Chemical generation of checkpoint inhibitory T cell engagers (CiTEs) for the treatment of cancer
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Graphical Abstract
Bispecific antibodies (bsAbs) provide enticing therapeutic opportunities in the area of immunotherapy, especially in the field of immuno-oncology. These constructs can bind two separate antigenic epitopes and thus provide access to unique mechanisms of action (MoAs). A key MoA is unlocked by bispecific T cell engagers (BiTEs), which cause T cells to be cross-linked with a targeted cancer cell, ultimately leading to death of the targeted cell. It has been shown that the combination of a BiTE with checkpoint inhibition, such as blockade of the PD-1/PD-L1 pathway, can lead to a synergistic effect and greater efficacy. Constructs built from a BiTE core (anti-CD3/anti-cancer antigen) with an immunomodulatory protein added, have been dubbed checkpoint-inhibitory T cell-engagers (CiTEs). Both bsAbs and CiTEs have traditionally been generated via protein engineering. However, recently, improved chemical methods for the construction of bsAbs have been reported. This includes a strategy developed by the Chudasama and Baker groups to synthesize homogenous fragment-based bsAbs from antibodies’ fragments antigen binding (Fabs), utilising click-enabled pyridazinediones (PDs) for functional disulfide re-bridging, followed by strain-promoted inverse electron-demand Diels-Alder cycloaddition (SPIEDAC) click chemistry to attach the two Fabs to each other. In this paper, we describe a first-in-class chemical method to generate biotin-functionalized three-protein conjugates, building significantly on the previously described PD-method. The three-protein constructs generated here include two such CiTE molecules, one containing an anti-PD-1 Fab, the other containing an immunomodulatory enzyme Salmonella typhimurium sialidase; Fab_{CD3}Fab_{HER2}^{\ast}Fab_{PD-1}\text{-Biotin and Fab}_{HER2}^{\ast}Fab_{CD3}^{\ast}\text{-Sia-Biotin. These constructs (along with suitable controls) were tested for their biological activity, and each of their protein components were shown to retain their function. Their efficacy was also compared to a simpler BiTE scaffold and was shown to be superior, with the sialidase-containing CiTE especially showing significantly enhanced potency in vitro. The chemical method described here has the potential to enable the rapid generation of a plethora of multi-protein constructs, which we envisage would be especially useful in hit-identification screening but could also potentially be scaled up for drug-development after further optimization.
Introduction

Recently, the field of bispecific antibodies (bsAbs) has been garnering increased interest and momentum with there now being five such therapeutics on the market, of which three have been approved by the FDA or EMA within the past year.\textsuperscript{1,2} This class of (primarily) artificial protein-constructs are characterized by the capacity to simultaneously bind to two distinct antigenic epitopes, be they on the same or different target biomacromolecules. This dual-binding facilitates novel mechanisms of action (MoAs) that are unavailable to traditional monospecific antibodies.\textsuperscript{3} However, the full potential for protein–protein conjugation is yet to be unlocked, as even more advanced MoAs can be accessed through the generation of multi-protein conjugates, especially with the option to attach small molecule functionalities. A promising class of such molecules combines T cell re-directing bsAb technology with immunomodulating proteins for additional therapeutic benefit.\textsuperscript{4} Here we report a first-in-class chemical method for the synthesis of functionalized three-protein conjugates and then test their efficacy \textit{in vitro}.

1. Chemical bispecific antibody-generation

To appreciate the challenges that need to be overcome to access three-protein conjugates, an understanding of the methods for bsAb generation is required. The standard strategy of producing bsAb constructs has to date relied on genetic/protein engineering to generate fused amino-acid sequences, which can then be expressed. However, the field of protein bioconjugation (i.e., how to attach small molecules to proteins) has undergone rapid advances in the past decade, leading to the recent emergence of new chemical methods for bsAb production. These improved chemistry-based strategies can offer benefits over expression-based methods as they conceptually offer greater modularity, speed, and potentially inherent handles for further functionalization, e.g., for the generation of bispecific antibody-drug or fluorophore conjugates. For a more comprehensive overview of the subject of chemical bsAb-synthesis, the readers are referred to two recent reviews on the topic.\textsuperscript{5,6}

The most modern purely chemical approaches for site-selective homogeneous bsAb formation rely on re-bridging the solvent accessible interchain disulfide bonds of antibodies or their antigen-binding fragments (Fabs). As the natural abundance of cysteine is low\textsuperscript{7} and most antibodies contain only four readily accessible disulfides, with Fabs containing only one, site-selective modification of these proteins can be achieved in this way. Homogeneous and well-defined bsAbs can only be generated through such site-selective functionalization strategies – as any heterogenous conjugation strategy would by definition lead to a heterogenous bsAb.

The first example of a chemically produced Fab-Fab conjugate was published in 2013, where two bis-sulfone molecules attached to a large PEG linker were used to generate a monospecific Fab-PEG-Fab construct.\textsuperscript{8} Subsequently, maleimide molecules with leaving groups on each double bond (termed “next-generation maleimides”, NGMs) were attached to each other to generate bis-NGM molecules. These were
used to synthesize a range of constructs; e.g., Fab-ScFv and albumin-Fab heterodimers and an (ScFv)3 homotrimer.\textsuperscript{9,10} A more modular strategy was reported combining the site-selective modification provided by the NGM platform and the flexibility of strain-promoted azide-alkyne cycloaddition (SPAAC) click chemistry to generate Fab-Fab\textsuperscript{11} and full length IgG2-IgG2 bispecific antibodies.\textsuperscript{12} While these methods showed promise, they were limited by long reaction times, poor yields and the inability to functionalise the constructs further.

