Towards immunotherapy for pancreatic cancer

Editor,—McKenzie and Apostolopoulos’ recent article on immunotherapy for pancreatic carcinoma (Gut 1999;44:767–769) gave an excellent overview. We agree that the poor prognosis of this disease makes it imperative that new agents and novel therapeutic strategies are investigated. However, although this paper discusses classical immunotherapy (where immune competent cells are stimulated to attack pancreatic cancer cells directly), the induction of antibodies directed against growth factors by immobilisation (where the immunogen stimulates the immune system to inhibit the growth of tumour cells indirectly) is not mentioned. We are currently undertaking a phase II clinical trial for inoperable pancreatic cancer using one such immunogen, Gastrimmune, which induces neutralising antibodies against gastrin-17 and its precursor glycine-extended gastrin-17 (this immunogen is also undergoing a phase II trial for gastric cancer at the University Department of Surgery, Nottingham, UK).

Gastrin has been shown to be a growth factor in a variety of malignancies including colorectal, gastric, and pancreatic cancers in both in vitro and in vivo studies; precursor forms such as progastrin and glycine extended gastrin also have a trophic effect. More recently the autocrine/paracrine pathway, in which tumour cells produce and respond to gastrin, has been shown to be increasingly important. In vitro and in vivo studies have also shown the trophic effect of gastrin and the inhibitory effect of both gastrin receptor antagonists and anti-gastrin antibodies,1,2,3 and further studies have confirmed gastrin expression in human pancreatic cancer cell lines and resection specimens.4 Thus, there is good evidence to suggest that immunisation against gastrin may be beneficial in the prevention of pancreatic cancer.

We have shown that Gastrimmune induced antibodies inhibit the growth of human pancreatic cancer cell lines, and they have previously been shown to inhibit the growth of gastric, colonic, and hepatocellular cancer cell lines in vitro and in vivo.5 Over 150 patients have now received Gastrimmune in several trials. The side effect profile has been extremely good and the early efficacy data in colorectal cancer has been encouraging; phase III studies are currently being designed for both pancreatic and colorectal cancer.

Pancratic cancer has an appalling prognosis. New molecular insights provide encouragement that novel therapeutic strategies may improve the outlook. Currently, immunotherapy can be employed directly and indirectly to target pancreatic cancer cells, and we hope the promise of these new strategies is fulfilled in the next decade.

B T BRETT
Centre for Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine, The Royal Free and University College Medical School, London NW3 2PF UK

Reply

Editor,—Brett and Caplin have highlighted that our paper was biased towards cellular immunotherapy. We specifically excluded reference to antibodies, but welcome the opportunity to mention these in the context of immunotherapy.

In the early 1980s, murine monoclonal antibodies offered great hope for the diagnosis and cure of cancer, but by the end of the decade, the outlook was pessimistic. Used alone, murine monoclonal antibodies had little effect, mostly because of the occurrence of HAMA (human anti-mouse response) which curtailed the life of the monoclonal antibody in patients by forming immune complexes; furthermore, antibodies that neutralise and amitigate gastrin-17 and inhibit the growth of colon cancer. Cancer Res 1996;56:4559–65.

More recently, however, an antibody, Her2/neu, reacts with molecules in 20–30% of patients with breast cancer. Her2/neu molecules have a growth effect function and if they can be blocked on the cell surface by the antibody, which inhibits the binding of the ligand (growth factor), the cells die. This has been further illustrated by the use of Gastrimmune against gastrin-17 by Brett and Caplin. Antibodies to other growth factor receptors have also been described, which are proving to be extremely useful in early clinical trials. Thus, selective antibodies against growth factor receptors may be useful in the treatment of diseases like pancreatic cancer.

It is possible that the antibodies will be humanised and a HAMA or HAHA (human anti-human antibody) response will occur, but this can only be shown by a clinical trial. There may also be problems with antibodies obtaining access to tumours not expressing the appropriate molecules as they de-differentiate. However, these are problems of any cellular or humoral immune response, and are no longer regarded as being peculiar to antibodies. Nevertheless, it is appropriate to consider special antibodies and growth factors to be part of immunotherapy for pancreatic cancer.

