production. High affinity peptides (IC₅₀ <50nM) foster significantly higher production of INF- γ compared to
170 Intermediate/Low affinity peptides (IC₅₀ >50nM) (E). P value was calculated using t test with Mann Whitney correction. The range of p value
171 was represented as follows: > 0.05 (ns), \leq 0.05 (*), \leq 0.01 (**), \leq 0.001 (***), \leq 0.0001 (****).

172

173 To further validate the efficiency of the HEX selected peptides, we designed another
174 experiment to assess whether the molecular mimicry between viral and tumor antigens could also
175 affect the growth of already established tumors in naïve mice. To this end, mice were engrafted
176 with B16OVA or the more aggressive and immunosuppressive B16F10 tumors and,
177 subsequently, treated with the previously developed vaccine platform PeptiCRAd¹⁴ consisting of
178 adenoviruses coated with MHC-I restricted peptides (Figure 4A). For this experiment, we
179 utilized the most effective pool of peptides from the previous results. In fact, vaccines were
180 prepared by coating the adenoviruses with the original TRP2₁₈₀₋₁₈₈ epitope (TRP2-PeptiCRAd)
181 or the corresponding pool of viral-derived peptides similar to TRP2 (Viral PeptiCRAd).
182 Intratumoral administration of PeptiCRAd significantly reduced the tumor progression compared
183 to treatment with saline buffer or uncoated-virus both for B16OVA (Figure 4B) and B16F10
184 tumors (Figure 4D). Mice treated with the original tumor antigen (TRP2) or the viral
185 homologous showed higher therapeutic success rate in both of the tumor models (Figure 4C, 4E).
186 Taken together this first set of experiments suggests that our tool, HEX, is efficient in selecting
187 peptides that share molecular mimicry and this molecular mimicry has a biological relevance.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

188



189

190 **Figure 4. Viral peptides homologous to tumor antigens can reduce tumor growth in already established tumors.** Either B16-OVA or
191 B16F10 cells were subcutaneously injected at day 0. As soon the tumors were visible, the mice were treated with either PBS (Mock), Adenovirus
192 alone (Uncoated virus), Adenovirus coated with viral-derived peptides similar to TRP2 (Viral-PeptiCRAd), or Adenovirus coated with TRP2
193 peptide (TRP2-PeptiCRAd) (A). Normalized B16-OVA (B) and B16F10 (D) tumor volume is shown as mean \pm SEM (statistical analysis Two-
194 way ANOVA with multiple comparison). Normalized B16-OVA (C) and B16-F10 (E) tumor volume curves of individual mice per each group.
195 The dotted line identifies the therapeutic success threshold and represents the median of the normalized volumes measured at the endpoint. p
196 value is represented as follow: > 0.05 (ns), ≤ 0.05 (*), ≤ 0.01 (**), ≤ 0.001 (***), ≤ 0.0001 (****).

197


198 *Pre-existing immunity to viruses enhances peptide-based cancer immunotherapy via molecular*
199 *mimicry*

200 After having established the efficiency of HEX and the biological efficacy of its peptides,
201 we could investigate whether the pre-existing immunity to a given virus would be beneficial
202 when mice are treated with a cancer vaccine based on peptides homologous to that same virus.

203 To mimic the anti-viral pre-existing immunity, we preimmunized half of a cohort of mice
204 with viral-derived peptides; as before, these viral peptides were selected by HEX to be similar to

205 TRP2, the antigen that gave the best anti-tumor response in previous experiments. After pre-
206 immunization, all the mice were engrafted with the syngeneic B16-OVA and mice that
207 developed palpable tumors were randomized and treated as follows: PBS (Mock), PeptiCRAd-
208 gp100 (no pre-existing immunity for this peptide) and PeptiCRAd-TRP2 (peptide with
209 homologous pre-existing immunity) (Figure 5A). We observed that mice treated with gp100-
210 coated PeptiCRAd displayed no statistically significant difference in tumor volume regardless of
211 their preimmunization status (Supplementary Figure 1A, B). Contrarily, mice preimmunized
212 with peptides similar to TRP2 showed both a better control of tumor growth compared to the
213 naïve group when treated with TRP2-coated PeptiCRAd (Figure 5B) and a higher therapeutic
214 success rate (83% vs 57%) (Figure 5C). At the experimental endpoint, mice were euthanized and
215 flow cytometry analysis was performed on the collected tumors. Interestingly we observed that
216 the anti-viral immunity had conditioned the tumor to become more responsive to the therapy. In
217 fact, we observed an increase of CD8⁺ and memory CD8⁺ T cells in the tumor of pre-vaccinated
218 mice, together with their proliferation activity (Ki67⁺). Interestingly, we also observed a
219 decrease of CD8⁺CXCR3⁺ population in pre-immunized mice, suggesting a more memory
220 phenotype in preimmunized mice (Figure 5D). These results support the hypothesis that
221 antiviral-pre-existing immunity can boost the effect of immunotherapies in an antigen specific
222 fashion if there is enough homology between pre-existing antigens and the antigens used for the
223 therapeutic vaccine.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



224

225 **Figure 5. Pre-existing immunity towards viral-derived epitopes mimicking tumors antigens increase efficacy of cancer immunotherapy.**

226 Schematic of the treatment pipeline (A). Average tumor growth shown as mean ± SEM of each treatment group (B). Statistical analysis Two-way
 227 ANOVA. Tumor volume curves of individual mice per each treatment group (C). The dotted line identifies the threshold of the therapeutic
 228 success rate and represents the median of the normalized volumes measured at the endpoint for the Naïve groups and the PEI (pre-immunized)
 229 groups respectively. Flow cytometry analysis of the tumors collected at the endpoint (where N stands for Naïve and P stands for pre-immunized)
 230 (D). p value is represented as follow: > 0.05 (ns), ≤ 0.05 (*), ≤ 0.01 (**), ≤ 0.001 (***), ≤ 0.0001 (****).