The Chudasama and Baker groups, however, recently developed a rapid and modular click-chemistry-based method for the construction of homogeneous bispecific antibody-conjugates, with the ability to add additional functionality to the bsAb.\textsuperscript{13} These attributes were key in the search for a chemical method applicable to the synthesis of three-protein conjugates. The method was based on the dibromopyridazinedione scaffold\textsuperscript{14–18} which was employed to re-bridge the disulfide bonds of enzymatically generated (or expressed) Fabs to functionalize the protein with bioorthogonal click handles, strained alkyne and tetrazine. These click-enabled Fabs could react with each other via strain-promoted inverse electron-demand Diels-Alder cycloaddition (SPIEDAC) reaction to generate a bsAb construct where the two proteins are linked by a flexible PEG-containing tether. As pyridazinediones contain two $N$-atoms in the ring, a second functional handle could be introduced. This was demonstrated with the attachment of two distinct fluorescent dyes to the bsAb via Cu-catalysed azide/alkyne click.\textsuperscript{13} However, due to the toxicity associated with Cu, and difficulties with its removal, in line with recent trends in bioorthogonal chemistry, it was thought that the method could be improved by having both click reactions be Cu-free. In this manner, the final Cu-free click could be used to introduce a $3^{rd}$ protein to generate a three-protein conjugate.

The primary objective of this work was the development of a chemical method for three-protein conjugate synthesis. This work thus explored the Cu-free chemical construction of functionalised bsAbs, followed by the generation of bsAb-enzyme and trispecific antibody (tsAb) conjugates. To date, to the best of our knowledge, no complexes composed of three different proteins have been assembled \textit{via} chemical means. Going a step further, further functionalization of these constructs with a biotin molecule to assist in applications (such as imaging) and purification was attempted. Finally, to showcase the functionality of these constructs, and to demonstrate that a key characteristic of the method described herein is its modularity, functional molecules were generated, the biological activities of which were then explored.

2. Checkpoint-inhibitory T cell engagers (CiTEs)

The class of functional molecules synthesized here can be termed “checkpoint-inhibitory T cell engagers” (CiTEs).\textsuperscript{19} These combine the cytotoxic ability of bispecific T cell engagers (BiTEs)\textsuperscript{20,21} with a checkpoint inhibitory modality to further enhance T cell activation and thus efficacy. Limited examples of such three-protein or four-protein conjugates, all generated \textit{via} protein engineering, have been reported in the
context of immunotherapy – these have been reviewed recently. For the purposes of this work, formats where T cell engagement are combined with immunomodulation should be discussed in more detail.

In the field of T cell redirection it has been shown that blockade of the PD-1/PD-L1 immune checkpoint axis could reverse immune escape in primary acute myeloid leukaemia (AML) cells ex vivo on treatment with an anti-CD33 BiTE. While the AML cells did not constitutively express PD-1, the expression of the protein was upregulated on addition of BiTE, due to pro-inflammatory cytokine release. Addition of anti-PD-1 or anti-PD-L1 antibody increased the cytotoxic ability of the BiTE. Based on these observations, Herrmann et al. have reported the generation of an anti-CD33/anti-CD3/PD-1ex construct, comprising the fusion of an anti-CD33 and an anti-CD3 scFv with the low affinity extracellular region of PD-1, thus combining an anti-CD33 BiTE with blockade of the PD-1/PD-L1 immune checkpoint. The authors of the work dubbed this molecule a checkpoint inhibitory T-cell engager (CiTE). The affinity of the PD-L1 binding moiety, the PD-1ex in this case, was kept low to stop the CiTE from exhibiting systemic checkpoint blockade, and only do so in a targeted manner on AML cells, as directed by the anti-CD33 arm. This was hoped to reduce the adverse effects associated with systemic checkpoint blockade, and also to stop the CiTE from localizing to off-cancer cells thus reducing on-cancer efficacy. A similar anti-CD33/anti-CD3/anti-PD-L1 species, constructed previously from three scFv proteins via fusion, dubbed a single-chain triplebody (sctb), served as a high affinity control, as the anti-PD-L1 scFv had a high affinity for PD-L1. The CiTE was shown to only induce lysis of CD33+PD-L1+ AML cells in vitro, whereas CD33-PD-L1+ non-AML cells were not affected. The CiTE was also shown to not lead to on-target off-cancer events as measured by lack of murine body weight loss and lack of systemic T cell activation, as seen by a lack of PD-1 upregulation. The sctb on the other hand was also able to kill CD33+PD-L1+ cells in addition to CD33-PD-L1+ cells, caused murine body weight loss, and systemic PD-1 upregulation. This study provided an elegant and promising new strategy for combining checkpoint blockade with immune cell redirection.