Finally, the colon cancer trial in which patients with Duke’s C disease had improved prognoses after receiving 171A antibodies is of interest, although there is still to be established whether the specific or non-specific nature of the antibody was responsible for the improvement. Nevertheless, phase III trials are now in progress to assess this. It is easier to treat disease by immunotherapy if treatment starts at an early stage. Unfortunately, early diagnosis of pancreatic cancer remains difficult—how can a disease with a relatively low frequency be diagnosed in the absence of symptoms? When the symptoms finally appear it may already be too late for immunotherapy.

J F C MCKENZIE
V APOTOLOPOULOS
The Austin Research Institute, Studley Road, Heidelberg, VIC 3084, Australia

Correspondence to: Professor McKenzie

Liver biopsy under ultrasound control: implications for training

EDITOR.—As a gastroenterologist/hepatologist, I appreciate the answers expressed by Shah et al (Gut 1999;48:628–629) about having to surrender liver biopsy samples to radiologists as a result of reduced training opportunities. The desire of an overwhelming number of gastroenterology trainees to become proficient in ultrasound techniques should be a matter of concern to trainees in both fields. The implications for training are many.

The purpose of ultrasound guidance in liver biopsy is threefold: (i) to target the liver; (ii) to avoid the gall bladder; and (iii) to avoid the gall bladder. In this day and age, it would be unthinkable to perform a blind liver biopsy on a patient who has a discrete liver lesion. However, when it comes to diffuse or generalised disease, “X marks the spot” or ultrasound-assisted biopsy is common practice. Although the liver is a large and superficial organ, targeting it, even for diffuse or generalised disease, should not be left completely to chance. In the ultrasound-assisted technique, the procedural aspect of liver biopsy is essentially blind subsequent to the initial ultrasound to mark the spot. Therefore becoming proficient in this technique would prevent loss of expertise in the blind approach, and yet the medical collegial position remains sound.

Inadvertent biopsy of the gall bladder can be very upsetting by allowing the patient to have a light breakfast, as the gall bladder becomes contracted following a meal. However, the more cautious would prefer patients to fast, in case they develop a complication requiring operative intervention.

S Y CHUAH
Hospital Pulsk Ayer Keroh, 75450 Malaka, Malaysia


Reply

EDITOR.—Dr Chuah makes some valuable points about the problems of training in gastroenterology in relation to ultrasound. One of the key messages of our article was to differentiate the “X marks the spot” ultrasound technique from the real-time ultrasound-guided method, which is in standard use within our hospitals. Using this technique, the needle is continuously visualised throughout its time within the liver and therefore there is minimal risk of biopsy of gall bladder or intrahepatic vessels. We consider this to be the safest technique to use but it is also the most difficult method in which to become proficient. Most training schemes for specialist registrars in gastroenterology will have difficulty in accommodating the additional time required to learn this technique.

S SHAH
J F MAYBERRY
A comprehensive study of vitamin D, this book starts with a brief consideration of the evolutionary aspects of vitamin D and the essential role of photosynthesis of the vitamin in the conservation of calcium in aquatic and land animals. Cutaneous synthesis is the principal source of vitamin D for most healthy people but dietary intake becomes increasingly important in the very young and the elderly. Adequate intakes (formerly called recommended daily allowances) for all age groups, and for pregnant or lactating women, are provided and the central question of how to define vitamin D deficiency is revisited; based on serum parathyroid hormone responses to vitamin D supplementation, a threshold level of intake of 20 ng/ml (50 nmol/l) is suggested.

Vitamin D deficiency is a common side effect of hepatic and gastrointestinal diseases and often results in bone disease; gastroenterologists should, therefore, have some knowledge of the causes, consequences, and treatment of vitamin D related bone disorders. It also has a wide range of actions which are unrelated to its effects on calcium metabolism; receptors for its active metabolite, 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D, are found in many places including the stomach, thymus, immune system, gonads, and some cancer cells. The antiproliferative and prodifferentiation effects of vitamin D have already been exploited in the development of treatment for psoriasis and other skin disorders and the exciting potential applications of vitamin D in some malignant diseases are discussed towards the end of the book.

