

Gamma-delta T Cells in Bladder Cancer Draining Lymph Nodes

Ali Ariafar¹, Zahra Mansourabadi^{2,3}, Hojat Alipoor¹, Zahra Faghih^{3*}

¹Department of Urology, School of Medicine, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran; ²Department of Immunology, School of Medicine, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran; ³Shiraz Institute for Cancer Research, School of Medicine, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran

ABSTRACT

Background: Gamma-delta ($\gamma\delta$) T cells are a distinct subset of T cells with a receptor composed of γ and δ chains. Their ability to directly recognize stress-induced molecules and non-peptide antigens expressed by cancer cells, along with their capacity to produce cytokines and interact with other immune cells, makes them potentially significant contributors to immune-based treatments.

Objective: To investigate the presence and frequency of $T\gamma\delta$ cells in tumor-draining lymph nodes of patients with bladder cancer (BC), and to assess their association with prognostic parameters.

Methods: Forty-nine fresh tumor-draining lymph nodes from untreated patients with BC were minced to obtain single cells. The cells were surface-stained with anti-CD3, anti-TCR $\gamma\delta$, and anti-HLA-DR antibodies, then acquired on a four-color FACSCalibur flow cytometer, and analyzed by FlowJo software.

Results: On average, $2.07\%\pm1.99\%$ of CD3⁺ lymphocytes in regional nodes of BC exhibited a $\gamma\delta$ T phenotype. A considerable percentage of these cells ($37.90\%\pm24.42\%$) expressed HLA-DR. Statistical analysis revealed that while the frequency of $\gamma\delta$ T cells showed no variation among patients with different prognoses, the HLA-DR⁺ subset was higher in T4 patients than in T2 patients (p=0.031). These cells also tended to be increased in stage III compared to stage II (p=0.077).

Conclusion: The data collectively indicated an association of HLA-DR expressing $\gamma\delta$ T cells with prognostic factors related to tumor progression (higher T-group and stage), suggesting their potential involvement in disease progression. However, future research, including longitudinal studies with larger cohorts, needs to validate these findings and elucidate the functional roles of $\gamma\delta$ T cells in the immune response against BC.

Keywords: Bladder Cancer, Draining Lymph Node, Gamma-delta T Cells, HLA-DR

*Corresponding author: Zahra Faghih, Shiraz Institute for Cancer Research, School of Medicine, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, P.O. Box: 71348-45550, Shiraz, Iran Email: Faghihz@sums.ac.ir

Cite this article as: Ariafar A, Mansourabadi Z, Alipoor H, Faghih Z. Gamma-delta T Cells in Bladder Cancer Draining Lymph Nodes. *Iran J Immunol.* 2024; 21(4):271-278, doi: 10.22034/iji.2024.103549.2846.

Received: 2024-07-29 Revised: 2024-09-01 Accepted: 2024-09-03

INTRODUCTION

Bladder cancer (BC), the fourth most common cancer in males worldwide, poses a major health challenge due to its high morbidity and mortality rates. Despite advances in medical research, survival rates for BC have not shown significant improvements, particularly for patients diagnosed at advanced stages. This underscores the urgent need for innovative therapeutic approaches (1). Understanding the role of the immune system and its components is a crucial step in developing effective treatments and improving patient outcomes due to its pivotal role in shaping the tumor microenvironment and influencing treatment responses (1, 2).

Gamma-delta ($\gamma\delta$) T cells are a distinct subset of T cells characterized by their T-cell receptors (TCRs), which are made up of γ and δ chains instead of the typical α and β chains found in most T cells. Unlike conventional T cells, γδ T cells recognize a diverse range of antigens without relying on major histocompatibility complex (MHC) presentation and can directly exert cytotoxic effects on infected or transformed cells (3, 4). Their ability to directly recognize stressinduced molecules and non-peptide antigens expressed by cancer cells, combined with their capacity to produce cytokines and interact with other immune cells, makes them potentially significant contributors to immune-based cancer treatments (5-7). A recent transcriptome analysis revealed that $\gamma\delta$ T cells are one of the strongest predictors of favorable outcomes in various cancers (8). Research on BC patients and mouse models has also demonstrated that injections of $\gamma \delta T$ cells extended survival. Additionally, when these cells were deleted, mice no longer responded to BCG, indicating a potential anti-tumorigenic function (9-12). However, the complex activity of $\gamma\delta$ T cells within the tumor microenvironment highlights their ability to have both tumor-suppressing and tumor-promoting effects. These effects are determined by the surrounding cytokine

environment and their interactions with other cellular components within the tumor (13-15). Therefore, in the present study, we focused on determining the presence and frequency of $\gamma\delta$ T cells in tumor-draining lymph nodes of patients with BC and their association with prognostic parameters.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patients

Forty-nine tumor-draining lymph nodes, dissected as part of the routine diagnostic procedure, were obtained from patients with BC who underwent surgery. These patients had no history of prior chemotherapy, radiotherapy or immunotherapy. The clinical and pathological characteristics of the patients were obtained from their medical records and are summarized in Table 1. Tumor stage was determined based on the American Joint Committee on Cancer Staging Manual, 8th edition. The study was explained to the participants, and informed consent was obtained prior to study. The ethical committee of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences was approved the study (IR.SUMS.MED. REC.1403.174).

