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ABSTRACT

Background and purpose: Immune checkpoint inhibitor with radiation therapy (ICI + RT) is under investigation for improved patient outcome, so we performed a systematic review/meta-analysis of toxicities for ICI + RT compared to immune checkpoint inhibitor (ICI) therapy alone.

Materials and methods: A PRISMA-compliant systematic review of studies in MEDLINE (PubMed) and in the National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines was conducted, with primary outcome grade 3+ toxicity. Criteria for ICI alone were: phase III/IV trials that compared immunotherapy to placebo, chemotherapy, or alternative immunotherapy; and for ICI + RT: prospective/retrospective studies with an arm treated with ICI + RT. Meta-analysis was performed by random effects models using the DerSimonian and Laird method. The $I^2$ statistic and Cochran’s Q test were used to assess heterogeneity, while funnel plots and Egger’s test assessed publication bias.

Results: This meta-analysis included 51 studies (n=15,398), with 35 ICI alone (n=13,956) and 16 ICI + RT studies (n=1,442). Our models showed comparable grade 3-4 toxicities in ICI + RT (17.8%; 95% CI, 12.0-24.5%) and ICI alone (22.3%; 95% CI, 18.1-26.9%). Stratification by timing of radiation and irradiated site showed no significant differences, but anti-CTLA4 therapy and melanoma showed increased toxicity. The grade 5 toxicities were 1.1% and 1.9% for ICI alone and ICI + RT respectively. There was significant heterogeneity, but not publication bias.

Conclusions: The random effects model showed comparable grade 3-4 toxicity in using ICI + RT compared to ICI alone in CNS melanoma metastases, NSCLC, and prostate cancer. ICI + RT is safe for future clinical trials in these cancers.

Keywords: combination therapy, radiation, immune checkpoint inhibitor, toxicity
INTRODUCTION

Recent rising use of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) in metastatic and recurrent cancers leverages their systemic activity to eradicate disseminated malignancies. For example, the current National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines (version 1.2019) for newly diagnosed metastatic melanoma to the brain recommend four treatment options: ipilimumab with nivolumab, nivolumab alone, pembrolizumab, or BRAF/MEK inhibitors.\(^1\) Similarly, radiation therapy (RT) may be used for palliation or definitive treatment of oligoproggressive disease.\(^1\) However, ICI use results in well-characterized accompanying toxicities.\(^2\) Targets of ICI therapy include cytotoxic T lymphocyte antigen 4 (CTLA4), programmed cell death protein 1 (PD1), and programmed death-ligand 1 receptor (PDL1).\(^3\)

There is interest in combining ICI with RT in order to increase efficacy of therapy and reduce rate of recurrence,\(^4\)\(\text{-}^{21}\) as well as to explore the possibility of enhancing an abscopal effect. However, there are few data regarding the toxicity of this combination therapy in humans. The proinflammatory effects of ICI and RT may be additive, resulting in unacceptable toxicity. A recent meta-analysis found that in patients treated for brain metastases by ICI and SRS, ipilimumab was associated with greater risk of radionecrosis.\(^7\)\(^,\)\(^{22}\)\(^,\)\(^{23}\) There is evidence that PD-L1 signaling is significantly involved in radiation-induced cardiac toxicity.\(^24\) Finally, it is not known what timeline of ICI and RT maximizes efficacy without sacrificing safety, though some evidence suggests concurrent therapy is superior to non-concurrent.\(^6\)\(^,\)\(^{25}\)\(^,\)\(^{26}\)

There are currently limited data available across disease sites regarding the safety of combination ICI + RT, with respect to ICI target, RT fractionation, timing of therapy, and region irradiated. We sought to compare toxicity of ICI + RT to ICI alone, review evidence for differences in timing of ICI + RT administration, and to examine other factors which may affect
toxicity. We hypothesized there is no increase in toxicity due to ICI + RT therapy compared to ICI alone.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Evidence acquisition

The inclusion criteria for the literature search was defined using the Population, Intervention, Control, Outcome, Study Design (PICOS), per Table 1.\textsuperscript{27-29} The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) literature selection protocol was used for article selection, per Figure 1.\textsuperscript{30} The Meta-analyses Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) guidelines were followed.