231


232 *MHC-I epitope mimicry and cross-reactive T-cells contribute to prolonged survival of anti-PD1*

233 *treated metastatic melanoma patients*

234 As demonstrated above, the similarity between tumor antigens and viral-derived antigens
235 can play a crucial role in tumor clearance via cross-reactive T-cells in murine model of cancer.
236 Thus, we wanted to study whether molecular mimicry could also play a significant role in human
237 cancer patients. To this end we studied a cohort of metastatic melanoma patients undergoing
238 treatment with anti-PD1 monotherapy. We collected peripheral blood samples from patients
239 before initiation of therapy, after one and three months and tested their serological status for
240 CMV and Epstein-Barr Virus (EBV) at each timepoint. Using Cox regression, the association of
241 pre-treatment serum CMV and EBV specific IgG levels to progression free survival (PFS) was
242 analyzed. Our results indicated that patients with pretreatment titer of serum anti-CMV IgG
243 higher than the median had significantly longer PFS when compared to patients with anti-CMV
244 IgG levels lower than the median (HR=0.34, 95% CI: 0.08-1.4, p=0.04) (Figure 6A). On the
245 contrary, the anti-EBV specific IgG was not associated with prolonged PFS (HR=0.75 95% CI:
246 0.2-3.1, p=ns) (Figure 6B).

247 To evaluate the more general immunological status of patients, quantitative assessment of
248 IgA, IgG and IgM was performed at each timepoint. The levels of immunoglobulins showed no
249 differences between the responders (R) and non-responders (NR) at pretreatment, indicating that
250 there was no general increased immune-reactive status in patients before initiation of checkpoint
251 inhibitor therapy (Figure 6 C-E). Further, after initiation of anti-PD1 treatment the responders'
252 IgG levels were significantly higher as compared to non-responders (mean: R_{1mo} 12.8 g/L vs.
253 NR_{1mo}: 9.4 g/L, p=0.02, R_{3mo} 12.7 g/L vs. NR_{3mo}: 9.9 g/L) (Figure 5D). Taken together our data
254 indicates that anti-CMV, but not anti-EBV immunity, correlates with prolonged PFS in
255 metastatic melanoma patients undergoing immune-checkpoint inhibitor (ICPI) therapy.

256



257 **Figure 6. Common viral infections influence prolonged progression-free survival in ICPI-treated metastatic melanoma patients.**

258 Kaplan-Meier curve of anti-CMV-IgG high patients (blue line, n=7) compared to anti-CMV-IgG low (pink line, n=5) patients (p=0.05) using Cox
259 regression model. Patients were divided based on their pretreatment anti-CMV-IgG titer as higher, equal (\geq) or lower (<) than the median. CMV-
260 seronegative patients were excluded from this analysis. Patients that ended their treatment due to severe adverse effects were censored (black tic
261 marks) (A). Kaplan-Meier curve of anti-EBV-IgG high patients (blue line, n=10) compared to anti-EBV-IgG low (pink line, n=4) patients
262 (p>0.99) using Cox regression model. Patients were divided based on their pretreatment anti-EBV-IgG titer as higher, equal (\geq) or lower (<) the
263 median. EBV-seronegative patients were excluded from this analysis. Patients that ended their treatment due severe adverse effects were censored
264 (black tic marks) (B). The immunoglobulin assay of IgA, IgG and IgM serum levels (g/L) between responders (R, white dots) and non-responders
265 (NR, black squares) before initiation (D0) and after one (1mo) and three months (3mo) of ICPI-therapy. The statistical difference between
266 timepoints is calculated with Student's t-test and the range of p value is labeled with asterisk (*P < 0.05) (C, D, E).










267

268 Our findings presented us with a good opportunity to study whether molecular mimicry
269 between CMV and tumor antigens could explain the better prognosis. In fact, we hypothesized
270 that, at least in some patients, cross-reactive T cells between known melanoma antigens and
271 CMV might explain the better PFS. To this end, we selected a pool of melanoma-associated
272 proteins¹⁵ and compared them to the CMV proteome using HEX, generating a list of melanoma-

273 associated peptides highly similar to CMV (Supplementary Table S2). In the one patient, of
274 whom we had available PBMCs, cross-reactivity between tumor and CMV peptides was
275 assessed by ELISpot. Interestingly we observed that in this responder patient, PBMCs were
276 significantly stimulated by both tumor peptides and their CMV homologous counterparts,
277 suggesting that the CMV infection could have expanded viral T cell clones that could attack and
278 kill tumor cells making seropositive patients more prone to react towards melanoma specific
279 epitopes similar to CMV (Figure 7 A, B).

280 This example indicates that molecular mimicry could explain part of the response of this
281 patient but does not yet demonstrate involvement of cross-reactive T cells. In fact, a CMV
282 positive cancer patient could theoretically expand two different T cell clones, one against the
283 tumor peptide and one against the viral CMV peptide. To overcome this problem and finally
284 assess whether homologous peptides could also activate and expand the same T cells clones we
285 designed an additional cross reactivity experiment using healthy donors seropositive for CMV.
286 In these individuals we investigated whether the same T cell clones were expanded when
287 PBMCs were pulsed with viral (V) and tumor (T) peptides with high molecular mimicry. Thus,
288 we activated PBMCs collected from a CMV seropositive donor, using these previously evaluated
289 viral and tumor antigen pairs (named V2/T2 and V5/T5). After the activation, we sorted the IFN-
290 γ positive and negative CD8⁺ T cells that were further analyzed with TCR β sequencing
291 (workflow of the experiment is presented in Figure 7C). From the TCR β data we identified
292 clones that were present in both activated T cell pools, pulsed either with viral or tumor peptides,
293 but not present when stimulated with IL2 only (Figure 7 D&E). Following, among these shared
294 clones, we filtered the top three clones based on the sum of productive frequency among the
295 activated T cell pools and compared the productive frequency of these clones in each

296 experimental T cell pool. Interestingly we observed that peptides with high molecular mimicry
297 (V2/T2 and V5/T5) expanded the same T cell clones when compared to the baseline productive
298 frequency and the productive frequency in IFN- γ negative CD8+ T-cell pool (Figure 7 F,G),
299 demonstrating that homologous peptides predicted by HEX could be recognized by the same
300 TCR. These findings indicate, for the first time, that molecular mimicry plays a role in mediating
301 anti-tumor immune response and can potentially be exploited to design more efficient anti-cancer
302 immunotherapies based on the pre-existing immunity of the patient.