Isolation of Mononuclear Cells from Lymph Node

Fresh lymph nodes were mechanically minced in culture medium supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS), and then filtered through a 40 μ m cell strainer to obtain a single-cell suspension. Mononuclear cells were isolated using Ficoll-Hypaque gradient centrifugation. The Trypan blue exclusion test was used to check the cells' viability. Samples with a viability of more than 95% were then proceeded to further evaluation.

Flow Cytometry Analysis

To specifically phenotype $\gamma\delta$ T cells, a density of 2.5×10⁵ cells was suspended in 50 μ l of staining buffer (1× PBS containing 2% FBS) and immediately surface-stained with

FITC-conjugated anti-CD3 (clone: UCHT1; BD Bioscience, USA), APC-conjugated anti-TCRy\delta (clone: B1, BioLegend, USA), and PerCP-conjugated anti-HLA-DR (clone: L243). The cells were incubated for 15 minutes at room temperature in the dark to prevent photobleaching of the fluorophores. The cells were then washed thoroughly and resuspended in staining buffer. Sample acquisition was performed using a fourcolor FACSCalibur flow cytometer (BD Biosciences), capable of detecting four fluorochromes simultaneously. FlowJo software version 10.8.1 (BD Life Sciences) was used for data analysis. Lymphocytes were first isolated by gating based on their relative side scatter (SSC-H) and forward scatter (FSC-H) to exclude debris and unwanted cells (Fig. 1A). Next, CD3⁺ cells were identified as the total T cell population (Fig. 1B). Further gating was performed within this population to isolate TCR $\gamma\delta$ expressing cells, specifically identifying $\gamma\delta$ T cells (Fig. 1C). Subsequently, HLA-DR-expressing subsets within $\gamma\delta$ T population were determined (Fig. 1D).

Statistical Analysis

Data was analyzed using statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) software version 26. Nonparametric tests, including Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests, were applied for statistical analyses comparing patients with different clinicopathological characteristics. Data was presented as median, and mean±standard deviation (SD). *P*-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. Graphs were created using the GraphPad Prism software package, version 8 (San Diego, CA, USA). **RESULTS**

RESULIS

Characteristics	N (valid %)	Median						
		CD3 ⁺ lymphocytes	γδ T cells (% of	HLA-DR+ γδ T				
		(% of lymphocytes)	CD3 ⁺ T cells)	(% of γδ T cells)				
		Gender						
Male	40 (81.6)	42.75	1.49	33.90				
Female	9 (18.4)	9.00	9.00	6.00				
P va	llue	0.517	0.379	0.849				
		Tumor type						
Urothelial	48 (98.00)	44.25	1.31	33.90				
carcinoma (UC)								
Non-UC	1 (2.00)	51.80	0.94	NA				
P va	lue	NA	NA	NA				
		Histological grade						
Low	3 (6.3)	41.50	0.62	38.00				
High	45 (93.7)	44.50	1.33	32.70				
P value		0.717	0.156	0.786				
Unreported	1	46.40	2.49	NA				
		T-stage						
T1	4 (8.3)	52.20	1.19	26.15				
T2	26 (54.2)	43.55	1.27	27.20				
Т3	8 (16.7)	50.85	1.31 22.88					
T4	10 (20.8)	34.95	1.24	48.50				
P value		0.19	1.000	0.154				
Unreported	1	38.10	1.53	60.20				
Lymph node involvement								
Positive	15 (30.6)	36.10	1.89	39.25				
Negative	34 (69.4)	47.25	1.24	32.35				
-								

 Table 1. Prognostic association of T cell subsets in patients with different cinicopathological characteristics of bladder cancer

