



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Liposomes as delivery system for allergen-specific immunotherapy

Leboux, R.J.T.

Citation

Leboux, R. J. T. (2021, November 16). *Liposomes as delivery system for allergen-specific immunotherapy*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3240101>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3240101>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Chapter 1

General introduction

Allergy

We are constantly exposed to airborne allergens. Not everyone is allergic or develops an allergy over time, but the incidence of allergic rhinitis, conjunctivitis and asthma is increasing rapidly. Estimates indicate that allergies affect approximately 30% of the population in the developed countries [1-5]. Sensitization to airborne allergens, such as pollen, is an overreaction to an otherwise harmless substance. Pollen from birch and other Fagales family members are the most dominant tree pollen in Northern and Central Europe. Birch pollen allergy often comes with allergies to other types of pollen (e.g. hazelnut, oak, chestnut) [6] and even food allergies [7, 8] as a result of protein homology. Based on samples in populations throughout Europe, it is estimated that between 10 and 20% of all citizens are sensitized to the main allergen of birch pollen: Bet v 1 [2-4, 9]. Among pollen-allergic patients, between 50 and 99% have Bet v 1-specific immunoglobulin (Ig) E.

An allergy is developed in two phases: the sensitization phase (Figure 1) and the effector phase (Figure 2). During sensitization, the immune response to an allergen is skewed towards a T-helper (Th) 2-type response. Allergen-specific Th2 cells secrete cytokines, including interleukin (IL)-4, IL-5 and IL-13, which ultimately results in antibody isotype switching towards IgE. In the effector phase, mast cells (MCs) and basophils are loaded with allergen-specific IgE. Upon binding of allergen to these specific IgE molecules, the MCs and basophils degranulate and thereby release a storm of molecules, such as histamines, prostaglandins and leukotrienes [10-15]. These are responsible for the most common symptoms of allergy, including sneezing, rhinitis and conjunctivitis.




Figure 1. Proposed mechanism of the sensitization phase of developing an allergy. Dendritic cells are exposed to allergens and, in the presence of IL-4, induce the differentiation of naive CD4⁺ T-cells into Th2 CD4⁺ T-cells. These cells produce IL-4, IL-5 and IL-13 and subsequently induce antibody isotype switching towards IgE on B-cells. This allergen-specific IgE can then bind FcεRI receptors on basophils and mast cells. Image was adapted from Larché et al. [15].

Even though allergic reactions most often are not lethal, the economic burden of allergies is severe. It was estimated to be 2-5 billion dollar in the United States in 2003 (approximately 20 dollar per citizen) [16], and more than 1 billion euro in Sweden in 2015 (approximately 960 euro per citizen) [17].




Figure 2. Proposed mechanism of the effector phase of an allergy. Upon subsequent exposure to the allergen, DCs take up allergen and IgE-bound allergen and activate Th2 CD4+ T-cells, which produce various cytokines and chemokines, resulting in activation of eosinophils, smooth muscle cells, mucus production and basophils. Image was adapted from Larché et al. [15].

Allergy therapies

The most effective allergy treatment is avoiding the allergen source. Unfortunately this is very difficult if not impossible for airborne allergens. First line therapy includes the administration of drugs, such as anti-histamines or corticosteroids [18]. These treat the symptoms, but not the underlying cause. The only curative treatment is allergen-specific immunotherapy (AIT) using allergy vaccines [18]. AIT is available as sublingual immunotherapy (SLIT) or subcutaneous immunotherapy (SCIT). In SLIT, atopic patients must administer themselves allergen sublingually daily for at least a year. SCIT consists of weekly subcutaneous injections by a general practitioner during the scale-up phase (first 3-6 months) of therapy, and monthly or bi-monthly injections during the maintenance phase (3-5 years) [19-21].

Allergy vaccines for SCIT are usually composed of an allergen extract, containing water-soluble proteins, adsorbed to aluminum hydroxide. The latter is a commonly used colloidal adjuvant in childhood vaccines, known to induce

strong Th2 mediated responses [22]. A recent advance in the field of AIT is the use of (well-defined) recombinant proteins instead of (poorly defined) allergen extracts [23-26]. As allergen extract content varies between allergen-source and even between batches of the same supplier [23, 27-29], this is the first step towards well characterized and reproducible vaccine formulations.