304

305 **Figure 7. T-cell cross-reactivity between viral and tumor antigens shares high degree of homology.** PBMCs derived from an HLA-A*02:01
306 patient with high serum level of anti-CMV Ab were pulsed with the peptides in Supplementary Table S2. The level of IFN- γ secreted by
307 activated CD8+ T cells was detected by ELISpot assay. The dotted line indicates the noise level coming from unspecific activation of CTL in
308 the negative control CMV resembling tumor (T1-5) and viral (V1-5) peptides presented in Supplementary Table S2 (A). PBMCs derived
309 from an HLA-A*02:01 positive patient with high serum level of anti-CMV Ab and from a healthy donor (HD) found positive for CMV
310 response were tested for anti-CMV response by ELISpot assay using CMV-specific HLA-A*02:01 restricted peptide NLVPMVATV. P value
311 was calculated using t-test with Mann-Whitney correction (B). Experimental design for cross-reactivity assay. On day 0 primary human
312 PBMCs were in vitro stimulated with matching viral and tumor peptides, on day 2 IL2 was added to the culture in order to sustain the primary
313 cell culture until day 8 when GolgiStop was added. After inhibition by GolgiStop on day 9 the IFN- γ positive and negative fractions of CD8 T
314 cells were sorted using FACS for further TCR β sequencing (C). Venn diagrams indicating the number of shared clones between viral or
315 tumor antigen expanded active CD8+ T-cells and the baseline CD8+ T-cells. Clones that expanded with IL2 stimulation only were excluded
316 from further analysis (D&E). The top three clones with highest combined productive frequency among IFN- γ producing CD8+ T cell pool
317 that overlapped between viral and tumor antigen expansion, but were not expanded with IL2 stimulation only. Bars represent the productive
318 frequency of clones in IFN- γ producing (pink) and IFN- γ negative (grey) CD8+ T-cells after viral (striped fill) and tumor (solid fill) antigen
319 expansion. Black dotted line represents the baseline expression (black bar) (F&G).

320

321 **Discussion**

322 In this study we present a novel bioinformatic tool (HEX) to identify tumor-specific
323 MHC-I restricted peptides with high similarity to viral-specific peptides. Using peptides
324 identified by this tool, we show that, in murine tumor models, viral pre-existing immunity
325 enhances the efficacy of cancer immunotherapy via molecular mimicry. We further report, that
326 in a cohort of human melanoma patients, with high humoral response to CMV, molecular
327 mimicry between CMV- and tumor-antigens potentially plays a role in the response to
328 checkpoint inhibitor therapy (anti-PD1), via activation of cross-reactive T-cells. In support of
329 this, we also demonstrate that, in healthy donors with pre-existing immunity to CMV,
330 melanoma-specific peptides similar to CMV-specific peptides activate and expand the same T
331 cell clones. Our findings demonstrate that viral molecular mimicry favorably modifies the tumor
332 immune-microenvironment, improving efficacy of immunotherapy.

333 The TCR is a highly promiscuous receptor and thus allows T-cells to recognize a very
334 large variety of different targets^{1,2}. The idea that an immune response toward certain pathogens
335 could lead to cross recognition of self-antigens is well established in the field of auto-immune
336 diseases, a mechanism known as “molecular mimicry”³. Here, we hypothesized that a similar
337 mechanism could also drive the anti-tumor immune response via cross-reactive T-cells.

338 Some studies have speculated that pathogen-specific cross-reactive T-cells could be
339 responsible for extraordinary anti-tumor immune responses and prolonged PFS observed in some
340 cancer patients^{4,8}. Although intriguing, this hypothesis has not been systematically studied nor
341 has it impacted clinical practice, partly due to the lack of a proper tool to identify molecular
342 mimicry between tumor and pathogen antigens. To overcome this problem, we developed a
343 unique and novel software to rapidly identify tumor-specific MHC-I restricted peptides with high

344 homology to pathogen derived MHC-I restricted peptides (HEX; Homology Evaluation of
345 Xenopeptides). Contrarily to a simple alignment of sequences, this software assesses physical-
346 chemical similarity at molecular level between an input sequence (single peptide or a list of
347 peptides) and a list of pathogen-derived antigens¹⁶ and provides a positionally weighted¹⁷
348 alignment score to prioritize similarities occurring in the central section of the peptide, primarily
349 involved in the interaction with the TCR¹⁸. Moreover, to increase the chances of identifying
350 naturally presented epitopes, it predicts the MHC-binding affinity of both the input and the
351 cognate viral peptides using state of the art MHC-binding-affinity predictors (NetMHC-API
352 from IEDB servers)¹⁹.

353 We found that preimmunization with viral peptides similar to well characterized tumor
354 peptides^{10, 11, 12, 13}, efficiently slowed down the growth of subcutaneously injected melanoma
355 tumor cells in mice, indicating that the pre-exposure to viral-derived peptides can affect the
356 tumor growth. Rosato et al. have reported that virus-specific memory T cells can populate the
357 tumor, enhancing checkpoint blockade therapy⁹. Herein, we propose the underlying mechanism
358 to be molecular mimicry between viral and tumor antigens. We also observed that the tumor-
359 homologous viral-derived peptides have therapeutic effect on already established tumors,
360 indicating that a viral infection occurring during tumor progression could influence tumor
361 response to treatment. Interestingly, mice intratumorally injected with the peptide-uncoated virus
362 didn't show any anti-tumor effect in contrast to what has been shown by Newman et al.²⁰. On the
363 contrary, viruses coated with highly homologous peptides produced a marked anti-tumor
364 response showing that the effect was antigen-specific and based on molecular mimicry. The
365 apparent discrepancy between these findings could be explained by the use of different viruses,
366 with differing antigen repertoire and different degree of homology between virus and tumor, in

367 the two studies. Tumor regression following viral administration or natural infection has
368 previously been reported. This could be due to a generic mechanism, such as the “adjuvancy”
369 effect of the virus with consequent recruitment of T cells at the tumor site, or to a more specific
370 mechanism of shared antigens and activation of cross-reactive T-cells. Many coincidences have
371 to occur to trigger potent mimicry-mediated tumor regression spontaneously, and, as for
372 autoimmune diseases, the mimicry-mediated mechanisms may not be enough to trigger a
373 biologically relevant T cell immune response, without other concomitant circumstances³.
374 However, we envisioned that with the right tool to identify optimal homologous antigens, the
375 mimicry between tumor and pre-existing exposure to a certain pathogen could be exploited to
376 specifically boost the efficacy of active immunotherapy. Our findings potentially have important
377 implications in peptide-selection for cancer vaccines, where peptides able to recruit antiviral-
378 memory T cells in the tumor microenvironment might improve the outcome of treatment^{4, 8}.
379 Recently, several attempts have been made to repurpose existing anti-viral T cells or using
380 general vaccines to boost and/or redirect T cells against the tumors; Rosato et al.⁹ have used
381 viral derived peptides to engage pre-existing T cells, Newman et al.²⁰ have used direct intra-
382 tumoral administration of the flu vaccine and Tähtinen & Feola et al. have previously used
383 tetanus-derived peptides to engage tetanus-specific CD4+ T cells in pre-vaccinated tumor-
384 bearing mice²¹. All these approaches have been successful in preclinical models and some of
385 them have also proceeded to clinical testing. We suggest that they could be even more efficient if
386 designed based on molecular mimicry with regards to the patients’ pre-existing immunity.