Of note is that neither of the three-protein conjugate platforms discussed here (CiTE or sctb) has an Fc fragment or similar half-life extending functionality incorporated. Thus, carefully monitoring the pharmacokinetics, and potentially considering half-life extension technologies may be required. These methods could also benefit from the increased flexibility that could potentially be offered by chemical methods for the generation of three-protein conjugates. Even from such a brief showcase, it is clear that the pool of protein components from which these species can be constructed is vast, and many parameters have to be considered (e.g., cancer target, binding-affinities, immune checkpoint pathway to modulate, potential side-effect caused by immune cell activation, half-life, tumour penetration, Fc-mediated effector function or lack thereof). The addition of small molecules to either modulate function, provide theranostic capabilities, or just as tools to allow for monitoring of the biodistribution of these species may also provide benefit. It follows that a modular method which can rapidly produce conjugates from a pool of components for initial testing would be advantageous.
The CiTEs envisaged here have an anti-CD3/anti-HER2 core with a checkpoint inhibitory Fab (anti-PD-1 Fab) or a checkpoint modulating enzyme (Salmonella typhimurium Sialidase, ST Sia) attached. To understand the significance of ST Sia, the role of sialic acid in immune regulation will be briefly examined. An important immune dampening signal of healthy cells comes from cell surface glycans terminating in sialic acid. These can bind the sialic acid-binding Ig-like lectins (Siglecs) on the surface of immune cells to downregulate the immune response. Unfortunately, cancer cells have evolved to exploit this mechanism by overexpressing sialic acid to evade detection and destruction by immune cells. The Bertozzi group have shown that fusing a sialidase moiety, which removes sialic acid from cell-surface glycans, to the anti-HER2 antibody trastuzumab can significantly increase antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC) and natural killer (NK) cell-mediated killing in cells that express lower amounts of HER2, and would thus be resistant to trastuzumab monotherapy. Subsequently, this strategy was expanded on, first by identifying an optimal sialidase enzyme for the conjugate. It was shown that using an enzyme with low intrinsic binding affinity would minimize off-target, antibody-independent, effects. On expressing and testing 6 different sialidases, the enzyme from Salmonella typhimurium (ST) was found to be the optimal candidate and was indeed shown to improve the therapeutic window 33-fold over the originally used Vibrio cholerae (VC) sialidase in a co-culture assay of a HER2+ and HER2- cell line. To improve stability of the conjugate, a mutant ST sialidase with a C-terminal cysteine was expressed. This residue was selectively modified (over the 4 endogenous cysteines) with an α-chloroacetamide-DBCO molecule to insert a strained-alkyne click-handle. Trastuzumab functionalized with an azide functionality was also prepared via a hydrazino-iso-Pictet Spengler (HIPS) reaction. The ST sialidase-DBCO moiety was then clicked to trastuzumab-N3 via strain-promoted azide-alkyne cycloaddition (SPAAC), to produce the optimized trastuzumab-sialidase (AbHER2-Sia) conjugate. It was also shown, that having one sialidase per antibody increased on-target enzymatic activity, while it was theorized that the reduced number of enzymes would also reduce off-target activity. With these results in hand, the AbHER2-Sia construct was tested on a HER2+, but trastuzumab resistant, mouse tumour model. AbHER2-Sia was shown to delay tumour growth when compared to trastuzumab alone. Of additional note is a study that has been recently published outlining the mechanism of involvement of sialic acid in the regulation of the CD28 – CD80/CD86 costimulatory pathway. This pathway is required alongside the antigen recognition mediated by the TCR/MHC axis for the differentiation of naïve T cells into functional effector T cells. It was shown that sialic acids are alternative ligands for CD28, thus blocking the binding of CD28 to CD80/CD86 and inhibiting T cell activation. Enzymatic removal of sialic acids from either T cells or antigen presenting cells can rescue T cell activation. Additionally, it was shown that exhausted, hypofunctional PD-1+ T cells can be revived by treatment with sialidase enzyme.

Thus, it was envisioned, that combining the ability of a sialidase enzyme, or a PD-1/PD-L1 checkpoint inhibitor, to remove one of a cancer cell’s mechanisms for immune escape, and its capability to re-invigorate exhausted T cells with the potency of bispecific T-cell engagers (BiTEs) in killing target cells, a potent therapeutic could be constructed.
Results and Discussion

Multiple methods were trialled to generate the desired three-protein CiTEs. The initial strategy, relying on the conversion of a bsAb-N\textsubscript{3} into a bsAb-PDB\textsubscript{r2} through SPAAC click with a bicyclononyne (BCN) strained alkyne-functionalized PD molecule, followed by addition of reduced Fab or ST sialidase (expressed with an SLCTPSRG\textsubscript{S} amino acid sequence at the C-terminus to introduce a solvent-accessible cysteine)\textsuperscript{25} to react with the PD molecule on the bsAb, met with some success. It was, however, hard to reproduce due to competing side-reactions which made the process less reliable (for detailed information, see ESI). The subsequently developed method, which will be detailed here, relied on strain-promoted inverse electron-demand Diels-Alder cycloaddition (SPIEDAC) reaction between tetrazine and BCN strained alkyne to achieve all protein–protein linkages. As this reaction was shown to work well for bispecific formation previously,\textsuperscript{13} it was envisaged that it would be optimal for the installation of the third protein (sialidase \textbf{1} or Fab\textsubscript{PD-1} \textbf{2}).

The plan thus involved initially generating a bispecific Fab–Fab construct bearing an azide handle. This Fab\textsubscript{X}-Fab\textsubscript{Y}-N\textsubscript{3} construct would then be converted to Fab\textsubscript{X}-Fab\textsubscript{Y}-BCN via reaction with BCN-PEG-BCN (in 10-fold excess to limit cross-linking). This Fab\textsubscript{X}-Fab\textsubscript{Y}-BCN could then be reacted with Sia-Tet-N\textsubscript{3} \textbf{3} or Fab\textsubscript{PD-1}-Tet-N\textsubscript{3} \textbf{4} and DBCO-Biotin \textbf{5} in situ, to add the enzyme or 3\textsuperscript{rd} Fab (via tetrazine–BCN click), and a biotin molecule (via azide–DBCO click) to further aid in purification or imaging (see Graphical Abstract).

Initially, Fab\textsubscript{HER2}-BCN \textbf{6} was reacted sequentially in a one-pot reaction with Sia-Tet-N\textsubscript{3} \textbf{3} and DBCO-Biotin \textbf{5} (Figure 1/A) to assess the orthogonality of the tetrazine–BCN and DBCO–azide clicks, as well as to test the stability of the sialidase enzyme \textbf{1} under the reaction conditions. As the enzyme was previously found to be acid-sensitive, the click reaction was carried out at pH 7 (PBS) instead of pH 5 (acetate). The reaction proceeded well, generating Fab\textsubscript{HER2}-Sia-Biotin \textbf{7} (Figure 1/F). After monomeric avidin agarose purification clean Fab\textsubscript{HER2}-Sia-Biotin \textbf{7} was isolated, with the purity confirmed by LC-MS (Figure 1/K) and SDS-PAGE (Figure 1/F). Additionally, a Fab\textsubscript{HER2}-Fab\textsubscript{CD3}-Biotin \textbf{8} bispecific T cell engager (BiTE) bsAb was synthesized. Initially, Fab\textsubscript{HER2}-Fab\textsubscript{CD3}-N\textsubscript{3} bsAb \textbf{9} was constructed, then after SEC purification (Figure 1/E) this was reacted with DBCO-Biotin to yield the biotinylated construct Fab\textsubscript{HER2}-Fab\textsubscript{CD3}-Biotin \textbf{8} (Figure 1/C). The purity of the constructs was confirmed by SDS-PAGE (Figure 1/G) and LC-MS (Figure 1/I-J).
Figure 1 | Generation of biotinylated bsAbs and the FabHER2-Sialidase conjugate 7 with pyridazinediones (PDs).