While proven effective, SCIT requires at least 3 years before sufficient effect is achieved. IgE levels first increase, before decreasing in the course of SCIT [12]. This may be explained by the Th2-type of immune response that aluminum hydroxide initially induces, resulting in IgE induction, before inducing IgG4 and IL-10 production. If the vaccine could directly induce either a regulatory response or a Th1 type response, the increase of allergy-related biomarkers probably would not happen. Thus, by replacing the adjuvant, the therapy might require less injections and work more quickly [10, 26, 30, 31].

Some issues about the safety of aluminum salts have been raised [21, 32-34]. Although the toxicity is debatable, development of new allergies has been reported as a result of AIT [35-37], which may be attributed to the induction of antigen-specific IgE as a result of the aluminum adjuvant. Moreover, there is a regulatory wish to replace aluminum salts in allergy vaccines [10, 26, 31]. Nanoparticles are an interesting alternative adjuvant for immunotherapy. A broad range of nanoparticles has been prepared and described as alternatives. Liposomes are among the most studied and several liposomal formulations are for purposes other than allergy vaccination are on the market [38].

Liposomes

Liposomes are nanoparticles composed of one or more (phospho-)lipid bilayers. Liposomes are a biocompatible, bio-degradable and highly versatile and tunable delivery system [39]. Molecules can be physically associated to liposomes in three ways (Figure 3): water-soluble molecules can be encapsulated in the aqueous core or adsorbed to the surface, while lipid-soluble molecules can be incorporated in the lipid bilayer [40]. Incorporation of molecules in liposomes typically alters the bio-distribution after administration. This formulation strategy has successfully been used to alter the pharmacokinetics of cytostatic drug molecules, such as doxorubicin [41]. Liposomes are also investigated and used as adjuvant for vaccination, to carry antigenic peptides or proteins as cargo.

Liposomes can serve as vaccine adjuvant in two ways. Firstly, they can act as a delivery system to enhance the delivery of antigenic cargo towards and into antigen presenting cells (APCs) [42, 43]. Secondly, they can induce, enhance or direct the subsequent immune response via various immunostimulatory mechanisms [43-45]. In order for an adjuvant to induce its effect, both antigen

and adjuvant need to be taken up by the same APC [46, 47]. The *in vivo* behavior of liposomes strongly depends on the physico-chemical properties, which in turn is determined by the content and lipid composition. The hydrodynamic diameter and zeta potential of liposomes and their impact on immunogenicity have been widely studied [42, 48-53].




Figure 3. Schematic overview of structure and composition of a unilamellar liposome. Liposomes consist of one or more lipid bilayers, in which hydrophobic molecules can be incorporated (A). The aqueous core can be used to encapsulate hydrophilic molecules (B). The surface of liposomes can contain charged lipids, PEG-conjugated lipids and lipids conjugated to targeting molecules (C). Molecules can also be adsorbed to the surface via e.g. electrostatic interactions (D).

Small particles (<500 nm) are thought to migrate towards the lymph node and then be taken up by lymph node resident APCs, whereas larger particles (>500 nm) are primarily taken up at the injection site [54, 55]. Consequently, small liposomes were shown to disappear more quickly from the injection site than large ones [56]. While smaller solid nanoparticles are often associated with a Th1-skewed immune response and stronger CD8 T-cell responses, this does not seem to be the case for liposomes [48]. Large neutral liposomes induced a strong Th1 response, whereas small liposomes induced a Th2 response [53, 57]. Small cationic liposomes containing pDNA were more effective at inducing both a humoral [56] and especially CD8+ T-cell response [51, 56]. This illustrates that not only size, but also other parameters, such as zeta potential and surface chemistry, are to be considered.