387 We also find that molecular mimicry could partially explain the efficacy of ICPIs in
388 human cancer patients. Novel ICPIs, such as anti-PD1, have significantly improved the survival
389 of patients with solid tumors, especially in metastatic melanoma, when compared to other

390 commonly used therapies such as radiation and chemotherapies^{22, 23}. However, despite the
391 enhanced survival and efficient response rates, it is yet unknown why some patients benefit more
392 than others. Certainly, the direct administration of viruses to the tumor site enhances the influx of
393 T cells predisposing the ICPIs to work more efficiently^{24, 25}. However, the link between these
394 viral T cells and anti-tumor response is still unknown. Molecular mimicry could be the missing
395 link, at least in some cases, explaining why anti-viral T cells at the tumor site have such a
396 beneficial effect. Therefore, we studied a cohort of metastatic melanoma patients undergoing
397 anti-PD1 therapy and measured their serum anti-CMV and anti-EBV IgG titers, as these are
398 common viruses and specific T cells have been often found in the tumors of patients²⁶. In
399 particular CMV reactivations have previously been reported in ICPI treated patients²⁶ and its
400 association to beneficial therapy response has been speculated. Our results indicated that the
401 patients with high titer of CMV-specific IgG levels had significantly longer PFS. On the
402 contrary, the EBV-specific IgG levels did not associate with prolonged PFS. Interestingly, no
403 significant differences could be observed in the general immunization between the responder and
404 non-responder cohorts supporting the hypothesis that the immune response specific to CMV
405 infection, might contribute to the prolonged survival in anti-PD1 treated melanoma patients. To
406 further strengthen these findings, we observed that the PBMCs, from a patient with high anti-
407 CMV-IgG titer, reacted with melanoma antigens similar to CMV peptides. In addition to this, a
408 deeper evaluation on the cross-reactivity by deep TCR β sequencing indicated that, indeed, the
409 same TCR clones were expanded in the activated T-cell populations when pulsed with
410 mimicking viral- and tumor-derived antigens even when absent at the baseline. This data
411 indicates the possibility of molecular mimicry, between viral- and tumor-derived antigens, to
412 contribute to cancer-specific T-cell immunity. Thus, based on our *in vitro* cross-reactivity

413 results, together with the association of high serum CMV IgG levels and prolonged survival of
414 melanoma patients, we also believe that the molecular mimicry between CMV and melanoma
415 could provide a clinical advantage for these patients undergoing ICPI therapy.

416 We are aware of some limitations of our study. Our HEX tool only predicts binding
417 affinity of CD8 restricted epitopes. These were, however, prioritized as CD8 T cells are the ones
418 mainly involved in recognizing both virally infected and transformed cells. Secondly, HEX does
419 not consider whether the peptides are naturally processed and this could affect the number of
420 false positive candidate peptides ²⁷. The small patient cohort available for this study is an
421 additional limiting factor. Thus, in order to explore molecular mimicry in a clinical setting,
422 further studies with larger patient cohorts in controlled clinical trials together with other possible
423 target epitopes is warranted.

424 The results of this study indicate that viral infections could have an impact on tumor
425 growth and clearance. Additionally, we show cross-reactivity of cytotoxic T-cells against viral-
426 and homologous tumor-derived antigens, selected using our novel software HEX. Our findings
427 highlight the importance of viral pre-existing immunity in cancer immunotherapy, and suggest
428 the use of HEX to select highly homologous viral-tumor antigens to engage cross-reactive T
429 cells.

430

431 **Materials and Methods**

432 *HEX (Homology Evaluation of Xenopeptides)*

433 Homology Evaluation of Xenopeptides (HEX) is a novel in silico platform that compares
434 similarity between tumor peptides (reference peptides) and viral peptides (query peptides). It

435 utilizes several metrics in order to expediate candidate peptide selection. This is done by
436 incorporating both novel methods (peptide scoring and alignment scoring algorithm) and
437 integrated pre-existing methods (MHC-I binding prediction). HEX comes with a number of
438 precompiled databases of known proteins, such as proteins derived from viral pathogens and the
439 human proteome¹⁶.

440 Peptides are ranked by a score (henceforth, B-score) as previously described¹⁶, which
441 represents the log-likelihood of the viral peptide being recognized by a T-cell. The associated
442 scoring matrix is generated ad hoc based on the amino acid composition of the reference peptide,
443 as opposed to experimentally. In particular, in the matrix rows representing the amino acid
444 position in the peptide and columns representing each of the 20 standard amino acids, amino acid
445 positions of the reference peptide were assigned the same high score and other positions were
446 assigned the same low score. The B-score is the agonist log-likelihood score for this special
447 matrix and is given by:

448
$$\frac{\sum_{p=1}^n \ln P[\alpha_p @ p]}{n}$$
, where $P[\alpha_p @ p] = \frac{\text{score of amino acid } \alpha \text{ at position } p}{\sum \text{ of all scores at position } p}$

449 Alignments are computed pairwise between peptides in the query set against the
450 reference set. For a given pair of peptides, their alignment is calculated by the summing the
451 distance scores between pairs of amino acids in the same position. Scoring is weighted to
452 prioritize similarity between more central amino acids in the peptide. HEX supports both
453 BLOSUM and PAM substitution matrices across several evolutionary distances.

454 MHC class I binding affinity predictions are made using NetMHC¹⁹ via the Application
455 programming interface of IEDB (<http://tools.iedb.org/main/tools-api/>) and are then parsed and
456 collated within the tool. The user can specify their desired scoring method or return a number of

457 recommended results. Predictions for a number of human and murine MHC-I alleles are
458 supported.

459 Users are able to select peptides by their own criteria or allow peptides to be selected by a
460 random forest model. The random forest was trained on experimental outcomes of peptides
461 chosen by the authors. Feature importance was determined by out-of-bag (OOB) increase in
462 mean squared error (MSE) and cross-validated on an unseen sample of the peptides. HEX was
463 developed as a web application using the R package Shiny and is accessible at
464 <https://picpl.arcca.cf.ac.uk/hex/app/> without user registration. The source code is available at
465 <https://github.com/whalleyt/hex>.