CD3* lymphacytes (% of lymphocytes) CD3* T cells) $\gamma \delta$ T cells (% of (% of y 0 T cells) P value 0.045 0.229 N0 34 (69.4) 47.25 1.24 32.35 N1 4 (8.2) 36.95 1.77 14.28 N2 10 (20.4) 36.40 1.94 48.25 N3 1 (2.0) 36.10 1.10 NA P value 0.136 0.337 0.111 TMM-stage	Characteristic	s N (valid %))	Median					
(% of ymphocytes) CD3* T cells) (% of yõ T cells) P value 0.045 0.229 0.656 N0 34 (694) 47.25 1.24 32.35 N1 4 (8.2) 36.95 1.77 14.28 N2 10 (20.4) 36.40 1.94 48.25 N3 1 (2.0) 36.10 1.10 NA P value 0.136 0.337 0.111 T 1 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 II 18 (37.5) 45.70 1.24 24.50 III 26 (54.2) 37.95 1.34 43.10 P value 0.105 0.774 0.166 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Organ-c			CD3 ⁺ lymphocytes	γδ T cells (% of	HLA-DR ⁺ γδ Τ				
P value 0.045 0.229 0.636 N0 34 (69.4) 47.25 1.24 32.35 N1 4 (8.2) 36.95 1.77 14.28 N2 10 (20.4) 36.40 1.94 48.25 N3 1 (2.0) 36.10 1.10 NA P value 0.136 0.337 0.111 T TM-stage 1 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 II 18 (37.5) 45.70 1.24 24.50 31.0 1.53 60.20 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 20.20 1.19 26.15 II 9 value 0.105 0.774 0.166 20.20 1.09 26.15 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 20.20 1.99 26.15 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Derivesical fat invasion -			(% of lymphocytes)	CD3 ⁺ T cells)	(% of γδ T cells)				
No 34 (69.4) 47.25 1.24 32.35 N1 4 (8.2) 36.95 1.77 14.28 N2 10 (20.4) 36.40 1.94 48.25 N3 1 (2.0) 36.10 1.10 NA P value 0.136 0.337 0.111 T TMM-stage 1 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 II 18 (37.5) 45.70 1.24 24.50 24.50 III 26 (54.2) 37.95 1.34 43.10 26.50 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Muscle invasion	P value		0.045	0.229	0.636				
N0 34 (69.4) 47.25 1.24 32.35 N1 4 (8.2) 36.95 1.77 14.28 N2 10 (20.4) 36.40 1.94 48.25 N3 1 (2.0) 36.10 1.10 NA P value 0.136 0.337 0.111 TMM-stage TMM-stage 26.15 11 1 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 II 18 (37.5) 45.70 1.24 24.50 11 P value 0.105 0.774 0.166 0.00 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Organ-confined tumor (OCT) 0 299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53			N-stage						
N1 4 (8.2) 36.95 1.77 14.28 N2 10 (20.4) 36.40 1.94 48.25 N3 1 (2.0) 36.10 1.10 NA P value 0.136 0.337 0.111 T 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 II 18 (37.5) 45.70 1.24 24.50 III 26 (54.2) 37.95 1.34 43.10 P value 0.105 0.774 0.166 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Muscle invasion 0.318 1.000 0.531 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Perivesical fat invasion - - - - P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 - Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.	N0	34 (69.4)	47.25	1.24	32.35				
N2 10 (20.4) 36.40 1.94 48.25 N3 1 (2.0) 36.10 1.10 NA P value 0.136 0.337 0.111 T 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 II 18 (37.5) 45.70 1.24 24.50 III 26 (54.2) 37.95 1.34 43.10 P value 0.105 0.774 0.166 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Muscle invasion	N1	4 (8.2)	36.95	1.77	14.28				
N3 1 (2.0) 36.10 1.10 NA P value 0.136 0.337 0.111 T TM-stage TM-stage I 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 II 18 (37.5) 45.70 1.24 24.50 III 26 (54.2) 37.95 1.34 43.10 P value 0.105 0.774 0.166 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Muscle invasion - Muscle invasion - - Positive 44 (91.7) 44.25 1.28 32.70 Negative 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 0.111 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50	N2	10 (20.4)	36.40	1.94	48.25				
P value 0.136 0.337 0.111 TNM-stage TNM-stage TNM-stage 1 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 II 18 (37.5) 45.70 1.24 24.50 III 26 (54.2) 37.95 1.34 43.10 P value 0.105 0.774 0.166 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Muscle invasion	N3	1 (2.0)	36.10	1.10	NA				
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline TNM-stage & TNM-stage & 1.19 & 26.15 \\ \hline II & 18 (37.5) & 45.70 & 1.24 & 24.50 \\ \hline III & 26 (34.2) & 37.95 & 1.34 & 43.10 \\ \hline P value & 0.105 & 0.774 & 0.166 \\ \hline Unreported & 1 & 38.10 & 1.53 & 60.20 \\ \hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$		P value	0.136	0.337	0.111				
I 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 II 18 (37.5) 45.70 1.24 24.50 III 26 (54.2) 37.95 1.34 43.10 P value 0.105 0.774 0.166 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Muscle invasion Positive 44 (91.7) 44.25 1.28 32.70 Negative 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Perivesical fat invasion P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Organ-confined tumor (OCT) OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Urrep			TNM-stage						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Ι	4 (8.3)	52.20	1.19	26.15				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	II	18 (37.5)	45.70	1.24	24.50				
P value 0.105 0.774 0.166 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Muscle invasion Muscle invasion	III	26 (54.2)	37.95	1.34	43.10				
Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Muscle invasion Muscle invasion Positive $44(91.7)$ 44.25 1.28 32.70 Negative $4(8.3)$ 52.20 1.19 26.15 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Positive $16(33.3)$ 44.25 1.31 43.10 Negative $32(66.7)$ 45.65 1.27 29.15 Positive $16(33.3)$ 44.80 1.53 60.20 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 OCT $27(55.1)$ 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT $22(44.9)$ 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Positive $17(36.2)$ 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative $20(40.8)$ 48.60 1.23 32.35 </td <td></td> <td>P value</td> <td>0.105</td> <td>0.774</td> <td>0.166</td>		P value	0.105	0.774	0.166				
Muscle invasion Positive 44 (91.7) 44.25 1.28 32.70 Negative 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Perivesical fat invasion Positive 16 (33.3) 44.25 1.31 43.10 Negative 32 (66.7) 45.65 1.27 29.15 P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Organ-confined tumor (OCT) OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Lymphovascular invasion Positive 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 39.00	Unreported	1	38.10	1.53	60.20				
Positive 44 (91.7) 44.25 1.28 32.70 Negative 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Perivesical fat invasion Perivesical fat invasion 44.25 1.31 43.10 Negative 32 (66.7) 45.65 1.27 29.15 P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Organ-confined tumor (OCT) OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Unreported 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 P P value 0.006 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00	1		Muscle invasion						
Negative 4 (8.3) 52.20 1.19 26.15 P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Perivesical fat invasion Positive 16 (33.3) 44.25 1.31 43.10 Negative 32 (66.7) 45.65 1.27 29.15 P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Organ-confined tumor (OCT) 0CT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 0.98 Lymphovascular invasion Lymphovascular invasion Urreported 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 90 P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 0.201 0.201 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.3	Positive	44 (91.7)	44.25	1.28	32.70				
P value 0.318 1.000 0.531 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Perivesical fat invasion Perivesical fat invasion 42.5 1.31 43.10 Negative 32 (66.7) 45.65 1.27 29.15 P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Lymphovascular invasion P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perincural invasion P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perincural invasion P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported	Negative	4 (8.3)	52.20	1.19	26.15				
Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Perivesical fat invasion Perivesical fat invasion 9	6	P value	0.318	1.000	0.531				
Perivesical fat invasion Perivesical fat invasion Positive 16 (33.3) 44.25 1.31 43.10 Negative 32 (66.7) 45.65 1.27 29.15 P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Organ-confined tumor (OCT) 0 0 0 24.93 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 1.27 39.25 39.25 Negative 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 30.90 Positive 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 30.90 Positive 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 30.90 Positive 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 30.90 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 32.35 32.35 Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 32.50 Negativ	Unreported	1	38.10	1.53	60.20				
Positive 16 (33.3) 44.25 1.31 43.10 Negative 32 (66.7) 45.65 1.27 29.15 P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Lymphovascular invasion Urreported 1 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perineural invasion Perineural invasion Perineural invasion Perineural invasion Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 <td></td> <td></td> <td>Perivesical fat invasion</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>			Perivesical fat invasion	1					
Negative 32 (66.7) 45.65 1.27 29.15 P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Organ-confined tumor (OCT) 0 0 0 0 0 OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Lymphovascular invasion 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perineural invasion P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05	Positive	16 (33.3)	44.25	1.31	43.10				
P value 0.299 0.844 0.219 Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Organ-confined tumor (OCT) 0CT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Lymphovascular invasion Positive 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 0.10 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Positive 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90	Negative	32 (66.7)	45.65	1.27	29.15				