A | Generation of FabHER2-Sia-Biotin 7. FabHER2-BCN 6 was reacted with Sia-Tet-N3 3 and DBCO-Biotin 5 to generate FabHER2-Sia-Biotin 7 after monomeric avidin agarose purification. B | The PDs used for the generation of biotinylated bsAbs and FabHER2-Sia-Biotin 7; Br2PD-BCN 10 and Br2PD-Tet-N3 11. The BCN-PEG-BCN linker 15 used for the generation of a bis-biotinylated bsAb 16. DBCO-Biotin 5 was used to biotinylate the constructs. C | Generation of FabHER2-FabCD3-Biotin 8. FabHER2-BCN 6 was reacted with
FabCD3-Tet-N3 12 to form FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. This construct was then reacted with DBCO-Biotin 5 to generate FabHER2-FabCD3-Biotin 8 after size-exclusion chromatography (SEC) purification. D | Generation of FabHER2-(Biotin)-FabCD20-Biotin 16. FabHER2-Tet-N3 13 was reacted with DBCO-Biotin 5 for 1 h to afford FabHER2-Tet-Biotin 14, followed by in situ addition of BCN-PEG-BCN 15 to generate FabHER2-(Biotin)-BCN 17 over a further 15 h. After removal of excess small molecule, this was reacted with FabCD20-Tet-N3 18 and DBCO-Biotin 5 in situ to FabHER2-(Biotin)-FabCD20-Biotin 16 after SEC purification. E | SEC UV-trace of FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9 formation reaction. F | SDS-PAGE analysis of FabHER2-Sia-Biotin 7. Lane 1 & 5: Ladder. Lane 2: Crude FabHER2-Sia-Biotin 7. Lane 3: FabHER2. Lane 4: Sia-Tet-N3 3. Lane 6: Non-bound fraction of monomeric avidin agarose purification. Lane 7: Bound fraction of purification; FabHER2-Sia-Biotin 7. G | SDS-PAGE analysis of FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. Lane 1: Ladder. Lane 2: Crude FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. Lane 3: Purified FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. H | SEC UV-trace of FabHER2-(Biotin)-FabCD20-Biotin 16 formation reaction. I | LC-MS analysis of FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. Expected mass: 96496 Da. Observed mass: 96506 Da. J | LC-MS analysis of FabHER2-FabCD3-Biotin 8. Expected mass: 97246 Da. Observed mass: 97257 Da. K | LC-MS analysis of FabHER2-Sia-Biotin 7. Expected mass: 95873 Da. Observed mass: 95845 Da and 95891 Da (Δ = 46 Da, formic acid, MS adduct). L | LC-MS analysis of FabHER2-(Biotin)-FabCD20-Biotin 16. Expected mass: 98734 Da. Observed mass: 98722 Da and 99181 Da (Biotin-FabHER2-FabHER2-Biotin 19, expected mass: 99193 Da).

As the bsAb produced by this method had an azide handle, it had to be converted to either a tetrazine or BCN to enable a tetrazine–BCN click to install the final protein. In this way we could ensure that all protein–protein attachment steps would be driven by the extremely fast BCN–Tetrazine IEDDA click, shown to be the best reaction to overcome the steric hindrance that makes the coupling of such large molecules difficult.27 To this end, BCN-PEG-BCN molecule 15 was synthesized (details in ESI) to enable the conversion of bsAb-N3 into bsAb-BCN.

To test the BCN-PEG-BCN molecule 15 and attempt the construction of a dually modified bsAb with Cu-free click chemistry, the synthesis of FabHER2-(Biotin)-FabCD20-Biotin 16 was carried out (Figure 1/D). FabHER2-Tet-N3 13 was reacted with DBCO-Biotin followed by BCN-PEG-BCN 15 sequentially, to generate FabHER2-BCN-Biotin 17. This was then further reacted with FabCD20-Tet-N3 18 and DBCO-Biotin 5 in situ to yield FabHER2-(Biotin)-FabCD20-Biotin 16 after SEC purification (Figure 1/H). The purity of the construct was assessed via LC-MS (Figure 1/L). About 10% FabHER2-(Biotin)-FabHER2-Biotin 19 impurity was observed stemming from unwanted dimerization during the BCN-PEG-BCN 15-addition step of the reaction. This could be mitigated by further reducing the concentration of the reaction and increasing the equivalents of BCN-PEG-BCN 15. Unfortunately, the solubility of BCN-PEG-BCN 15 in water was suboptimal, and thus required careful monitoring to ensure the compound did not precipitate out of solution. This is not a major limitation when low equivalents are sufficient, but in this case where controlling a competing side-reaction depends on a large excess of the molecule, it is a concern. Here, two biotin molecules were
installed into the construct, but as they were added at different stages, two distinct cargo molecules could just as easily have been added. Thus, a first-in-class method for the Cu-free dual modification of a chemically constructed bsAb was developed.

