Site-specific modification of nanobodies targeting ovarian cancer and innovative bioconjugation methods for the efficient detection of cancer at early stage

Lan-Huong Tran<sup>1</sup>, Geert-Jan Graulus<sup>1</sup>, Natalia Smiejkowska<sup>2</sup>, Cecile Vincke<sup>2</sup>, Nick Devoogdt<sup>2</sup>, Serge Muyldermans<sup>2</sup>, Peter Adriaensens<sup>1,3</sup>, and Wanda Geudens<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Biomolecule Design Group, Institute for Materials Research (IMO), Hasselt University, Agoralaan-Building D, BE-3590 Diepenbeek, Belgium

<sup>2</sup> Cellular and Molecular Immunology, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Boulevard de la Plaine 2, 1050 Ixelles

<sup>3</sup> Applied and Analytical Chemistry, Institute for Materials Research (IMO), Hasselt University, Agoralaan-Building D, BE-3590 Diepenbeek, Belgium

# Abstract

Ovarian cancer (OC) is one of the most common cancer types in woman. The incidence of OC increases with age. OC can be successfully treated if detected early but the diagnosis of OC at early stages is difficult since there are no obvious symptoms and no screening test has proven to be effective. Several biomarkers have been identified for the diagnosis and therapy of ovarian carcinomas such as Cancer Antigen 125 (CA125) or Human Epididymis protein 4 (HE4). Furthermore, Secretory leukocyte protease inhibitor (SLPI) and Progranulin (PGRN) are both overexpressed markers related to survival in ovarian cancer. PGRN has been described as a prognostic biomarker for the advanced stages while SLPI has been considered as an early detection marker of OC. However, those biomarkers' sensitivity is still poor in the early stages of the disease, with an average of 50% for stage I and 90% for the stage II or higher. Since the selectivity and sensitivity for the biomarkers dedicated to OC are still insufficient for the detection at early stages and for monitoring the treatment and the recurrence of the disease, we attempt to develop a more efficient biosensor strategy based on the simultaneous detection of the biomarkers HE4, SLPI and PGRN. Several approaches, by which a bio-orthogonal functional group will be introduced site-specifically in the nanobody structure, will be explored. This might pave the way to develop a biosensor platform on which all nanobodies have a uniform orientation at the biosensor surface. This should lead to an improved sensitivity since all nanobodies will have their active regions accessible for binding the biomarker. The best strains of each kind of nanobody (HE4, SLPI and PGRN) were characterized by measuring the binding affinity of these Nbs with their antigens via enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA), surface plasmon resonance (SPR) and epitope mapping.





Clone	Estimated $K_{D}(nM)$
3223	768
3232	198
3233	175
3234	15
3237	2.7
3238	-
3239	1.13
3246	2.06
3250	3.48
3274	122
3276	1.77
3277	-



## **Figure 4**. Affinity of PGRN Nanobodies by ELISA

Nb 1PRGN-1R-22-1 (3223); Nb\_1PRGN-2R-43-1 (3232); Nb\_1PRGN-2R-48-1 (3233); Nb\_1PRGN-2R-90-1 (3234); Nb\_1PRGN-2R-4-1 (3237); Nb\_1PRGN-2R-8-2 (3238); Nb\_1PRGN-3R-14-1 (3239); Nb\_1PRGN-3R-33-2 (3246); Nb\_1PRGN-3R-13-2 (3250); Nb 1PRGN-3R-25-2 (3274); Nb 1PRGN-3R-27-3 (3276); Nb 1PRGN-3R-43-2 (3277).