Liposomes can be either neutral, anionic or cationic. Neutral liposomes are typically composed of phosphatidylcholines (PC), phosphoethanolamines (PE) and cholesterol. Neutral liposomes are not stabilized by electrostatic repulsion, which can result in rapid aggregation or sedimentation [58]. Despite this challenge, neutral liposomes are the basis of AS01 (in combination with MPL-A and Saponin), GSK's adjuvant used in malaria and recombinant Zoster vaccine [46]. Cationic liposomes generally form a depot at the site of injection, where they accumulate and need to be taken up by APCs to remove them from the injection site. Cationic liposomes are efficiently taken up by APCs and generally induce a strong T-helper cell type (Th) 1 response and are able to induce antigen specific CD8+ T-cell responses [44, 59-62]. The uptake mechanism for cationic liposomes seems to be based on electrostatic interaction between liposomes and cell surface [45, 68]. Anionic liposomes are taken up via scavenger receptors present on macrophages and liver sinusoidal endothelial cells [66, 67]. Studies with anionic liposomes have shown that liposomes containing lipids with either a phospho-glycerol or a phospho-serine headgroup can induce a regulatory immune response rather than an inflammatory Th1 or Th2 response [45, 63-65].

Besides improving the delivery of the antigen, another advantage of using liposomes, or nanoparticles in general, is their ability to co-encapsulate molecular immune modulators [66-72]. This will ensure the delivery of both antigen and immune modulator into the same APC. This co-delivery is necessary for an optimal effect of the immune modulator on antigen specific immune responses. Additionally, targeting moieties could be coupled to the surface to enhance uptake by specific subsets of cells (e.g. dendritic cells, Langerhans Cells or foam cells) [73-77]. In this thesis we use liposomes as antigen delivery systems for two different antigens: model antigen ovalbumin (OVA) and Bet v 1, the major allergen in birch pollen allergy.

Aim and outline of this thesis

In this thesis we investigate liposomes as a delivery system for SCIT. We set out to gain fundamental knowledge on the effect of antigen association method on the subsequent induced immune responses *in vitro* and *in vivo*. Moreover, we developed a new method of antigen association that can both reduce antigen loss during preparation and improve the immunogenicity of the antigen. We have prepared cationic and anionic liposomes and focused on the delivery of antigens in different animal models and in *ex vivo* human skin biopsies.

Chapter 2 compares different methods of Bet v 1 association to cationic liposomes. Bet v 1 was adsorbed to the surface, encapsulated in the aqueous core and resulting association efficiencies were determined. Aggregation was observed after exceeding a 0.15 protein/lipid ratio (w/w) in all cases. Liposomes with Bet v 1 encapsulated, adsorbed, and unbound induced the strongest IgG1 response.

In **chapter 3** atomic force microscopy was used to accurately measure the rigidity (Young's modulus, Y_m) of anionic liposomes as function of lipid composition. The Y_m was correlated to liposome uptake *in vitro* and induction of regulatory T-cells *in vivo*. A linear correlation was observed between liposome rigidity and the uptake of liposomes by cultured dendritic cells. Moreover, the linear correlation was also observed between liposome rigidity and induction of antigen-specific regulatory T-cells (Tregs) *in vivo*: the more rigid the liposome membrane, the more Tregs.

We evaluated the fate of two liposome formulations (cationic and anionic) after intradermal injection in human skin biopsies in **chapter 4**. Fluorescent OVA or Bet v 1 was encapsulated in fluorescent anionic and cationic liposomes. Subsequently, we analyzed which subsets of dendritic cells had taken up antigen and liposomes. Antigen uptake in different subsets was not affected by injection depth. We found that most CD14⁺ dDCs take up antigen, while Langerhans cells showed the smallest fraction of antigen-positive cells. Moreover, encapsulation of Bet v 1 in liposomes greatly enhanced uptake by APCs.

In order to reduce the loss of precious antigen during the preparation of liposomal antigen formulations, we developed a novel antigen association platform, which is described in **chapter 5**. This association method is based on the interaction between two complementary peptides (pepE and pepK, figure 4) that form a coiled coil. PepE was covalently linked to an antigenic peptide sequence (yielding a pepE-antigen conjugate), while pepK was covalently linked to cholesterol (yielding CPK). CPK was subsequently incorporated in the lipid

bilayers of cationic liposomes. This coiled coil-based association of pepE-antigen conjugates to liposomes was compared to association to non-functionalized cationic liposomes and showed superior *in vivo* co-localization, as well as *in vitro* and *in vivo* antigen specific CD4+ T-cell responses.