With these encouraging preliminary results obtained, the generation of a first-in-class Fab_{HER2}-Fab_{CD20}-Sia-biotin species 20 was attempted (Figure 2/A). SDS-PAGE analysis showed that the bsAb formation proceeded well and after Fab_{HER2}-Fab_{CD20}-N_{3} 21 was reacted with BCN-PEG-BCN 15 (and excess small molecule removed after 6 h), Sia-Tet-N_{3} 3 and DBCO-biotin 5 addition lead to consumption of Fab_{HER2}-Fab_{CD20}-BCN 22 and appearance of a larger band (Figure 2/C). Interestingly, vigorous denaturing conditions (95 °C, 5 min) were required to increase the resolution of the gel. SEC purification showed that >80% conversion to the Fab_{HER2}-Fab_{CD20}-Sia-biotin 20 construct was achieved (Figure 2/E), which was encouraging compared to the best previous conversion of <50% (as detailed in the ESI). SDS-PAGE (Figure 2/G) and LC-MS analysis (Figure 2/I) confirmed the purity of the sample.
Figure 2 | Synthesis of bsAb-Sia conjugates; FabHER2-FabCD20-Sia-Biotin 20 and FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 26.
**A** | Method for the synthesis of bsAb-Sia conjugates. FabX-FabY-N3 is prepared as outlined before. This is then either SEC purified (for maximum final purity) or taken forward without purification to be reacted with BCN-PEG-BCN 15 to generate FabX-FabY-BCN. Sia-Tet-N3 3 and DBCO-Biotin 5 are then added and reacted in situ to form FabX-FabY-Sia-Biotin, which is then isolated after SEC purification. **B** | The PDs and small molecules used for the generation of bsAb-Sia-Biotin conjugates; Br2PD-BCN 10, Br2PD-Tet-N3 11, BCN-PEG-BCN linker 15 and DBCO-Biotin 5. **C** | SDS-PAGE of FabHER2-FabCD20-Sia-Biotin 20 formation. **Lane 1:** Ladder. **Lane 2:** FabHER2-FabCD20-Sia-Biotin 20 heated at 95 °C for 5 min. **Lane 3:** Unheated FabHER2-FabCD20-Sia-Biotin 20. **Lane 4:** FabHER2-FabCD20-N3 21 + Sia-Tet-N3 3 (no BCN-PEG-BCN 15 was added, thus no reaction was possible). **D** | SDS-PAGE of FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 23 formation. **Lane 1:** ladder. **Lane 2:** Crude FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 23. **Lane 3:** Crude FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. **E** | UV trace of SEC purification of FabHER2-FabCD20-Sia-Biotin 20. **F** | UV trace of SEC purification of FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 23. **G** | SDS-PAGE of SEC purification of FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 23. **Lane 1:** ladder. **Lane 2:** Crude FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 23. **Lane 3:** purified FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 23 (+ FabHER2-FabCD3-FabHER2 24 impurity). **Lanes 8-11:** FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. **Lanes 12-13:** Sia-Tet-N3 3. **I** | LC-MS analysis of FabHER2-FabCD20-Sia-Biotin 20. Expected mass: 144532 Da. Observed mass: 144553 Da. **J** | LC-MS analysis of FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 23. Expected mass: 144799 Da. Observed mass: 144791 and 144644 Da (FabHER2-FabCD3-FabHER2 tsAb impurity, expected mass: 144632 Da). **K** | SDS-PAGE of SEC purification of FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. **Lane 1:** Ladder. **Lane 2:** Crude FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. **Lane 3:** purified FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. **L** | UV trace of SEC purification of FabHER2-FabCD20-BCN 25 generated from SEC purified FabHER2-FabCD3-N3 9. **M** | LC-MS analysis of FabHER2-FabCD3-BCN 25. Expected mass: 96493 Da. Observed mass: 96506 Da. **N** | LC-MS analysis of FabHER2-FabCD3-BCN 25. Expected mass: 97065 Da. Observed mass: 97081 Da. **O** | LC-MS analysis of FabHER2-FabCD20-Sia-Biotin CITE 26. Expected mass: 144799 Da. Observed mass: 144825 Da.

Following these encouraging results, the generation of FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-biotin 23 was attempted via the same strategy. Unfortunately, in this case, bispecific formation also led to a significant amount of undesired FabHER2-FabCD3-FabHER2 trispecific antibody 24, as shown by SDS-PAGE (Figure 2/D). Whilst not impacting further reactions, as it is of similar size as FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-biotin 23, SEC purification would not be able to separate them. As expected, addition of Sia-Tet-N3 3 and DBCO-biotin 5 lead to significant consumption of FabHER2-FabCD3-BCN 25 (Figure 2/D) and SEC purification confirmed good conversion (~70%) of bsAb to product 23 (Figure 2/F). SDS-PAGE (Figure 2/H) and LC-MS analysis (Figure 2/J) confirmed the purity of the sample, although with ~15% FabHER2-FabCD3-FabHER2 24 impurity arising from the bsAb-formation step of the reaction as discussed. This issue could be alleviated by either controlling the equivalents of Fabs to minimize the formation of trispecific antibody or scaling up the reaction and purifying the bsAb-N3 9 by SEC before subsequent reactions. Alternatively, a dual purification approach of
protein A and monomeric avidin agarose resin could be carried out, which should leave only species that contain both Fab\text{HER2} (binds protein A) and Sia-biotin (binds avidin).

To address the purity issues of the final construct, the synthesis was repeated, this time with a purification after the bsAb-formation step. Fab\text{HER2}-Fab\text{CD3}-N₃ 9 was formed as before, albeit on a larger scale to account for mechanical protein-loss during purification, and subsequently purified by SEC (Figure 2/E). SDS-Page (Figure 2/G) and LC-MS analysis (Figure 2/I) confirmed the purity of the construct. A portion of the purified Fab\text{HER2}-Fab\text{CD3}-N₃ 9 was reacted with an excess of DBCO-Biotin 5 to yield Fab\text{HER2}-Fab\text{CD3}-Biotin 8, the purity of which was confirmed by LC-MS (Figure 2/J).

The remainder of the Fab\text{HER2}-Fab\text{CD3}-N₃ 9 was treated with BCN-PEG-BCN 15 as before, over 6 h. After removal of excess small molecule the purity of the sample was confirmed by LC-MS (Figure 2/N) and then Sia-Tet-N₃ 3 and DBCO-Biotin 5 were added, and the mixture incubated for 20 h at 22 °C. After this time, the sample was SEC purified (Figure 2/L) and subsequently the purity was confirmed by LC-MS analysis (Figure 2/O). Gratifyingly, clean Fab\text{HER2}-Fab\text{CD3}-Sia-biotin 26 was obtained.