466

467 *Patients and samples*

468 In total of 16 stage four metastatic melanoma patients were treated with anti-PD1
469 monoclonal antibody in the Helsinki University Central Hospital (HUCH) Comprehensive
470 Cancer Center. Patients were randomly selected to receive either nivolumab (n=7) infusions
471 every second week or pembrolizumab (n=9) infusions every third week. The study was approved
472 by the HUCH ethical committee (Dnro 115/13/03/02/15). Written informed consent was received
473 from all patients and the study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.
474 For detailed patient characteristics see Supplementary Table S3.

475 Peripheral blood samples (3ml EDTA blood, 50ml Heparin blood) were collected from
476 three time-points; before initiation of treatment, after one and three months of treatment. From
477 these the plasma was separated by centrifuging and then stored in -70C°. The CMV and EBV
478 IgG levels were measured from thawed EDTA plasma samples using VIDAS CMV IgG

479 (BioMérieux, Marcy-l'Etoile, France) and Siemens Enzygnost Anti-EBV/IgG kits (Siemens
480 Healthcare Diagnostics, Marburg, Germany). The immunoglobulins (IgA, IgM, IgG) from
481 thawed Heparin plasma were measured in the central laboratory of the Helsinki University
482 Central Hospital (HUSLAB).

483

484 *Cell lines and human samples*

485 The murine melanoma cell line B16-F10 was purchased from the American Type Culture
486 Collection (ATCC; Manassas, VA, USA). Cells were cultured in RPMI (Gibco, Thermo Fisher
487 Scientific, US) with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) (Life Technologies), 1% Glutamax (Gibco,
488 Thermo Fisher Scientific, US), and 1% Penicillin and Streptomycin (Gibco, Thermo Fisher
489 Scientific, US) at 37°C/ 5% CO₂.

490 The cell line B16-OVA, a mouse melanoma cell line modified to constitutively express
491 chicken Ovalbumin (OVA), was kindly provided by Prof. Richard Vile (Mayo Clinic, Rochester,
492 MN, USA). These cells were cultured in RPMI Low glucose (Gibco, Thermo Fisher Scientific,
493 US) with 10% FBS (Gibco, Thermo Fisher Scientific, US), 1% Glutamax, 1% Penicillin and
494 Streptomycin (Gibco, Thermo Fisher Scientific, US) and 1% Geneticin (Gibco, Thermo Fisher
495 Scientific, US) at 37°C/ 5% CO₂.

496 All cells were tested for mycoplasma contamination with a commercial detection kit
497 (Lonza - Basel, Switzerland). Isolated human PBMCs were frozen in FBS supplemented with
498 10% DMSO and then maintained in liquid nitrogen until use.

499 Cryopreserved PBMCs were thawed and rested overnight at 37°C/ 5% CO₂ in complete
500 RPMI medium supplemented with 10% FBS, 1% Glutamax, 1% penicillin-streptomycin over
501 night before plating them for ELISPOT.

502

503 *Peptides*

504 All the peptides used in this study were purchased from Zhejiang Ontores
505 Biotechnologies Co. (Zhejiang, China) or GenScript (New Jersey, USA) 5mg >90% purity. The
506 sequences of all the peptides used in this study are found in Supplementary Table S1 and S2.

507

508 *PeptiCRAd preparation*

509 All PeptiCRAd complexes described in this work were prepared by mixing Adenoviruses
510 and polyK-tailed peptides according to the following protocol: 1x10⁹vp were mixed with 20ug
511 peptides; after vortexing, the mixture was incubated at room temperature for 15 min;
512 successively, PBS was added up to the injection volume (50uL). For the TRP2-PeptiCRAd,
513 1x10⁹vp were mixed with 20ug of 6K-TRP2₁₈₀₋₁₈₈ peptide, while the Viral-PeptiCRAd was
514 prepared using 1x10⁹vp mixed with 5ug of each viral 6K-peptide homologous for TRP2₁₈₀₋₁₈₈.
515 gp100 PeptiCRAd was prepared using 1x10⁹vp mixed with 20ug of 6K- GP100₂₅₋₃₃ peptide.

516 New PeptiCRAds were prepared before each experiment using fresh reagents. All
517 dilutions of virus and peptides required before incubation were performed in sterile PBS. Viruses
518 were generated, propagated, and characterized as elsewhere described ¹⁴.

519

520 *Animal experiments and ethical permits*

521 All animal experiments were reviewed and approved by the Experimental Animal
522 Committee of the University of Helsinki and the Provincial Government of Southern Finland. All
523 in vivo models were carried using C57BL/6JOlaHsd mice obtained from Scanbur (Karlslunde,
524 Denmark).

525 For the first animal experiment, 8- to 9-week-old immune competent female C57BL/6J
526 mice were divided in 4 groups. N = 3 mice were used as mock group, n = 7 mice were used to
527 form each of the three different treatment groups. Each group was immunized with a different
528 pool of viral-derived peptides homologous to tumor epitopes. Mice were vaccinated twice and
529 injections were performed at one-week interval (day 0 & 7) at the base of the tail with 40ug of
530 peptides pool (10ug each peptide) and 40ug of adjuvant (VacciGrade poly(I:C) – Invivogen) in a
531 final injectable volume of 100ul. Naïve mice (PBS injected) were used as Mock group. At day
532 fourteen mice were injected with 3×10^5 B16-OVA cells on the right flank and tumor growth was
533 followed until endpoint was reached.

534 For the treatment of established tumors, we tested 2 different tumor cell lines: B16-OVA
535 cells and the more aggressive B16F10 cells. 3×10^5 B16-OVA cells and 1×10^5 B16-F10 were
536 injected subcutaneously on the right flank of 8- to 9-week-old immune competent female
537 C57BL/6J mice. Successively, these mice were randomly divided in 4 groups of 7-8 mice for
538 each tumor cell line. A mock group was treated with PBS; a second group was treated with
539 uncoated Adenovirus; a third group was treated with Adenovirus coated with TRP2₁₈₀₋₁₈₈
540 (TRP2–PeptiCRAd); the last group was treated with Adenovirus coated with TRP2-homologous
541 viral peptides (Viral–PeptiCRAd).

542 Mice were intratumorally treated twice and injections were performed at two days
543 interval (day 10 and 12 from tumor engraftment) a final volume of 50uL per injection. Tumor

544 growth was measured every 2 days with a digital caliper until endpoint was reached. The tumor
545 volume was mathematically calculated according to the following formula:

$$546 \quad \frac{(long\ side) \times (short\ side)^2}{2}$$

547 The median of the tumor volume measurement of the last day identified the therapeutic
548 success threshold and showed as a dotted line in the graphs. Mice that at the end point showed a
549 tumor volume below the threshold were considered responders, while mice above it were
550 considered non-responders.