Figure 4. Schematic overview of the intermolecular interactions that happen when pepE and pepK form a coiled coil (A) and a representative image of what the coiled coil looks like on a molecular scale (B). Image was adapted from Fernandez-Rodriguez et al. [78]

Mice were immunized with Bet v 1 associated to liposomes or aluminum hydroxide in **chapter 6**. We compared the coiled coil-based association to the gold standard in SCIT: adsorption to aluminum hydroxide. Coiled coil associated Bet v 1 resulted in a superior immune response compared to plain adsorbed Bet v 1 to either cationic liposomes or aluminum hydroxide, with high levels of Bet v 1-specific IgG1 and IgG2a. Moreover, cells derived from lung draining lymph nodes produced high levels of IL-4, IL-5, IL-10 and IL-13.

Finally, in **chapter 7** the results of this thesis are summarized and the possible application of liposomes as adjuvant in (allergen specific) immunotherapy is discussed.

References

1. Biedermann, T., et al., *Birch pollen allergy in Europe*. Allergy, 2019. **74**(7): p. 1237-1248.
2. Stemeseder, T., et al., *Cross-sectional study on allergic sensitization of Austrian adolescents using molecule-based IgE profiling*. Allergy, 2017. **72**(5): p. 754-763.
3. Blomme, K., et al., *Prevalence of Allergic Sensitization versus Allergic Rhinitis Symptoms in an Unselected Population*. International Archives of Allergy and Immunology, 2013. **160**(2): p. 200-207.
4. Linneberg, A., et al., *Increasing prevalence of specific IgE to aeroallergens in an adult population: Two cross-sectional surveys 8 years apart: The Copenhagen Allergy Study*. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, 2000. **106**(2): p. 247-252.
5. Platts-Mills, T.A., *The allergy epidemics: 1870-2010*. J Allergy Clin Immunol, 2015. **136**(1): p. 3-13.
6. Asam, C., et al., *Tree pollen allergens-an update from a molecular perspective*. Allergy, 2015. **70**(10): p. 1201-11.
7. Roulias, A., et al., *Differences in the intrinsic immunogenicity and allergenicity of Bet v 1 and related food allergens revealed by site-directed mutagenesis*. Allergy, 2013. **69**(2): p. 208-215.
8. Geroldinger-Simic, M., et al., *Birch pollen-related food allergy: clinical aspects and the role of allergen-specific IgE and IgG4 antibodies*. J Allergy Clin Immunol, 2011. **127**(3): p. 616-622.
9. Schmitz, R., et al., *Patterns of Sensitization to Inhalant and Food Allergens - Findings from the German Health Interview and Examination Survey for Children and Adolescents*. International Archives of Allergy and Immunology, 2013. **162**(3): p. 263-270.
10. Gunawardana, N.C. and S.R. Durham, *New approaches to allergen immunotherapy*. Annals of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology, 2018: p. 293-305.
11. Shamji, M.H. and S.R. Durham, *Mechanisms of allergen immunotherapy for inhaled allergens and predictive biomarkers*. J Allergy Clin Immunol, 2017. **140**(6): p. 1485-1498.
12. Akdis, M. and C.A. Akdis, *Mechanisms of allergen-specific immunotherapy: Multiple suppressor factors at work in immune tolerance to allergens*. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, 2014. **133**(3): p. 621-631.
13. Akdis, M., *Immune tolerance in allergy*. Current Opinion in Immunology, 2009. **21**(6): p. 700-707.
14. Akdis, M. and C.A. Akdis, *Mechanisms of allergen-specific immunotherapy*. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, 2007. **119**(4): p. 780-789.
15. Larche, M., C.A. Akdis, and R. Valenta, *Immunological mechanisms of allergen-specific immunotherapy*. Nat Rev Immunol, 2006. **6**(10): p. 761-771.
16. Reed, S.D., T.A. Lee, and D.C. McCrory, *The Economic Burden of Allergic Rhinitis*. Pharmacoeconomics, 2004. **22**(6): p. 345-361.
17. Cardell, L.-O., et al., *TOTAL: high cost of allergic rhinitis—a national Swedish population-based questionnaire study*. npj Primary Care Respiratory Medicine, 2016. **26**(1): p. 15082.
18. A.P.E. Sachs, et al., *NHG-Standaard Allergische en niet-allergische rhinitis*. Huisarts Wet, 2006.
19. Dretzke, J., et al., *Subcutaneous and sublingual immunotherapy for seasonal allergic rhinitis: A systematic review and indirect comparison*. Journal of Allergy and Clinical