To further showcase the modularity of the three-protein conjugation approach developed here and to generate an additional useful construct, the synthesis of a Fab\text{CD3}-Fab\text{HER2}-Fab\text{PD-1}-Biotin CiTE 27 was attempted (Figure 3/A). The synthesis of a Fab\text{CD3}-Fab\text{HER2}-N₃ bsAb 28 was carried out as before, although with the positions of the Fab\text{CD3} and Fab\text{HER2} arms swapped to showcase the modularity of the strategy and investigate the effect of Fab-placement within the construct on biological function. Following SEC purification (Figure 3/H), the purity of the construct was determined via SDS-PAGE (Figure 3/G) and LC-MS (Figure 3/C) analysis. The bsAb-N₃ 28 was converted to Fab\text{CD3}-Fab\text{HER2}-BCN 29 with BCN-PEG-BCN 15 as before (Figure 3/D). After removal of small molecule, Fab\text{PD-1}-Tet-N₃ 4 (Figure 3/E) and DBCO-Biotin 5 were added to form Fab\text{CD3}-Fab\text{HER2}-Fab\text{PD-1}-Biotin CiTE 27 after SEC purification (Figure 3/I). The purity of the construct was analysed via SDS-PAGE (Figure 3/G) and LC-MS (Figure 3/F). The SDS-PAGE analysis showed an additional fainter band beneath the main band, however the LC-MS spectrum showed only the expected masses (with the three major peaks arising from one-amino acid variations in the precursor Fabs as discussed in the ESI). We propose that this could be due to incomplete denaturation of the construct, with more completely denatured molecules traveling faster on the gel.
Figure 3 | Synthesis of FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CiTE 27. 

A | Method for the synthesis of FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CiTE 27. FabCD3-FabHER2-N3 28 was prepared as outlined before. This was then SEC purified and reacted with BCN-PEG-BCN 15 to generate FabCD3-FabHER2-BCN 29. FabPD-1-Tet-N3 4 and DBCO-Biotin 5 were then added and reacted in situ to form FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CiTE 27, which was then isolated after SEC purification. B | The PDs and other small molecules used for the generation of CiTE conjugate 27; Br2PD-BCN 10, Br2PD-Tet-N3 11, BCN-PEG-BCN linker 15, and DBCO-Biotin 5. C | LC-MS analysis of FabCD3-FabHER2-N3 28. Expected mass: 96496 Da and 96610 Da. Observed mass: 96505 Da and 96615 Da. D | LC-MS analysis of FabCD3-FabHER2-BCN 29. Expected mass: 97068 Da and 97182 Da. Observed mass: 97086 and 97190 Da. E | LC-MS analysis of FabPD-1-Tet-N3 4. Expected mass: 48820 Da and 48959 Da. Observed mass: 48818 Da and 48957 Da. F | LC-MS analysis of FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CiTE 27. Expected mass: 146610 Da, 146749 Da and 146858 Da. Observed mass: 146618 Da, 146758 Da and 146861 Da. G | SDS-PAGE analysis of FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CiTE 27. Lane 1: Ladder. Lane 2: Purified FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CiTE 27. Lane 3: Left over bsAb (FabCD3-FabHER2-BCN 29) after SEC. Lane 4: Left over Fab (FabPD-1-Tet-N3 4) after SEC. Lane 5: Crude FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CiTE 27 formation reaction. H | UV trace of SEC purification of FabCD3-FabHER2-N3 28. I | UV trace of SEC purification of FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CiTE 27.
Biological evaluation of CITE constructs

With the CITE constructs prepared, their biological activity was evaluated. Initially, the binding of Fab$_{HER2}$-Fab$_{CD3}$-Sia-Biotin CITE 26 to HER2$^+$ cancer cells (SKBR3, HCC1954, BT-20) was measured via flow cytometry and shown to be not significantly different from the binding of Fab$_{HER2}$-Fab$_{CD3}$-Biotin BiTE 8 to these cells (Figure 4/B). Next the binding assay was repeated on T cells, and here it was shown that the CD3-binding of CITE 26 was significantly lower than that of BiTE 8 (Figure 4/C). We postulate that this may be due to the placement of the Fab$_{CD3}$ moiety as it is sandwiched between the other two protein components. This decreased binding is however not necessarily a drawback – in fact, weaker binding to T cells compared to HER2$^+$ target cells could lead to better tumour-specificity and localization, and thus less systemic immune activation, lowering the risk of associated side-effects such as cytokine release syndrome.$^{28}$ It was thus established that the two Fab components of CITE 26 retained their biological activity (as it pertains to binding), so next the activity of the sialidase enzyme component was investigated. T cells or PBMCs were incubated with CITE 26 and BiTE 8 and the cell-surface sialic acid content was measured. While BiTE 8 as expected, exhibited no sialidase activity (as it lacks the enzyme), CITE 26 showed significant desialylation, with activity on T cells being more than an order of magnitude higher than off-target desialylation on other PBMCs (not expressing CD3, Figure 4/D,E). It is worth noting that visualization of the binding of CITE 26 and BiTE 8 was carried out by incubation with a streptavidin Alexa Fluor™ 647 conjugate – thus also confirming that the biotin molecule attached to the constructs retained its binding to streptavidin, and showing why the capacity of the method for functionalization of these protein–protein constructs is beneficial. The desialylation of breast cancer cell lines (HCC-1954, BT-20, MDA-MB-468 and SKBR3) by CITE 26 was then investigated (Figure 4/F). BiTE 8 again exhibited no activity, while desialylation by CITE 26 was dependent on HER2 expression, as HER2$^{hi}$ cells (HCC-1954 and SKBR3) were desialylated at lower concentrations than HER2$^{lo}$ cells (BT-20, MDA-MB-468). The components of CITE 26 (Fab$_{HER2}$, Fab$_{CD3}$, ST sialidase) thus all retained their relevant biological activity despite the numerous enzymatic and chemical transformations carried out during construct-assembly.
Figure 4 | Biological testing of CITE constructs 26 and 27. 

A | Structures of constructs used in assay. 

B | Binding of FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 26 and FabHER2-FabCD3-Biotin BiTE 8 to HER2+ cancer cell lines (SKBR3, HCC1954, BT-20) detected by flow cytometry, normalized to maximum binding. 

C | Binding of FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 26 and FabHER2-FabCD3-Biotin BiTE 8 to T cells from three donors detected by flow cytometry, normalized to maximum binding for each donor. 