Medical literature including clinical trials, clinical studies, comparative studies, and multicenter studies published in English was searched in PubMed, Google Scholar, and the 2019 NCCN guidelines. For ICI alone, the search terms used were: (nivolumab or ipilimumab or pembrolizumab or durvalumab or cemiplimab or atezolizumab or avelumab or tremelimumab or ctla4 or pd1 or pdl1). For ICI + RT, the search terms used were the same along with: and ("radiation therapy" or radiotherapy or radiosurgery); the ICI alone results were limited to phase III/IV clinical trials in humans. 703 ICI + RT studies and 93 ICI alone studies from PubMed were found and screened based on title to exclude non-relevant studies such as basic science and non-human studies; 12 additional non-duplicate ICI + RT records were identified from the NCCN guidelines. The studies were checked for completeness by coauthors who are both medical and radiation oncologists (EL, NZ, DT, CH). Of the 618 ICI + RT and 93 ICI alone non-duplicate remaining studies, 29 ICI + RT and 66 ICI alone full-text articles passing the title screening were reviewed for inclusion of relevant treatment and toxicity data. An additional 13 ICI + RT articles were excluded for not including grade 3-4 adverse event data, and 27 ICI alone articles excluded as subgroup analyses of trials already included (Figure 1).
Data extraction

51 full-text articles (16 ICI + RT and 35 ICI alone) were reviewed and coded into a database by two authors (CMS and EL); discrepancies were discussed with three other authors (NZ, DT, CH). Extracted data included number of patients, disease site, therapy (radiation method and/or ICI used), timing of radiation with respect to immunotherapy, radiation dose and fractionation, radionecrosis incidence, and toxicities (grade 3-4 and/or grade 5). Each study arm was coded separately, and RT alone control arms in the ICI + RT studies were excluded.

Intervention and endpoints

The intervention was radiation therapy alone (RT), immunotherapy alone (ICI), or combination radiation and immunotherapy (ICI + RT). Included ICI + RT studies could have multiple arms comparing therapies or could be single-arm studies of each intervention alone.

The primary endpoint was worst reported grade 3-4 toxicities for each patient. One study did not provide this information, and we reached out to the corresponding author for patient adverse event logs. In this case, we coded a grade 3-4 toxicity if the toxicity was “probably” or “definitely” caused by treatment.

We classified timing RT relative to ICI administration into four categories: “before” in which RT was given and completed before an ICI; “mixed” in which RT was given before the ICI and continued during ICI administration; “concurrent” in which RT was administered within 4 weeks after ICI; and “after” in which RT was administered past 8 weeks after the last ICI. We provide this timing data in Supplemental Table 3. Data were discussed by all authors to maintain reporting accuracy.
Statistical Analysis

RStudio version 3.6.1 (Boston, MA) and The Meta-Analysis Package for R (metafor v. 2.1.0) version were used to conduct the meta-analyses.\textsuperscript{31, 32} The General Package for Meta-Analysis was used to generate the forest plots. The DerSimonian and Laird method was used to perform meta-analysis of grade 3-4 toxicities.\textsuperscript{33} Univariate meta-regression of toxicities was also performed with respect to concurrency of ICI + RT, RT target, immune signaling axis targeted by ICI, malignant histology, and ICI used. Heterogeneity was assessed using the I\textsuperscript{2} statistic and the Cochran Q-Test, with significance if I\textsuperscript{2}>50\% and p<0.10 respectively.\textsuperscript{34}

Random effects models were used over fixed effects models to mitigate heterogeneity. Forest plots were generated for ICI alone and ICI + RT. Graphing of meta-regression intercepts, 95\% confidence intervals, and statistical significance by Wald test were also performed. A Bonferroni correction was applied to the p-values of the Wald-type tests for each categorical variable, so that the null hypothesis was rejected with p<0.05.

We analyzed the studies for publication bias using funnel plots (funnelR) and tested for asymmetry with Egger’s test, significant if p<0.05.\textsuperscript{35}
RESULTS

The meta-analysis included 15,398 patients across 51 studies published during the years 2004-2019. The ICI + RT studies were mainly from the United States, with two studies done in France, one study in Italy, one in Australia, and one between Belgium and Canada. The ICI alone studies included multi-national/multi-center randomized clinical trials with patients from the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Poland, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Austria, Canada, Australia, and other countries.

There were 35 studies with ICI alone arms totaling 13,956 patients (Supplemental Table 3). Disease sites include cancers of head and neck, stomach, melanoma, lung, kidney, prostate, and urothelial origin. Four studies compared ICI alone regimens to other ICI alone regimens.

Three studies assigned multiple ICI therapy to an arm (combination nivolumab with ipilimumab). The ICIs used were: anti-CTLA4 (ipilimumab, nivolumab, pembrolizumab, atezolizumab, avelumab, durvalumab).