- Immunology, 2013. **131**(5): p. 1361-1366.
20. Meadows, A., et al., *A systematic review and economic evaluation of subcutaneous and sublingual allergen immunotherapy in adults and children with seasonal allergic rhinitis*. Health Technol Assess, 2013. **17**(27): p. vi, xi-xiv, 1-322.
21. Exley, C., *Aluminium adjuvants and adverse events in sub-cutaneous allergy immunotherapy*. Allergy, asthma, and clinical immunology : official journal of the Canadian Society of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, 2014. **10**(1): p. 4-4.
22. Jensen-Jarolim, E., *Aluminium in Allergies and Allergen immunotherapy*. The World Allergy Organization Journal, 2015. **8**(1): p. 7.
23. Valenta, R., et al., *Allergen Extracts for In Vivo Diagnosis and Treatment of Allergy: Is There a Future?* The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology: In Practice, 2018.
24. Valenta, R., et al., *Recombinant allergens for allergen-specific immunotherapy: 10 years anniversary of immunotherapy with recombinant allergens*. Allergy, 2011. **66**(6): p. 775-783.
25. Valenta, R., et al., *Vaccine development for allergen-specific immunotherapy based on recombinant allergens and synthetic allergen peptides: Lessons from the past and novel mechanisms of action for the future*. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 2016. **137**(2): p. 351-357.
26. Klimek, L., et al., *Development of subcutaneous allergen immunotherapy (part 2): preventive aspects and innovations*. Allergo Journal International, 2019. **28**(4): p. 107-119.
27. Esch, R.E., *Allergen Source Materials and Quality Control of Allergenic Extracts*. Methods, 1997. **13**(1): p. 2-13.
28. Carnés, J., et al., *Mite allergen extracts and clinical practice*. Annals of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology, 2017. **118**(3): p. 249-256.
29. Cox, L., *Standardized allergen extracts: past, present and future*. Expert Review of Clinical Immunology, 2005. **1**(4): p. 579-588.
30. Klimek, L., et al., *Evolution of subcutaneous allergen immunotherapy (part 1): from first developments to mechanism-driven therapy concepts*. Allergo Journal International, 2019: p. 78-95.
31. Pfaar, O., et al., *Perspectives in allergen immunotherapy: 2019 and beyond*. Allergy, 2019. **74 Suppl 108**: p. 3-25.
32. Jensen-Jarolim, E., et al., *State-of-the-art in marketed adjuvants and formulations in Allergen Immunotherapy: a position paper of the European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology (EAACI)*. Allergy, 2019: p. 746-760.
33. Kawahara, M. and M. Kato-Negishi, *Link between Aluminum and the Pathogenesis of Alzheimer's Disease: The Integration of the Aluminum and Amyloid Cascade Hypotheses*. International Journal of Alzheimer's Disease, 2011. **2011**: p. 276393.
34. Harrington, C.R., et al., *Alzheimer's-disease-like changes in tau protein processing: association with aluminium accumulation in brains of renal dialysis patients*. The Lancet, 1994. **343**(8904): p. 993-997.
35. Gellrich, D., et al., *De novo sensitization during subcutaneous allergen specific immunotherapy - an analysis of 51 cases of SCIT and 33 symptomatically treated controls*. Sci Rep, 2020. **10**(1): p. 6048.
36. Asero, R., *Injection Immunotherapy with Different Airborne Allergens Did Not Prevent de novo Sensitization to Ragweed and Birch Pollen North of Milan*. International Archives of Allergy and Immunology, 2004. **133**(1): p. 49-54.
37. Harmanci, K., et al., *Evaluation of new sensitizations in asthmatic children*