D | Desialylation of T cells from three donors by FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 26 and FabHER2-FabCD3-Biotin BiTE 8, normalized to untreated. 

E | Desialylation of T cells and PBMCs from three donors by FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 26, normalized to untreated. 

F | Desialylation of breast cancer cell lines detected by flow cytometry, normalized to untreated. 

G | Binding of FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CITE 27 and FabHER2-FabCD3-Biotin BiTE 8 to the HER2+ SKBR3 cancer cell line detected by flow cytometry, normalized to maximum binding. 

H | Binding of FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CITE 27 and FabHER2-FabCD3-Biotin BiTE 8 to T cells from three donors detected by flow cytometry, normalized to maximum binding for each donor. 

I | Binding of FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CITE 27 and FabHER2-FabCD3-Biotin BiTE 8 to T cells from one donor, after CD3 blockade, detected by flow cytometry, normalized to maximum binding. 

Data represented as individual datapoints, from three replicates (except in F and for BiTE 8 binding in I which are single datapoints without replicates). Statistical analysis carried out with two-way ANOVA followed by post-hoc Šídák’s multiple comparisons test with multiplicity-adjusted P values with $\alpha = 0.05$. *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001, ****P < 0.0001. For A and C, the differences were not significant, and significant (****), at all concentrations, respectively. Curves fitted with non-linear regression with the following models: One-site – Specific binding: B, C, H. [Inhibitor] vs response (three parameters): D, E. [Agonist] vs response (three parameters): G, I.
This testing of components was then carried out on FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CITE 27. While CITE 27 showed binding to HER2\(^+\) target cells (SKBR3), it was significantly weaker than that of FabHER2-FabCD3-Biotin BiTE 8, corroborating the theory that the Fab sandwiched in the middle of the construct has lower binding strength – presumably due to the steric hindrance of the other two proteins on either side of it (Figure 4/G). Certainly, weaker target-binding is not desirable in this case, thus in the future a Fab\(_{\text{HER2}}\)-Fab\(_{\text{CD3}}\)-Fab\(_{\text{PD-1}}\)-Biotin CITE would be a better candidate, with higher HER2-binding but the aforementioned lower (and beneficial) CD3-binding. Additionally, a Fab\(_{\text{PD-1}}\) moiety would also be a more suitable way of targeting the PD-1/PD-L1 checkpoint as PD-L1 is expressed on target cells while PD-1 on effector cells – and ideally effector cell-binding would only occur in the tumour environment. Unfortunately, our efforts to obtain clean PD-L1 Fab were unsuccessful, which is why Fab\(_{\text{PD-1}}\) was our protein of choice. The binding of CITE 27 to T cells was also compared to that of BiTE 8 and it was found that CITE 27 bound T cells significantly weaker at higher concentrations compared to BiTE 8 (Figure 4/H). However, this decrease in T cell binding was clearly less pronounced than in the case of CITE 26. This increased T cell binding of CITE 27 compared to CITE 26 may have been due to PD-1 binding, or the change in connectivity (Fab\(_{\text{CD3}}\) now being on the outside of the construct rather than in the middle), or a combination of both. Indeed, to investigate the PD-1 binding of CITE 27, T cells were pre-incubated with anti-CD3 mAb, followed by incubation with varying concentration of CITE 27 or BiTE 8 (Figure 4/I). The binding of BiTE 8 clearly decreased comparatively and was found to be significantly lower than CITE 27 under these conditions, suggesting that Fab\(_{\text{CD3}}\)-Fab\(_{\text{HER2}}\)-Fab\(_{\text{PD-1}}\)-Biotin CITE 27 was indeed capable of binding to PD-1. Again, all binding studies here were carried out with the aid of a dye-tagged streptavidin, showing that the biotin molecule attached to CITE 27 provided an important advantage for ease of analysis. The components of CITE 27 (Fab\(_{\text{HER2}}\), Fab\(_{\text{CD3}}\), and Fab\(_{\text{PD-1}}\)) thus also retained their binding activity, at least to an extent.

Finally, a cell-kill assay was carried out to observe whether any efficacy-increase can be attributed to the CITE molecules compared to a conventional BiTE. Here a non-biotinylated Fab\(_{\text{HER2}}\)-Fab\(_{\text{CD3}}\) BiTE 30 (see ESI for details on synthesis) was used to conserve biotinylated Fab\(_{\text{HER2}}\)-Fab\(_{\text{CD3}}\)-Biotin BiTE 8 for studies where the biotin would be important for the visualization of binding. HER2\(^+\) MDA-MB-231 cells were either untreated or incubated with IFN-\(\gamma\) to induce PD-L1 expression. They were then incubated with a range of concentrations of Fab\(_{\text{HER2}}\)-Fab\(_{\text{CD3}}\) BiTE 30, Fab\(_{\text{HER2}}\)-Fab\(_{\text{CD3}}\)-Sia-Biotin CITE 26, or Fab\(_{\text{CD3}}\)-Fab\(_{\text{HER2}}\)-Fab\(_{\text{PD-1}}\)-Biotin CITE 27. In the case of both IFN-\(\gamma\)-treated and untreated cells both CITEs as a trend showed greater cytotoxicity than CITE 27 between the concentrations of 0.01 – 1 nM (Figure 5/B,C). Another general trend was the higher cytotoxicity observed in the case of IFN-\(\gamma\)-treated MDA-MB-231 cells.
Figure 5 | Cytotoxicity assay of FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 26 and FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CITE 27. A | Structures of constructs used in assay. B | Cytotoxicity assay of FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 26 and FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CITE 27. MDA-MB-231 cells were co-cultured with T cells (E:T ratio of 2:1) and treated with 0.01 – 10 nM of CITE 26, CITE 27 or BiTE 30. MDA-MB-231 viability was assessed 24 h following treatment via LDH assay. C | Cytotoxicity assay of FabHER2-FabCD3-Sia-Biotin CITE 26 and FabCD3-FabHER2-FabPD-1-Biotin CITE 27. MDA-MB-231 cells, pre-incubated with IFN-γ to induce PD-L1 expression, were co-cultured with T cells (E:T ratio of 2:1) and treated with 0.01 – 10 nM of CITE 26, CITE 27 or BiTE 30. MDA-MB-231 viability was assessed 24 h following treatment via LDH assay. D | Comparison of cytotoxicity of CITE 26 and BiTE 30 on MDA-MB-231 cells. Statistical analysis carried out with two-way ANOVA followed by post-hoc Tukey’s multiple comparisons test with multiplicity-adjusted P values with α = 0.05. E | Comparison of cytotoxicity of CITE 26 and BiTE 30, with IFN-γ-activated MDA-MB-231 cells. Statistical analysis carried out with two-way ANOVA followed by post-hoc Tukey’s multiple comparisons test with multiplicity-adjusted P values with α = 0.05.