Unreported 1 38.10 1.53 60.20 Organ-confined tumor (OCT) OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Lymphovascular invasion Positive 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 P value 0.066 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perineural invasion Positive $25 (51.0)$ 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported	riegutite	P value	0 299	0.844	0.219				
Organ-confined tumor (OCT) Organ-confined tumor (OCT) OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Lymphovascular invasion 127 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Tumor necrosis Tumor necrosis P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unrep	Unreported	1	38.10	1 53	60.20				
OCT 27 (55.1) 48.80 1.26 28.50 non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Lymphovascular invasion 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perineural invasion Perineural invasion Perineural invasion 90.00 Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported	Chiepontea	1	Organ-confined tumor (O	CT)	00.20				
non-OCT 22 (44.9) 36.90 1.62 43.10 P value 0.021 0.41 0.098 Lymphovascular invasion Positive 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perineural invasion Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape </td <td>OCT</td> <td>27 (55 1)</td> <td>48.80</td> <td>1.26</td> <td>28 50</td>	OCT	27 (55 1)	48.80	1.26	28 50				
Init of I Init of I <thinit i<="" of="" th=""> <thinit i<="" of="" th=""> <thinit i<="" of="" th=""></thinit></thinit></thinit>	non-OCT	22 (44.9)	36.90	1.62	43.10				
Lymphovascular invasion Unit 0000 Positive 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perineural invasion Perineural invasion 7.35 39.00 Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00		P value	0.021	0.41	0.098				
Positive 17 (36.2) 36.10 1.27 39.25 Negative 30 (63.8) 47.60 1.37 30.90 P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perineural invasion Perineural invasion 32.35 32.35 Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Tumor shape Tumor shape 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 <td></td> <td>1 10100</td> <td>Lymphoyascular invasio</td> <td>n</td> <td>0103.0</td>		1 10100	Lymphoyascular invasio	n	0103.0				
Notifie17 (60.9)10 (60.9)10 (60.9)10 (60.9)Negative30 (63.8)47.601.3730.90P value0.060.5950.201Unreported256.951.3739.00Perineural invasionPositive25 (51.0)38.701.3437.35Negative20 (40.8)48.601.2332.35P value0.2050.7490.494Unreported438.051.3739.00Tumor necrosisPositive18 (54.5)44.851.1825.90Negative15 (45.5)46.401.5437.90P value0.9010.2290.152Unreported1639.801.3438.00Tumor shapePapillary29 (87.9)44.501.2728.50Flat (sessile)4 (12.1)54.201.3751.65P value0.1840.8940.262	Positive	17 (36 2)	36.10	1.27	39.25				
P value 0.06 0.595 0.201 Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perineural invasion Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	Negative	30 (63.8)	47.60	1.27	30.90				
Unreported 2 56.95 1.37 39.00 Perineural invasion Perineural invasion Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	riegutive	P value	0.06	0.595	0.201				
Perineural invasion Perineural invasion Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	Unreported	2	56.95	1 37	39.00				
Positive 25 (51.0) 38.70 1.34 37.35 Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	omeported	2	Perineural invasion	1.57	57.00				
Negative 20 (40.8) 48.60 1.23 32.35 P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Version 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	Positive	25 (51 0)	38 70	1 34	37 35				
P value 0.205 0.749 0.494 Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	Negative	20 (40.8)	48.60	1.31	32.35				
Unreported 4 38.05 1.37 39.00 Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	riegative	P value	0.205	0.749	0.494				
Tumor necrosis Tumor necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape 7 28.50 51.65 Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	Unreported		38.05	1 37	39.00				
Tunior necrosis Positive 18 (54.5) 44.85 1.18 25.90 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	onreported	7	Tumor necrosis	1.57	57.00				
Negative 15 (51.5) 46.40 1.10 22.50 Negative 15 (45.5) 46.40 1.54 37.90 P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	Positive	18 (54 5)	44.85	1 18	25.90				
P value 0.901 0.229 0.152 Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	Negative	15 (45 5)	46.40	1.10	37.90				
Unreported 16 39.80 1.34 38.00 Tumor shape Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	riegative	P value	0.901	0.229	0.152				
Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	Unreported	1 value 16	39.80	1 34	38.00				
Papillary 29 (87.9) 44.50 1.27 28.50 Flat (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	omeported	Tumor shape							
Fight (sessile) 4 (12.1) 54.20 1.37 51.65 P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	Panillary	29 (87 9)	44 50	1 27	28 50				
P value 0.184 0.894 0.262	Flat (sessile)	A(121)	54.20	1.27	51.65				
U 1 value 0.104 0.074 0.202	1 100 (5055110)	T (12.1)	0.18/	0.80/	0.262				
Linterported 16 44.00 1.89 32.70	Unreported	1 value 16	44 00	1.80	32 70				