- monosensitized to house dust mite by specific immunotherapy.* Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol, 2010. **28**(1): p. 7-13.
38. Bobo, D., et al., *Nanoparticle-Based Medicines: A Review of FDA-Approved Materials and Clinical Trials to Date.* Pharmaceutical Research, 2016. **33**(10): p. 2373-2387.
 39. Li, J., et al., *A review on phospholipids and their main applications in drug delivery systems.* Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 2015. **10**(2): p. 81-98.
 40. Watson, D.S., A.N. Endsley, and L. Huang, *Design considerations for liposomal vaccines: Influence of formulation parameters on antibody and cell-mediated immune responses to liposome associated antigens.* Vaccine, 2012. **30**(13): p. 2256-2272.
 41. Vaage, J., et al., *Tumour uptake of doxorubicin in polyethylene glycol-coated liposomes and therapeutic effect against a xenografted human pancreatic carcinoma.* British journal of cancer, 1997. **75**(4): p. 482-486.
 42. Schwendener, R.A., *Liposomes as vaccine delivery systems: a review of the recent advances.* Therapeutic Advances in Vaccines, 2014. **2**(6): p. 159-182.
 43. Perrie, Y., et al., *Designing liposomal adjuvants for the next generation of vaccines.* Adv Drug Deliv Rev, 2016. **99**(Pt A): p. 85-96.
 44. Christensen, D., et al., *Cationic liposomes as vaccine adjuvants.* Expert Review of Vaccines, 2007. **6**(5): p. 785-796.
 45. Benne, N., et al., *Anionic 1,2-distearoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphoglycerol (DSPG) liposomes induce antigen-specific regulatory T cells and prevent atherosclerosis in mice.* J Control Release, 2018. **291**: p. 135-146.
 46. Didierlaurent, A.M., et al., *Adjuvant system AS01: helping to overcome the challenges of modern vaccines.* Expert Review of Vaccines, 2017. **16**(1): p. 55-63.
 47. Calabro, S., et al., *Vaccine adjuvants alum and MF59 induce rapid recruitment of neutrophils and monocytes that participate in antigen transport to draining lymph nodes.* Vaccine, 2011. **29**(9): p. 1812-23.
 48. Benne, N., et al., *Orchestrating immune responses: How size, shape and rigidity affect the immunogenicity of particulate vaccines.* Journal of Controlled Release, 2016. **234**: p. 124-134.
 49. Zolnik, B.S., et al., *Minireview: Nanoparticles and the Immune System.* Endocrinology, 2010. **151**(2): p. 458-465.
 50. Ibaraki, H., et al., *Effects of surface charge and flexibility of liposomes on dermal drug delivery.* Journal of Drug Delivery Science and Technology, 2019. **50**: p. 155-162.
 51. Henriksen-Lacey, M., A. Devitt, and Y. Perrie, *The vesicle size of DDA:TDB liposomal adjuvants plays a role in the cell-mediated immune response but has no significant effect on antibody production.* Journal of Controlled Release, 2011. **154**(2): p. 131-137.
 52. Bachmann, M.F. and G.T. Jennings, *Vaccine delivery: a matter of size, geometry, kinetics and molecular patterns.* Nature Reviews Immunology, 2010. **10**: p. 787-796.
 53. Brewer, J.M., et al., *Lipid Vesicle Size Determines the Th1 or Th2 Response to Entrapped Antigen.* The Journal of Immunology, 1998. **161**(8): p. 4000-4007.
 54. Manolova, V., et al., *Nanoparticles target distinct dendritic cell populations according to their size.* European Journal of Immunology, 2008. **38**(5): p. 1404-1413.
 55. Oussoren, C. and G. Storm, *Liposomes to target the lymphatics by subcutaneous administration.* Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 2001. **50**(1): p. 143-156.
 56. Carstens, M.G., et al., *Effect of vesicle size on tissue localization and immunogenicity*