551 As for the animal experiment depicted in Figure 5, we used a combination of all the
552 above-mentioned methods. Half of the cohort of C57BL/6J female mice (8- to 9-week-old) was
553 preimmunized with the pool of viral-derived peptides similar to TRP2 (Supplementary Table S1)
554 according to the protocol described previously. After two weeks from the first immunizations all
555 the mice were subcutaneously injected with 3×10^5 B16-OVA cells on their right flank. When the
556 tumor was visible, mice were divided into 6 groups of $n = 8-10$ mice per group, and were
557 intratumorally injected three times (two days apart) with either PBS (Mock group), gp100-coated
558 PeptiCrad (gp100 group) or TRP2-coated PeptiCrad (TRP2 group). Tumor growth was followed
559 as previously described until the endpoint of the experiment was reached.

560

561 *ELISpot assay*

562 To assess the amount of active antigen specific T-cells, interferon- γ (IFN- γ) secretion
563 was measured by ELISPOT assay from IMMUNOSPOT (CTL, Ohio USA) for the murine IFN- γ
564 and MABTECH (Mabtech AB, Nacka Strand, Sweden) for the human IFN- γ .

565 Fresh mice splenocytes collected at the end point of the experiment have been used. The
566 procedure was carried out according to the manufacturer instructions. In brief, for murine IFN- γ ,
567 3×10^5 of splenocytes/well were plated at day 0. Cells were stimulated with 2 μ g/well of
568 peptides. After 3 days of incubation at 37°C/ 5% CO₂, plates were developed according to the
569 kit's protocol.

570 For human IFN- γ ELISPOT, human PBMCs were thawed and let rest over-night at 37°C/
571 5% CO₂ in complete medium. The following day, 3×10^5 PBMCs/well were plated and stimulated
572 with 2 μ g/well of peptides. After 48h of incubation at 37°C/ 5% CO₂ the plates were developed
573 according to the manufacturer's protocol. Plates were sent to CTL-Europe GmbH to be analyzed.

574

575 *Flow cytometry analysis*

576 Intracellular staining was performed using FOXP3 Fixation/Permeabilization Buffer
577 (Biolegend - 421403) according to the manufacturer instructions.

578 Antibodies used in this study were the following: TruStain fcX (anti-mouse CD16/32)
579 (Biolegend - 101320), CD3-BV711 (BD - 563123), CD4-PECF594 (BD - 562285),
580 CXCR3-APC (BD - 562266), CD44-V450 (BD - 560451), Ki67-PECy7 (BD - 561283), CD8a
581 (KT15)-FITC (Proimmune 1705F/33790).

582 The data were acquired using BD LSR-FORTESSA flow cytometer and subsequently
583 analyzed using FlowJo software v10.

584

585 *Cross-reactivity assay*

586 The cross-reactivity of T-cells against the viral and tumor antigens sharing high similarity
587 was studied by first expanding the PBMCs from CMV seropositive donor in vitro using the
588 matching viral and tumor antigens (V2/T2 and V5/T5).

589 Cryopreserved PBMCs were thawed in warm 37°C RMPI and then rested overnight at
590 37°C, 5% CO₂ in complete RPMI medium supplemented with 10% FBS, 1% L-glutamine, 1%
591 penicillin-streptomycin, before stimulation with viral or tumor antigens. After resting overnight,
592 on day 0 the PBMCs were plated as 6x10⁶ cells/well on 6-well plates with the selected peptides
593 in final concentration of 4 μM/ml and incubated 48 hours at 37°C, 5% CO₂ in complete RPMI
594 medium, duplicate samples were used for each peptide stimulation. NLV peptide was used as a
595 positive control, for negative control no peptide stimulation was used. On day 2 half of the media
596 was replaced with fresh complete RMPI with IL2 in final concentration of 20 IU/ml. On day 8
597 GolgiStop™ (BD BioSciences) was added according to manufacturer's instructions and cells
598 were incubated overnight before cell sorting.

599 On day 9 the cells were collected and stained with surface markers; CD3, CD8, CD45,
600 CD56 and NLV pentamer followed by fixing and permeabilization using BD
601 Cytotfix/Cytoperm™ (BD BioSciences) and staining with intracellular IFN-γ. The IFN-γ positive
602 and negative CD8⁺ T-fractions were sorted for DNA extraction followed by TCRβ deep-
603 sequencing (FIMM). The workflow of cross-reactivity assay is illustrated in Figure 7C.

604

605 **Supplementary Materials**

606 Supplementary Table S1. *Peptides used for the animal experiment.*

607 Supplementary Table S2. *Peptides used for the ELISpot on patients' PBMCs.*

608 Supplementary Table S3. Patient characteristics.

609 Supplementary Figure 1.

610

611 **References:**

612

613 1. Bentzen AK, *et al.* T cell receptor fingerprinting enables in-depth characterization of the
614 interactions governing recognition of peptide–MHC complexes.) (2018).

615

616 2. Wooldridge L, *et al.* A single autoimmune T cell receptor recognizes more than a million
617 different peptides. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, (2012).

618

619 3. Rojas M, *et al.* Molecular mimicry and autoimmunity.) (2018).

620

621 4. Snyder A, *et al.* Genetic basis for clinical response to CTLA-4 blockade in melanoma.
622 *The New England journal of medicine* **371**, 2189-2199 (2014).

623

624 5. Rizvi NA, *et al.* Mutational landscape determines sensitivity to PD-1 blockade in non-
625 small cell lung cancer. *Science*, (2015).

626

627 6. Carbone DP. First-Line Nivolumab in Stage IV or Recurrent Non-Small Cell Lung
628 Cancer. *Oncology Times*, (2017).

629

630 7. Schumacher TN, Schreiber RD. Neoantigens in cancer immunotherapy.) (2015).

631

632 8. Balachandran VP, *et al.* Identification of unique neoantigen qualities in long-term
633 survivors of pancreatic cancer. *Nature* **551**, 512-516 (2017).

634

635 9. Rosato PC, *et al.* Virus-specific memory T cells populate tumors and can be repurposed
636 for tumor immunotherapy. *Nat Commun* **10**, 567 (2019).

637

638 10. Colluru VT, Johnson LE, Olson BM, McNeel DG. Preclinical and clinical development
639 of DNA vaccines for prostate cancer.) (2016).

640

641 11. Bowne WB, *et al.* Coupling and Uncoupling of Tumor Immunity and Autoimmunity. *The*
642 *Journal of Experimental Medicine*, (2002).