γδ T cells: Gamma-delta T cells; NA: not-applicable

* Since there was only one patient in the N3 group, this group was excluded from the analysis



Fig. 1. Phenotype determination of gamma-delta ($\gamma\delta$) T cells in tumor-draining lymph nodes from patients with bladder cancer. Lymphocytes were selected based on their relative side scatter (SSC-H) and forward scatter (FSC-H) to exclude debris and unwanted cells (A). Next, CD3 positive cells were identified as total T cell population within the mononuclear/lymphocyte gate (B). Further gating was performed within this population to specifically isolate $\gamma\delta$ T cells (C). HLA-DR expressing subsets were then determined among $\gamma\delta$ T cells (D).

Table 2. Frequency of gamma-delta T cells in tumor draining lymph nodes of patients with bladder cancer

Cell subset	Min	Max	Median	Mean±SD
CD3 ⁺ lymphocytes (% of lymphocytes)	23.20	75.80	44.50	45.60±13.11
$\gamma\delta$ T cells: CD3 ⁺ TCR $\gamma\delta^+$ (% of CD3 ⁺ T cells)	0.12	8.77	1.28	2.06 ± 1.96
HLA-DR ⁺ $\gamma\delta$ T (% of $\gamma\delta$ T cells)	2.66	99.10	33.90	37.90±24.42

γδ T cells: Gamma-delta T cells

Patient Demographics and Clinical Characteristics

After pathological confirmation, a total of 49 untreated patients with BC with a mean age of 64.65 ± 11.59 years were recruited for this study. According to the pathological reports, most patients were in stage III (26/48, 54.2%) and 15 out of the 49 patients had at least one involved lymph node (30.6%). The primary clinicopathological characteristics of the patients are summarized in Table 1.

γδ T Cells in Tumor Draining Lymph Nodes of Patients with Bladder Cancer

We first determined the frequency of T cells, $\gamma\delta$ T cells (n=49) and the expression of HLA-DR on the surface of $\gamma\delta$ T cells (n=28) in tumor draining lymph nodes of patients with BC. The descriptive statistics for these markers, including minimum, maximum, mean, and median frequencies are presented in Table 2. Our phenotyping results showed that on average, 2.06%±1.96% of CD3⁺ lymphocytes in the regional draining nodes of BC had a $\gamma\delta$ T phenotype, as demonstrated

by the expression of TCR $\gamma\delta$. A considerable percentage of these cells (37.90%±24.42%) also expressed HLA-DR, which is an activation marker for T cells.

We then examined the distribution of these cells among patients with different clinical and pathological characteristics (Table 1). Statistical analysis revealed that while the frequency of $\gamma\delta$ T cells did not vary among patients with different prognoses, their subsets did vary across different T-stages. In this regard, HLA-DR⁺ subsets were higher in T4 patients than in T2 patients (p=0.031). HLA- $DR^+ \gamma \delta T$ cells also tended to be higher in stage III than in stage II (p=0.077). In addition, the percentage of total CD3⁺ T lymphocytes increased significantly in patients with organ-confined tumors (p=0.021) and LN⁻ (p=0.045). It also tended to be higher in patients with stage II (p=0.066) and those without lymphovascular invasion (p=0.060) compared to patients with non-organ confined tumors, LN⁺ patients, those in stage III, and those positive for lymphovascular invasion, respectively.

No significant associations were observed

with other clinicopathological characteristics including sex, age, shape of tumor, histological grade, invasion to the muscle and perivesical fat layers, tumor necrosis, perineural invasion, and carcinoma in situ.

DISCUSSION

In the present study, we investigated the frequency of $\gamma\delta$ T cells and their HLA-DR expressing subset in the tumor draining lymph nodes of patients diagnosed with BC. Our findings revealed that nearly 2% of T lymphocytes exhibited a $\gamma\delta$ T cell phenotype. A considerable percentage of these cells (more than 35%) expressed the HLA-DR activation marker. This subset showed an association with prognostic factors related to tumor progression including higher T-groups and tumor stages.

 $\gamma\delta$ T cells are unconventional, innatelike T cells that make up a small portion of T cells (about 2%) and are predominantly found among intraepithelial lymphocytes. Their rapid, non-MHC-restricted responses to various stimuli make them particularly interesting in tumor studies including BC. However, in our study, no association was observed between the frequency of $\gamma\delta$ T cells and BC prognosis. Nevertheless, most studies have reported that these cells are associated with favorable clinical outcomes. It has been also shown that the tumor reactivity of $\gamma\delta$ T cells could be boosted by BCG and zoledronate treatments, potentially leading to improved survival (9, 10). Other studies have consistently shown that this T subset enhances the cytotoxic effects of chemotherapy (i.e. carboplatin and mTOR inhibitors), leading to increased therapeutic efficacy and reduced adverse responses (11, 12). This favorable role could be attributed to the fact that these cells can rapidly respond to tumor cells by recognizing non-classical antigens independently of MHC presentation. They exhibit direct cytotoxicity by releasing substances like perforin and granzyme,

interacting with death receptors such as Fas and TRAIL on tumor cells, and releasing pro-inflammatory cytokines, including interferon-gamma (IFN- γ) and tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF- α) (6, 14, 16). These findings suggest that $\gamma\delta$ T cells may play a protective role in BC and could serve as a new prognostic biomarker for patients with BC undergoing specific immune or chemotherapy treatments.