		HE4		SLPI		PGRN		
Clone		2183	2210	2252	2276	3237	3239	3276
Expression		4.4 mg/L	7.72 mg/L	20.87 mg/L	0.82 mg/L	10.45 mg/L	0.53 mg/L	11.31 mg/L
ELISA	4	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Biacore	<b>k</b> on	5.2E+6	3.2E+6	3.2E+6	2.1E+6	1.0E+5	1.1E+6	5.2E+5
	$\mathbf{k}_{\mathrm{off}}$	1.9E-3	8.9E-3	5.6E-2	3.5E-3	3.3E-3	7.9E-4	2.2E-3
KD		3.6E-10	2.8E-9	1.8E-8	1.7E-9	3.3E-8	7.2E-10	4.2E-9
Epitope mapping		<ul> <li>independent of 2211 &amp; 2212         <ul> <li>interferes</li> <li>with 2205 &amp; 2309</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Not measured but same behavior expected as 2183	<ul> <li>independent of 2276</li> <li>interferes with 2253;</li> <li>2258 &amp; 2311</li> </ul>	- independent of <b>2252; 2258</b> - interferes with <b>2253</b> & <b>2311</b>	<ul> <li>independent of 3239;</li> <li>3246 &amp; 3250</li> <li>competitive with 3276</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>independent of 3237;</li> <li>3246 &amp; 3276</li> <li>competitive with 3250</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>independent of 3239;</li> <li>3246 &amp; 3250</li> <li>competitive with 3237</li> </ul>



#### Figure 1. Site-specific functionalization and conjugation methods of Nanobodies. (A) Expressed protein ligation (EPL). (B) Copper (I)-catalyzed azide-alkyne cycloaddition (CuAAC). (C) Sortase-A mediated protein ligation (SPL). Nb: Nanobody

# Results



## Figure 2. Affinity of HE4 Nanobodies by ELISA

HE4-2R22.1(2183); HE4-2R49.3(2203); HE4-2R50.2(2204); HE4-2R42.1 (2205); HE4-2R5.1(2209); HE4-2R8.1(2210); HE4-2R71.3(2211); HE4-2R78.3 (2212); HE4-2R36.3(2213); HE4-1R50.1(2214); 1R1.1(2309); HE4-1R47.1(2310); HE4-2R57.4(2364)

## Figure 5. Characterization of best clones of HE4; SLPI and PGRN Nanobodies



**Figure 6**. Purification of Nb-mediated by alkynation and CuAAC of Nb with polymer PEG-N3 10000 and analysis by SDS-PAGE . E: Elution fraction; B: Bead fraction. (+) positive control; 1,3,5,7: Alkynated Nbs; 2,4,6,8: non-alkynated Nbs.



Clone

2183

2203

2204

2205

2209

2210

2211

2212

2213

2214

2309

2310

2364



#### Figure 3. Affinity of SLPI Nanobodies by ELISA Nb\_1SLPI-2R-2-2 (2252); Nb\_1SLPI-2R-4-1 (2253); Nb\_1SLPI-2R-33-1 (2258); Nb\_1SLPI-2R-94-2 (2262); Nb 1SLPI-3R-23-1 (2275); Nb 1SLPI-2R-37-2 (2276); Nb 1SLPI-2R-7-1 (2277); Nb 1SLPI-2R-60-1 (2311).

## References

[1] Grigorios Kalapotharakos, Christine Asciutto, Emir Henic, Bertil Casslén and Christer Borgfeldt. Journal of Ovarian Research (2012) 5 20. [2] M. Robyn Andersen, Barbara A. Goff, Kimberly A. Lowe, Nathalie Scholler, Lindsay Bergan, Charles W. Drescher, Pamela Paley, and Nicole Urban. *Gynecol* Oncol. (2010) 116(3), 378.

[3] Jinping Li, Sean Dowdy, Tracy Tiptom, Karl Podratz, Wei-Guo Lu, Xing Xie, Shi-Wen Jiang. Expert Rev Mol Diagn. (2009) 9(6), 555–566.

[4] Rafael Molina, Jose M. Escudero, Jose M. Augé, Xavier Filella, Laura Foj, Aureli Torné, Jose Lejarcegui, Jaume Pahisa. Tumor Biol. (2011) 32,1087-1095.

[5] Andrew M. Prantner, Marc Turini, Brigitte Kerfelec, Shree Joshi, Daniel Baty, Patrick Chames, and Nathalie Scholler. Journal of Biomedical Nanotechnology, (2015) 11, 1201-1212.