Since the pivotal research in the 1960s on the metabolism of vitamin D there has been intense research activity in a number of related areas, including the synthesis and metabolism of vitamin D metabolites and analogues, the molecular biology of the vitamin D receptor, and the mechanisms by which 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D affects the renal, intestinal, and skeletal transport of calcium. These aspects are covered in considerable detail and occupy about one half of the book; there is also a detailed chapter on the methodology for assays of vitamin D, although the authors do not discuss the usefulness of these assays in clinical practice. The latter part of the book is devoted to clinical issues—for example, rickets and osteomalacia, osteoporosis, inherited defects of vitamin D metabolism, and the pathophysiology of hypercalcaemia associated with the extrarenal production of 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D, which occurs in conditions such as sarcoidosis and lymphoproliferative disorders. There is also an interesting chapter on the epidemiology of cancer risk and vitamin D. Disappointingly, at least for the gastroenterologist, there is very little coverage of vitamin D deficiency associated with hepatic and gastrointestinal disorders.

The book is well produced and has many illustrations and diagrams; it provides an excellent and comprehensive account of the substantial advances occurring in this area. Furthermore, the chapters are well referenced, many containing over 100 references. This book is not for the gastroenterologist who wishes to extract information about the diagnosis and management of vitamin D deficiency in clinical practice, but will be highly valued by those with a close interest in following the fascinating progress of this hormone.

J E COMPSTON

NOTES

The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine with the 20th Century History of Medicine Group present A Witness Seminar—Peptic Ulcers: rise and fall in the twentieth century

This seminar will be held on 12 May 2000 in London. Registration is £15 (Students/Friends £10) and the closing date is 5 May 2000. For registration/further information: Ms Frieda House, The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 183 Euston Road, London NW1 2BE, UK. Tel: +44 (0)20 7611 8619/8888.

Falk Symposia and Workshops

The Symposium on Hepatology 2000 will be held in Munich, Germany, on 4 and 5 May 2000.

The Symposium on Hiking and Health will be held in Titisee, Germany, on 19 and 20 May 2000.

The Workshop on Hepatobiliary Diseases: Cholestasis and Gallstones will be held in Cluj Napoca, Romania, on 9 and 10 June 2000.

The Symposium on Non-Neoplastic Diseases of the Anorectum—An Interdisciplinary Approach on 1 and 2 October 2000, and the Symposium on Immunosuppression in Inflammatory Bowel Diseases—Standards, News, Future Trends on 3 and 4 October 2000 will be held at Gastroenterology 2000 in Freiburg, Germany.

The Symposium on Biology of Bile Acids in Health and Disease will be held at the XVI International Bile Acid Meeting in Den Haag, The Netherlands on 12 and 13 October, 2000.

The Symposium on Steatohepatitis (NASH and ASH) will be held in Den Haag, The Netherlands, on 14 and 15 October.

The Symposium on Non-Neoplastic Diseases of the Anorectum—An Interdisciplinary Approach at the End of the Century will be held in Bucharest, Romania, on 4 November 2000.

For further information on any of these symposia or workshops, please contact: Falk Foundation e.V.—Congress Division, Lennengeberstr. 5, PO Box 6529, D-79041 Freiburg, Germany. Tel: +49 761 1514359; fax: +49 761 1514359; email: symposia@falkfoundation.de

Digestive Disease Week

The Digestive Disease Week will be held at the San Diego Convention Centre, San Diego, California, USA, on 21–24 May 2000. Further information from: DDD Administra- tion, 7910 Woodmont Avenue, 7th Floor, Bethesda, Maryland 20814, USA. Tel: +1 301 272 0022; fax: +1 301 654 3978; website: www.ddw.org