We also examined the HLA-DR expression on $\gamma\delta$ T cells and found that a significant portion of these cells expressed HLA-DR (more than one third). However, the expression levels varied widely, ranging from 2.66% to 99.10%. In addition to genetic diversity that may influence HLA-DR expression levels, the activation status of the cells, as well as the environmental and pathological factors may contribute to the variation within $\gamma\delta$ T cells population. The human leukocyte antigen-DR isotype (HLA-DR), a common marker on professional antigen-presenting cells, is considered an activation marker for T cells but its exact role in $\gamma\delta$ T cell function is not clear. However, this marker might play a role in γδ T cells as professional antigenpresenting cells (17). Our analysis revealed intriguing associations between the HLA-DR-expressing $\gamma\delta$ T cell subset and various clinicopathological characteristics of BC. Specifically, these cells were significantly elevated in patients in the higher T group (T4>T2) and tumor stages (III>II), suggesting their potential involvement in disease progression. To the best of our knowledge, there is no report on HLA-DR expression on $\gamma\delta$ T cells in BC draining nodes, but these T cells have been associated with immune reconstitution after allogeneic stem cell transplantation, and have been found to be higher in patients with autoimmune rheumatic diseases such as systemic sclerosis (18). HLA-DR expression on cytotoxic T cells could differentiate patients with axillary lymph node metastasis from those without infiltration. These cells exhibited increased expression of effector molecules such as

IFN- γ and Granzyme B, indicating their immune competent profile. This information can assist in predicting patients' response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy (19, 20). On the other hand, there is evidence that $\gamma\delta$ T cells could promote tumor growth through the release of pro-inflammatory cytokines like IL-17, enhancing angiogenesis, and inhibiting antitumor responses (15). Our findings corroborate these studies that underscore the dual roles of $\gamma\delta$ T cells in cancer, where they can exhibit both tumor-suppressing and tumor-promoting effects.

We also observed an increase in the total CD3⁺ T lymphocytes in patients with organconfined tumors and favorable prognostic indicators including negative lymph node involvement, lower tumor stage, and absence of lymphovascular invasion. This confirms that T cells are critical determinants of the immune landscape and therapeutic outcomes in cancer. These findings further emphasize the complex interplay between immune surveillance and tumor progression in BC, highlighting the importance of conducting subset-specific studies as previously noted (21-23).

Our sample size was relatively modest, which may have affected the statistical power to detect subtle associations with certain clinicopathological parameters. The cross-sectional nature of the study also limited our ability to determine the temporal dynamics of immune cell changes during disease progression. Future research directions could include conducting longitudinal studies with larger cohorts to validate these findings and elucidate the functional roles of $\gamma\delta$ T cells in the immune response against BC.

CONCLUSION

Taken together, our data indicated that although the frequency of $\gamma\delta$ T cells in draining lymph nodes showed no association with BC prognosis, an association of HLA-DR expressing $\gamma\delta$ T cells with poor prognostic factors related to tumor progression, including

higher T-group and tumor stage suggests their potential involvement in disease progression. These findings, along with the association of total T population with favorable prognostic factors further emphasize the complex interplay between the immune system and tumor cells. This highlights the importance of conducting subset-specific studies. Investigating the mechanisms underlying $\gamma\delta$ T cell activation and their interactions with other immune and tumor cells in the regional lymph node may provide novel insights into immune evasion mechanisms and potential targets for immunotherapy.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

ZF designed the study, analyzed the data, and wrote and edited the manuscript. AA and HA provided the samples and secured the grants. ZM performed the experiments and analyzed the data. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This project was financially supported by the grants from Shiraz University of Medical Sciences (Grant No. 30032) and Shiraz Institute for Cancer Research (ICR-504).

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- 1. Dobruch J, Oszczudłowski M. Bladder Cancer: Current Challenges and Future Directions. Medicina (Kaunas, Lithuania). 2021;57(8).
- Joseph M, Enting D. Immune Responses in Bladder Cancer-Role of Immune Cell Populations, Prognostic Factors and Therapeutic Implications. Frontiers in oncology. 2019;9:1270.
- 3. Vantourout P, Hayday A. Six-of-the-best: unique

contributions of $\gamma\delta$ T cells to immunology. Nature Reviews Immunology. 2013;13(2):88-100.