643

644 12. Gold JS, *et al.* A single heteroclitic epitope determines cancer immunity after xenogeneic
645 DNA immunization against a tumor differentiation antigen. *Journal of immunology*
646 (*Baltimore, Md : 1950*) **170**, 5188-5194 (2003).

647

648 13. Wolchok JD, *et al.* Safety and immunogenicity of tyrosinase DNA vaccines in patients
649 with melanoma. *Molecular Therapy* **15**, 2044-2050 (2007).

650

- 651 14. Capasso C, *et al.* Oncolytic adenoviruses coated with MHC-I tumor epitopes increase the
652 antitumor immunity and efficacy against melanoma. *OncoImmunology* **5**, e1105429-
653 e1105429 (2016).
654
- 655 15. Weinstein D, Leininger J, Hamby C, Safai B. Diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers in
656 melanoma.). Matrix Medical Communications (2014).
657
- 658 16. Szomolay B, *et al.* Identification of human viral protein-derived ligands recognized by
659 individual MHCI-restricted T-cell receptors. *Immunology and Cell Biology* **94**, 573-582
660 (2016).
661
- 662 17. Sidney J, *et al.* Quantitative peptide binding motifs for 19 human and mouse MHC class I
663 molecules derived using positional scanning combinatorial peptide libraries. *Immunome
664 Research* **4**, 2-2 (2008).
665
- 666 18. Sharma AK, *et al.* Class I Major Histocompatibility Complex Anchor Substitutions Alter
667 the Conformation of T Cell Receptor Contacts. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **276**,
668 21443-21449 (2001).
669
- 670 19. Andreatta M, Nielsen M. Gapped sequence alignment using artificial neural networks:
671 application to the MHC class I system. *Bioinformatics* **32**, 511-517 (2016).
672
- 673 20. Newman JH, *et al.* Intratumoral injection of the seasonal flu shot converts
674 immunologically cold tumors to hot and serves as an immunotherapy for cancer.
675 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 1119 (2020).
676
- 677 21. Tähtinen S, *et al.* Exploiting Preexisting Immunity to Enhance Oncolytic Cancer
678 Immunotherapy.
679
- 680 22. Koury J, *et al.* Immunotherapies: Exploiting the Immune System for Cancer Treatment.
681 *Journal of Immunology Research* **2018**, 1-16 (2018).
682
- 683 23. Ugurel S, *et al.* Survival of patients with advanced metastatic melanoma: the impact of
684 novel therapies—update 2017.) (2017).
685
- 686 24. Ribas A, *et al.* Oncolytic Virotherapy Promotes Intratumoral T Cell Infiltration and
687 Improves Anti-PD-1 Immunotherapy.
688
- 689 25. Zamarin D, *et al.* Localized oncolytic virotherapy overcomes systemic tumor resistance
690 to immune checkpoint blockade immunotherapy. *Sci Transl, Med*, (2014).
691
- 692 26. Franklin C, *et al.* Cytomegalovirus reactivation in patients with refractory checkpoint
693 inhibitor-induced colitis. *European Journal of Cancer* **86**, 248-256 (2017).
694
- 695 27. The problem with neoantigen prediction.). Nature Publishing Group (2017).
696

697

698 **Acknowledgments:** We thank all the co-authors for their support and hard work and to the
699 Advanced Research Computing at Cardiff (ARCCA) for hosting and assisting with HEX.
700 The authors would like to thank also the patients, clinicians and study-nurses for their
701 participation.

702 **Funding:** This work has been supported by European Research Council under the European
703 Union's Horizon 2020 Framework programme (H2020)/ ERC-CoG-2015 Grant Agreement
704 n.681219. Moreover, this research was supported by Helsinki Institute of Life Science (HiLIFE),
705 Jane and Aatos Erkko foundation and Cancer society of Finland. Additionally, this work has
706 been supported by Finnish Cancer Organizations, Sigrid Juselius Foundation, Relander
707 Foundation, State funding for university-level health research in Finland, Fican South funding
708 and HiLife fellow funds from the University of Helsinki.

709 **Author contributions:** J.C.: acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting of the
710 manuscript; H.H.E.K.: acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data, writing of the manuscript;
711 T.W.: coding of the software, development and maintenance; C.C.: conception and design of the
712 study, acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript; M.G.:
713 interpretation of data and revision of the manuscript; S.F.: interpretation of data and revision of
714 the manuscript; K.D.P.: interpretation of data and revision of the manuscript; F.S.H.:
715 interpretation of data and revision of the manuscript; M.M.H.: treating clinician, provided the
716 clinical data and samples from patients; S.M.: treating clinician, provided the clinical data and
717 samples from patients; B.M.: acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data; M.F.: acquisition,
718 analysis and interpretation of data; A.S.K.: conception and design of the study, analysis and
719 interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript; S.M.M.: conception and design of the study
720 and interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript; B.S.: conception and design of the study,
721 analysis and interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript; V.C.: conception and design of the
722 study, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript.

723 **Competing Interests:** J.C., H.H.E.K., T.W., C.C., M.G., S.F., K.D.P., F.S.H., M.M.H., S.M.,
724 B.M., M.F., A.S.K. and B.S. declare to not have any conflict of interests. S.M.M. has received
725 honoraria and research funding from Novartis, Pfizer and Bristol-Myers Squibb (not related to
726 this study). V.C. is co-founder and shareholder of the Valo Therapeutics LTD.

727 **Data and materials availability:** All data associated with this study are available on request
728 from the corresponding author.

729

730

731 **Supplementary Materials:**

732
733
734
735

Supplementary Table S1: Peptides used for the animal experiment.

Known melanoma tumor peptides (TRP2₁₈₀₋₁₈₈, hGP100₂₅₋₃₃ and TYR₂₀₈₋₂₁₆) were analyzed with HEX. The best viral candidate peptides proposed by the software were selected and a pool composed by the best 4 viral-derived peptides per each original tumor epitope was tested *in vivo*.

