Personalized cancer immunotherapy: Tailoring treatment to individual immune profiles.

Ann Lander*

Department of Oncology, UCL Cancer Institute, United Kingdom

Introduction

Personalized cancer immunotherapy has revolutionized oncology, offering treatments that are tailored to the unique immune profiles of individual patients. By leveraging advances in tumor immunology and genomics, personalized immunotherapy aims to optimize efficacy and minimize adverse effects, addressing the limitations of one-size-fits-all approaches [1].

The immune system's interaction with cancer varies significantly among individuals. Immune profiles encompass a range of factors, including The presence and activity of TILs indicate the immune system's engagement with the tumor. Levels of proteins like PD-1, PD-L1, and CTLA-4 influence the tumor's ability to evade immune detection [2].

Pro- and anti-inflammatory cytokines shape the immune microenvironment. Tumor-specific antigens generated by mutations drive the immune response. Targeting immune checkpoints such as PD-1, PD-L1, and CTLA-4 has proven effective in reactivating T-cell responses. Biomarkers like PD-L1 expression and tumor mutational burden (TMB) help identify patients likely to respond to ICIs [3].

Personalized vaccines are designed to elicit immune responses against tumor-specific neoantigens. Ongoing trials are evaluating their efficacy in cancers such as melanoma and non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). T-cell receptor (TCR) and chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T-cell therapies involve engineering patients' T-cells to target specific tumor antigens [4].

These therapies have shown remarkable success in hematologic malignancies and are being adapted for solid tumors. Genetically modified viruses selectively infect and destroy cancer cells while stimulating an anti-tumor immune response. Combining oncolytic viruses with ICIs enhances their efficacy [5].

Integrating ICIs with other modalities like chemotherapy, radiation, or targeted therapies can overcome resistance and enhance immune activation.Despite its promise, personalized cancer immunotherapy faces several hurdles: Variability within and between tumors complicates the identification of universal biomarkers [6].

The immune microenvironment evolves over time and in response to treatment, necessitating continuous monitoring. High costs and the complexity of personalized approaches limit widespread adoption. Tailored therapies must balance efficacy with the risk of immune-related adverse events (irAEs) [7].

AI-driven algorithms analyze multi-omics data to predict immune responses and guide treatment decisions. Non-invasive blood tests detecting circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) and immune markers offer real-time insights into treatment efficacy. Advanced imaging techniques map immune cell distribution and gene expression within tumors, refining therapeutic targeting [8].

Gut microbiome composition influences systemic immunity and immunotherapy outcomes. Probiotic and dietary interventions are under investigation. The integration of personalized immunotherapy into routine clinical practice requires. Ensuring consistency in biomarker detection and interpretation [9].

Developing algorithms to adjust therapies based on real-time immune profiling. Sharing data and resources to accelerate research and overcome disparities in access [10].

Conclusion

Personalized cancer immunotherapy represents a paradigm shift in oncology, transforming the treatment landscape by tailoring interventions to individual immune profiles. As research advances and new technologies emerge, the promise of precision immunotherapy is becoming a reality, offering hope for improved outcomes and quality of life for cancer patients worldwide.

References

1. Herberman RB, Nunn ME, Holden HT, et al. Natural cytotoxic reactivity of mouse lymphoid cells against syngeneic and allogeneic tumors. II. characterization of effector cells. Int J Cancer. 1975;16(2):230–9.
2. Zinkernagel RM, Doherty PC. MHC-restricted cytotoxic T cells: studies on the biological role of polymorphic major transplantation antigens determining T-cell restriction-specificity, function, and responsiveness. Adva Immunol. 1979;27:51-177.
3. Lanier LL. Up on the tightrope: Natural killer cell activation and inhibition. Nat Immunol. 2008;9(5):495–502.

***Correspondence to:** Ann Lander, Department of Oncology, UCL Cancer Institute, United Kingdom. E-mail: annland@ucl.ac.uk

***Received:** 02-Dec-2024, Manuscript No. AAJCIT-24-155292; **Editor assigned:** 03-Dec-2024, Pre QC No. AAJCIT-24-155292(PQ); **Reviewed:** 17-Dec-2024, QC No AAJCIT-24-155292; **Revised:** 23-Dec-2024, Manuscript No. AAJCIT-24-155292(R); **Published:** 30-Dec-2024, DOI:10.35841/aajcit-7.6.239*

***Citation:** Lander A. Personalized cancer immunotherapy: Tailoring treatment to individual immune profiles. J Cancer Immunol Ther. 2024;7(6):239*

4. Dorshkind KE, Pollack SB, Bosma MJ, et al. Natural killer (NK) cells are present in mice with severe combined immunodeficiency (scid). J Immunol. 1985;134(6):3798-801.
5. Dixon SJ, Stockwell BR. The role of iron and reactive oxygen species in cell death. Nat Chem Biol. 2014;10:9–17.
6. Fischbacher A, von Sonntag C, Schmidt TC. Hydroxyl radical yields in the Fenton process under various pH, ligand concentrations and hydrogen peroxide/Fe (II) ratios. Chemosphere. 2017;182:738–744.
7. Lambeth JD, Neish AS. Nox enzymes and new thinking on reactive oxygen: a double-edged sword revisited. Annu Rev Pathol. 2014;9:119–145.
8. Ward RJ, Zucca FA, Duyn JH, Crichton RR, et al. The role of iron in brain ageing and neurodegenerative disorders. Lancet Neurol. 2014;13:1045–1060.
9. Schreiber RD, Old LJ, Smyth MJ. Cancer immunoediting: integrating immunity's roles in cancer suppression and promotion. Sci. 2011;331:1565–70.
10. Zhou Liangfu, Zhao Bin, Zhang Lixiu, et al. Alterations in Cellular Iron Metabolism Provide More Therapeutic Opportunities for Cancer. Int J Mole Sci. 2018;19(5):1545

Citation: *Lander A. Personalized cancer immunotherapy: Tailoring treatment to individual immune profiles. J Cancer Immunol Ther. 2024;7(6):239*