- of liposomal DNA vaccines. *Vaccine*, 2011. **29**(29): p. 4761-4770.
57. Badiie, A., et al., *The role of liposome size on the type of immune response induced in BALB/c mice against leishmaniasis: rgp63 as a model antigen*. *Experimental Parasitology*, 2012. **132**(4): p. 403-409.
 58. Trefalt, G. and M. Borkovec, *Overview of DLVO theory*. Laboratory of Colloid and Surface Chemistry, University of Geneva, Switzerland, 2014: p. 1-10.
 59. Heuts, J., et al., *Cationic Liposomes: A Flexible Vaccine Delivery System for Physicochemically Diverse Antigenic Peptides*. *Pharmaceutical Research*, 2018. **35**(11).
 60. Varypataki, E.M., et al., *Cationic DOTAP-based liposomes: a vaccine formulation platform for synthetic long peptides with widely different physicochemical properties*, in *Leiden Academic Center for Drug Research*. 2016, Leiden University: Leiden.
 61. Hussain, M.J., et al., *Th1 immune responses can be modulated by varying dimethyldioctadecylammonium and distearoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine content in liposomal adjuvants*. *J Pharm Pharmacol*, 2014. **66**(3): p. 358-366.
 62. Foged, C., et al., *Interaction of dendritic cells with antigen-containing liposomes: effect of bilayer composition*. *Vaccine*, 2004. **22**(15-16): p. 1903-13.
 63. Pujol-Autonell, I., et al., *Use of Autoantigen-Loaded Phosphatidylserine-Liposomes to Arrest Autoimmunity in Type 1 Diabetes*. *PLOS ONE*, 2015. **10**(6).
 64. Nagata, S., R. Hanayama, and K. Kawane, *Autoimmunity and the clearance of dead cells*. *Cell*, 2010. **140**(5): p. 619-30.
 65. Ramos, G.C., et al., *Apoptotic mimicry: phosphatidylserine liposomes reduce inflammation through activation of peroxisome proliferator-activated receptors (PPARs) in vivo*. *British Journal of Pharmacology*, 2007. **151**(6): p. 844-850.
 66. Short, K.K., et al., *Co-encapsulation of synthetic lipidated TLR4 and TLR7/8 agonists in the liposomal bilayer results in a rapid, synergistic enhancement of vaccine-mediated humoral immunity*. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 2019.
 67. Du, G., et al., *Intradermal vaccination with hollow microneedles: A comparative study of various protein antigen and adjuvant encapsulated nanoparticles*. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 2017. **266**: p. 109-118.
 68. Bal, S.M., et al., *Co-encapsulation of antigen and Toll-like receptor ligand in cationic liposomes affects the quality of the immune response in mice after intradermal vaccination*. *Vaccine*, 2011. **29**(5): p. 1045-1052.
 69. Varypataki, E.M., et al., *Cationic Liposomes Loaded with a Synthetic Long Peptide and Poly(I:C): a Defined Adjuvanted Vaccine for Induction of Antigen-Specific T Cell Cytotoxicity*. *The AAPS Journal*, 2015. **17**(1): p. 216-226.
 70. Wilkinson, A., et al., *Lipid conjugation of TLR7 agonist Resiquimod ensures co-delivery with the liposomal Cationic Adjuvant Formulation 01 (CAF01) but does not enhance immunopotential compared to non-conjugated Resiquimod+CAF01*. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 2018. **291**: p. 1-10.
 71. Cheng, N., et al., *A nanoparticle-incorporated STING activator enhances antitumor immunity in PD-L1-insensitive models of triple-negative breast cancer*. *JCI Insight*, 2018. **3**(22).
 72. Schmidt, S.T., et al., *The administration route is decisive for the ability of the vaccine adjuvant CAF09 to induce antigen-specific CD8+ T-cell responses: The immunological consequences of the biodistribution profile*. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 2016. **239**: p. 107-117.

73. Schulze, J., et al., *A Liposomal Platform for Delivery of a Protein Antigen to Langerin-Expressing Cells*. *Biochemistry*, 2019. **58**(21): p. 2576-2580.
74. Joshi, M.D., et al., *Targeting tumor antigens to dendritic cells using particulate carriers*. *J Control Release*, 2012. **161**(1): p. 25-37.
75. Tacken, P.J., et al., *Targeting DC-SIGN via its neck region leads to prolonged antigen residence in early endosomes, delayed lysosomal degradation, and cross-presentation*. *Blood*, 2011. **118**(15): p. 4111.
76. Benne, N., et al., *Complement Receptor Targeted Liposomes Encapsulating the Liver X Receptor Agonist GW3965 Accumulate in and Stabilize Atherosclerotic Plaques*. *Adv Healthc Mater*, 2020. **9**(10): p. e2000043.
77. Rosalia, R.A., et al., *CD40-targeted dendritic cell delivery of PLGA-nanoparticle vaccines induce potent anti-tumor responses*. *Biomaterials*, 2015. **40**: p. 88-97.
78. Fernandez-Rodriguez, J. and T.C. Marlovits, *Induced heterodimerization and purification of two target proteins by a synthetic coiled-coil tag*. *Protein Science : A Publication of the Protein Society*, 2012. **21**(4): p. 511-519.