Name of the protein	Sequence
TYR (208-216)	LPWHRLL
Viral peptides - POOL 1:	
>GI 9626011 REF NP_040258.1 UNNAMED PROTEIN PRODUCT [SAIMIRIINE HERPESVIRUS 2]	FAWPRLFEL
>GI 23309025 REF NP_694680.1 GUANYLYLTRANSFERASE [MAMMALIAN ORTHOREOVIRUS 3]	LRWTRLALL
>SP P16752 UL79_HCMVA PROTEIN UL79 OS=HUMAN CYTOMEGALOVIRUS (STRAIN AD169) GN=UL79 PE=3 SV=1	LYGHRFLRL
>SP Q49P94 GAAP_VACCL GOLGI ANTI-APOPTOTIC PROTEIN OS=VACCINIA VIRUS (STRAIN LISTER) GN=L6 PE=1 SV=1	LFLHLLQLL
TRP2 (180-188)	SVYDFVWL
Viral peptides - POOL 2:	
>GI 46852141 REF YP_012613.1 RNA DEPENDENT RNA POLYMERASE [HUMAN METAPNEUMOVIRUS]	LNYDFEAL
>SP Q38SQ8 HEMA_I83A8 HEMAGGLUTININ OS=INFLUENZA A VIRUS (STRAIN A/HONG KONG/5/1983 H3N2) GN=HA PE=3 SV=1	SVNSFFSRL
>GI 66275873 REF YP_232958.1 VIRAL CORE CYSTEINE PROTEINASE [VACCINIA VIRUS]	KVYTFKFL
>GI 9625900 REF NP_040149.1 DNA PACKAGING PROTEIN UL32 [HUMAN HERPESVIRUS 3]	SNYSFFVQA
hGP100 (25-33)	KVPRNQDWL
Viral peptides - POOL 3:	
>GI 389656439 REF YP_006393315.1 MAJOR CAPSID PROTEIN [HUMAN PAPILOMAVIRUS TYPE 144]	KVPLNADVL
>GI 253756606 REF YP_003038519.1 ORF1A POLYPROTEIN [HUMAN ENTERIC CORONAVIRUS STRAIN 4408]	KATRNNCWL
>SP Q3KSU8 DEN_EBVG DENEDYLASE OS=EPSTEIN-BARR VIRUS (STRAIN GD1) GN=BPLF1 PE=3 SV=1	AVARNIDL
>SP Q66849 POLG_EC09H GENOME POLYPROTEIN OS=ECHOVIRUS 9 (STRAIN HILL) PE=3 SV=3	IVVRNHDDL

736
737
738
739
740

Supplementary Table S2: Peptides used for the ELISpot on patients' PBMCs.

Known Melanoma-associated antigens were analyzed with HEX. The best human CMV-derived candidate peptide per each antigen was chosen to be tested *in vitro*.

ID	Tumor Antigen	Sequence	ID	Viral Protein	Sequence
T1	hTERT (934-942)	LLDTRTLEV	V1	hCMV Envelope Glycoprotein H, gH	MLDRRTVEM
T2	MAGE A10 (353-361)	AMASASSA	V2	hCMV 65kDa phosphoprotein, pp65	AMAGASTSA
T3	FINC (2009-2017)	EILDVPSTV	V3	hCMV Uncharacterized protein UL42	DMMEMPATM
T4	CSPG4 (22-30)	MLARLASAA	V4	hCMV Major Capsid Protein, MCP	FLTRLAEAA
T5	MAGE A10 (251-259)	NMMGLYDGM	V5	hCMV 55kDa immediate-early protein, IE1	CMMTMYGGI

741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748

Supplementary Table S3: Patient characteristics.

The Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status1. Stage classification, AJCC7 Metastasis stage2:M1a = metastasis in distant skin sites or areas under the skin or in distant lymph nodes with normal LDH, M1b = metastasis in lung with normal LDH levels, M1c = metastasis in internal organ or any other metastasis with elevated LDH. Treatment responses evaluated using the RECIST-criteria3; Best achieved response during anti-PD1 therapy: CR = complete response, PR = partial response, SD = stable disease, PD = progressive disease. Response status; Responder (CR, PR or SD > 6mo), non-responder (SD < 6mo, PD). Pretreatment anti-CMV-IgG; High ≥93 UA/ml < Low.

No	Age at initiation	Sex	ECOG	Stage	Metastasis stage	Brain metastasis	Drug	BestResponse	FollowUp (months)	PFS (months)	Response status	Pretreatment anti-CMV-IgG
1	71	1	0	4	M1b	no	Pembrolizumab	SD	27	9	Responder	High
2	78	1	0	4	M1c	no	Pembrolizumab	PR	21	20	Responder	High
3	70	1	1	4	M1c	no	Nivolumab	PD	20	4	Non-responder	High
4	84	2	0	4	M1a	no	Nivolumab	CR	18	17	Responder	High
5	78	1	0	4	M1c	no	Pembrolizumab	PD	12	4	Non-responder	High
6	66	2	0	4	M1c	no	Nivolumab	PR	12	11	Responder	High
7	59	2	1	4	M1c	no	Nivolumab	PD	27	6	Non-responder	Low
8	53	1	0	4	M1c	no	Nivolumab	PD	26	1	Non-responder	Low
9	75	1	0	4	M1b	no	Pembrolizumab	SD	22	6	Responder	Low
10	63	1	1	4	M1b	no	Pembrolizumab	PD	21	2	Non-responder	Low
11	69	1	0	4	M1a	no	Pembrolizumab	SD	21	8	Responder	Low
12	66	2	0	4	M1b	no	Pembrolizumab	PR	20	3	Responder	Low
13	69	2	0	4	M1c	no	Pembrolizumab	PR	21	18	Responder	CMV neg
14	70	1	1	4	M1c	no	Nivolumab	PR	17	16	Responder	CMV neg
15	79	2	0	4	M1a	no	Nivolumab	PR	18	12	Responder	CMV neg
16	74	1	0	4	M1a	no	Pembrolizumab	CR	22	20	Responder	no data


1. Oken M, Creech R, Tormey D, et al. Toxicity and response criteria of the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. *Am J Clin Oncol.* 1982;5:649-655
2. Edge SB, Compton CC. The American Joint Committee on Cancer: the 7th edition of the AJCC cancer staging manual and the future of TNM. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2010;17:1471-4.
3. Eisenhauer EA, Therasse P, Bogaerts J, Schwartz LH, Sargent D, Ford R, et al. New response evaluation criteria in solid tumours: revised RECIST guideline (version 1.1). *Eur J Cancer.* 2009;45:228-47.

749
750
751
752
753
754


Supplementary Figure 1:

Average tumor growth shown as mean \pm SEM. Statistical analysis Two-way ANOVA (A). Tumor volume curves of individual mice per each group. The dotted line identifies the threshold of the therapeutic success rate and represents the median of the normalized volumes measured at the endpoint for the Naïve groups and the PEI groups respectively (B).

A



B



755
756
757
758
759