- Ribot JC, Lopes N, Silva-Santos B. γδ T cells in tissue physiology and surveillance. Nature Reviews Immunology. 2021;21(4):221-32.
- Silva-Santos B, Mensurado S, Coffelt SB. γδ T cells: pleiotropic immune effectors with therapeutic potential in cancer. Nature reviews Cancer. 2019;19(7):392-404.
- Li Y, Li G, Zhang J, Wu X, Chen X. The dual roles of human γδ T cells: anti-tumor or tumor-promoting. Frontiers in immunology. 2021;11:619954.
- Champagne E. γδ T cell receptor ligands and modes of antigen recognition. Archivum immunologiae et therapiae experimentalis. 2011;59:117-37.
- Gentles AJ, Newman AM, Liu CL, Bratman SV, Feng W, Kim D, et al. The prognostic landscape of genes and infiltrating immune cells across human cancers. Nat Med. 2015;21(8):938-45.
- Yuasa T, Sato K, Ashihara E, Takeuchi M, Maita S, Tsuchiya N, et al. Intravesical administration of γδ T cells successfully prevents the growth of bladder cancer in the murine model. Cancer Immunology, Immunotherapy. 2009;58(4):493-502.
- Nguyen S, Chevalier MF, Benmerzoug S, Cesson V, Schneider AK, Rodrigues-Dias SC, et al. Vδ2 T cells are associated with favorable clinical outcomes in patients with bladder cancer and their tumor reactivity can be boosted by BCG and zoledronate treatments. J Immunother Cancer. 2022;10(8).
- PAN Y, CHIU Y-H, CHIU S-C, CHO D-Y, LEE L-M, WEN Y-C, et al. Gamma/Delta T-Cells Enhance Carboplatin-induced Cytotoxicity Towards Advanced Bladder Cancer Cells. Anticancer Research. 2020;40(9):5221-7.
- Ji N, Mukherjee N, Shu ZJ, Reyes RM, Meeks JJ, McConkey DJ, et al. γδ T Cells Support Antigen-Specific αβ T cell-Mediated Antitumor Responses during BCG Treatment for Bladder Cancer. Cancer Immunol Res. 2021;9(12):1491-503.
- 13. Rei MMSG. Characterization of a pro-tumour role of interleukin-17 producing yδ t cells in ovarian

cancer: Universidade do Porto (Portugal); 2014.

- Chan KF, Duarte JDG, Ostrouska S, Behren A. γδ T Cells in the Tumor Microenvironment-Interactions With Other Immune Cells. Front Immunol. 2022;13:894315.
- Zhao Y, Niu C, Cui J. Gamma-delta (γδ) T cells: friend or foe in cancer development? Journal of Translational Medicine. 2018;16(1):3.
- Schönefeldt S, Wais T, Herling M, Mustjoki S, Bekiaris V, Moriggl R, Neubauer HA. The Diverse Roles of γδ T Cells in Cancer: From Rapid Immunity to Aggressive Lymphoma. Cancers (Basel). 2021;13(24).
- Brandes M, Willimann K, Moser B. Professional antigen-presentation function by human gammadelta T Cells. Science. 2005;309(5732):264-8.
- Bank I. The Role of Gamma Delta T Cells in Autoimmune Rheumatic Diseases. Cells. 2020;9(2).
- Saraiva DP, Azeredo-Lopes S, Antunes A, Salvador R, Borralho P, Assis B, et al. Expression of HLA-DR in Cytotoxic T Lymphocytes: A Validated Predictive Biomarker and a Potential Therapeutic Strategy in Breast Cancer. Cancers (Basel). 2021;13(15).
- Osuna-Gómez R, Arqueros C, Galano C, Mulet M, Zamora C, Barnadas A, Vidal S. Effector Mechanisms of CD8+ HLA-DR+ T Cells in Breast Cancer Patients Who Respond to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy. Cancers (Basel). 2021;13(24).
- Faghih Z, Erfani N, Haghshenas MR, Safaei A, Talei A-R, Ghaderi A. Immune profiles of CD4+ lymphocyte subsets in breast cancer tumor draining lymph nodes. Immunology Letters. 2014;158(1):57-65.
- 22. Faghih Z, Shobeiri SS, Ariafar A, Sarkarian M, Zeighami S, Nazari N, et al. CD8+ T Lymphocyte Subsets in Bladder Tumor Draining Lymph Nodes. Iran J Immunol. 2016;13(4):237-48.
- 23. Ariafar A, Sanati A, Ahmadvand S, Shekarkhar G, Safaei A, Shayan Z, Faghih Z. Prognostic significance of immunoscore related markers in bladder cancer. BMC Urol. 2022;22(1):133.