*P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001, ****P < 0.0001. Data represented as individual datapoints, from three replicates. Curves fitted with non-linear regression with the following model: [Agonist] vs response (three parameters). See ESI for ANOVA table and comparisons between CITE 27 and BiTE 30, and CITE 26 and CITE 27.
PD-1 blocking CiTE 27 was slightly more potent at lower concentrations than BiTE 30, especially when the MDA-MB-231 cells were treated with IFN-γ to induce PD-L1 expression (see ESI). However, sialidase-containing CiTE 26 was significantly more active at lower concentrations than either CiTE 27 or BiTE 30, suggesting that under these conditions desialylation is highly synergistic with T cell engagement, and more so than PD-1/PD-L1 checkpoint blockade (Figure 5/D,E, and see ESI for additional comparisons). The catalytic activity of sialidase enzyme contrasted with the stoichiometric nature of PD-1 blockade could perhaps play a role in how active CiTE 26 was at low concentrations compared to CiTE 27. Indeed, the cancer cell and T cell desialylation data discussed previously (Figure 4/D,F) suggests that all sialic acid is removed by between 0.1 nM and 1 nM CiTE 26, facilitating T cell-mediated cytotoxicity.

**Conclusion and Outlook**

In summary, a first-in-class method was developed for the chemical generation of functionalized three-protein constructs. Checkpoint-inhibitory T cell engager (CiTE) molecules with either an ST sialidase enzyme for removal of immuno-suppressive sialic acid glycans from target and effector cells,25 or an anti-PD-1 Fab checkpoint inhibitor19 attached were synthesized along with relevant controls. The syntheses were carried out via tetrazine–BCN SPIEDAC click chemistry for protein–protein conjugation, and each CiTE had a biotin small molecule also conjugated via SPAAC for imaging and/or purification. These CiTE molecules were then tested for their biological activity. Due to the modularity of this method, showcased here, it could be applied to the generation of a wide variety of three-protein constructs. BiTEs could be conjugated to different checkpoint inhibitors (e.g., CTLA-4, ICOS) or cytokines (e.g., IL2),29 the selectivity of the construct could be improved by targeting two separate tumour-associated receptors in addition to CD3, or target-independent immune-activators could be developed to re-activate exhausted T cells regardless of cancer indication.26 The method has the added flexibility of an inherent handle for the attachment of small molecules, e.g., biotin, fluorophores, cytotoxins, half-life extenders or activity-masking moieties.30,31 The strategy also, to some extent, enables control over the binding-profile of the constructs, as it seems that the Fab moiety sandwiched in the middle of the three-protein species has reduced ability to bind its target, presumably due to steric hindrance. This could be exploited to minimize unwanted binding, and thus potentially reduce side effects. The method is also rapid (the conjugates can be prepared starting from mAbs within a 5-7 day timescale) and modular (works with most mAbs and cysteine-mutant proteins). It could thus be very useful in hit-identification, where a large number of constructs with various protein-combinations are generated from a pool of biomacromolecules, e.g., in a 96-well plate. These crude constructs could then be screened for biological activity and the most promising hits scaled up for further testing. The scalability and developability of this strategy should, however, be investigated as based on current information it is hard to judge whether it would be feasible
to make the shift to large-scale industrial production. That being said, we do not see any inherent reason it could not, provided the process can be streamlined to minimize protein-loss during purification steps, as the chemical reactions themselves all proceed with excellent conversions.

The generated constructs, Fab\textsubscript{HER2}-Fab\textsubscript{CD20}-Sia-Biotin \textsuperscript{20}, Fab\textsubscript{HER2}-Fab\textsubscript{CD3}-Sia-Biotin CiTE \textsuperscript{26} and Fab\textsubscript{CD3}-Fab\textsubscript{HER2}-Fab\textsubscript{PD-1}-Biotin CiTE \textsuperscript{27} along with simpler two-protein constructs had their biological activities investigated. The constituent parts were shown to retain their biological function (although binding was impaired in some cases). The CiTEs were then shown to be significantly more effective than the corresponding BiTE \textsuperscript{30} at killing HER2\textsuperscript{+} cells in the presence of T cells. While the increase in efficacy of PD-1 blocking CiTE \textsuperscript{27} was perhaps not astounding in its magnitude, there was significant benefit in adding the checkpoint inhibitory modality to a BiTE scaffold even under these relatively unoptimized conditions. The sialidase containing CiTE \textsuperscript{26} however had robustly increased cytotoxic activity (by about an order of magnitude) at lower concentrations than BiTE \textsuperscript{30}. Carrying out more in-depth biological assays (including \textit{in vivo} assays and testing different HER2\textsuperscript{+} cancer cells lines) was beyond the scope of this chemistry-focused project, but since other groups have demonstrated the synergy between checkpoint inhibition and T cell engagement,\textsuperscript{19} we believe this exciting angle of immunomodulation should be explored further, especially as this work goes on to show that sialic-acid removal is strongly synergistic with BiTE treatment \textit{in vitro}. Furthermore, we hope we have provided a method and proof-of-concept for the generation of such three-protein constructs to enable further innovation in the field. We also hope we have demonstrated the power of bioorthogonal chemical strategies for protein–protein conjugation, as while this area of research has been gaining momentum recently,\textsuperscript{5,6} there is much untapped potential that is still waiting to be uncovered.
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