There were 16 studies with ICI + RT arms totaling 1,442 patients (Supplemental Table 3). Of these, 507 patients were given concurrent RT and ICI, 456 were given RT courses ending before ICI administration, and the remaining 479 patients were given a combination of timings of RT with respect to ICI administration. Most studies reported a disease site of melanoma metastases to the brain; other disease sites included cancers of lung, kidney, prostate, and urothelial origin. The ICIs used were: anti-CTLA4 (ipilimumab, tremelimumab), anti-PD1 (nivolumab, pembrolizumab), and anti-PDL1 (durvalumab). Median
radiation dosage for all ICI + RT patients was 22.5 Gy / 1 fraction. One study included 473 patients who received 60 Gy in multiple fractions to the lungs,\textsuperscript{13} and two other studies totaling 434 patients delivered 8 Gy / 1 fraction to bony lesions from the prostate.\textsuperscript{17, 20, 31}

We assessed for publication bias using funnel plots and Egger’s test (Supplemental Figure 1). For ICI alone, Egger’s test gave $p=0.698$ while for ICI + RT, Egger’s test gave $p=0.258$. Since $p>0.05$ in both cases, we did not reject the null hypothesis that the funnel plots are symmetric.

According to our weighted random effects model, worst reported grade 3-4 toxicities are observed in 22.3\% (95\% confidence interval: 18.1-26.9\%) of ICI alone patients and 17.8\% (95\% CI: 12.0-24.5\%) of ICI + RT patients. Forest plots are in Figures 2A and 2B, with side-by-side comparison in Figure 2C.

Across all ICI + RT studies, only 2 patients in one multi-arm study and 1 patient in a case series were reported to experience grade 3-4 radionecrosis.\textsuperscript{5, 18} The authors did not find significant differences in radionecrosis among the RT, concurrent ICI + RT, or non-concurrent ICI + RT groups.\textsuperscript{6}

From univariate categorical meta-regression, no statistically significant differences in grade 3-4 toxicity were seen in either the timing or irradiated site for the ICI + RT studies (Figures 3A and 3B). Variables which resulted in significant differences in grade 3-4 toxicity were: the axis targeted (e.g. anti-PD1 vs anti-CTLA4, Figure 3C), the histological origin of the malignancy (e.g. HNSCC vs melanoma, Figure 3D), and the specific ICI used in the study (e.g. durvalumab vs ipilimumab, Figure 3E).
A statistically significant effect on grade 3-4 toxicity was seen with histological origin of the malignancy in the ICI alone studies (Figure 3D). Treatment of melanoma was associated with greater toxicity than treatment of NSCLC. However, this result may be confounded by the effects of anti-CTLA4 therapy, with 9 melanoma arms out of 19 total treated with ipilimumab; one additional arm was treated with the anti-CTLA4 agent tremelimumab. No such effect was seen for the ICI + RT studies.

Anti-CTLA4 therapy increased grade 3-4 toxicity compared to anti-PD1 therapy and anti-PDL1 therapy in the ICI alone studies (Figure 3C). The breakdown of specific ICIs reflects this trend in the ICI alone studies, with the anti-CTLA4 ipilimumab and tremelimumab showing increased toxicity compared to the anti-PD1 nivolumab and pembrolizumab and the anti-PDL1 atezolizumab and durvalumab (Figure 3E).

There were twenty-eight grade 5 toxicities (deaths related to treatment) observed in the phase III ICI + RT studies. Grade 5 toxicities were observed at a rate of 4.4% (21 deaths) for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC treated with adjuvant durvalumab and definitive platinum-based chemoradiotherapy, and 1.0% (7 deaths) for castration-resistant prostate cancer treated with concurrent ipilimumab and directed radiotherapy for bone metastases. No other ICI + RT study included in this meta-analysis reported any grade 5 toxicities, giving an overall grade 5 toxicity incidence of 1.9% (28 deaths out of 1,442 treated) for the ICI + RT studies. This rate was similar to the overall grade 5 toxicity incidence of the ICI alone studies, which was 1.1% (158 deaths out of 13,956 treated).
DISCUSSION

ICI + RT is currently being investigated as a treatment strategy for cancers of various origin, however there are few clinical trials with characterize the toxicity of ICI + RT compared to ICI alone. This meta-analysis indicates that around 1 in 5 patients treated with ICIs experienced treatment-related grade 3-4 toxicity, a rate paralleled in ICI + RT patients regardless of timing of ICI + RT administration. Incidence of treatment-related grade 5 toxicity was slightly higher for ICI + RT than for ICI alone, at 1.9% and 1.1% respectively. Due to the similar toxicities between ICI + RT and ICI alone, it appears that ICI + RT is a viable treatment option and warrants further study.

In the ICI alone studies, the significant heterogeneity observed may be due to differences in adverse event grading, ICI agent used, and disease site. There were some study arms with significantly higher rates of grade 3-4 toxicity.\textsuperscript{12, 46, 47, 61, 70, 71} The disease sites (i.e. melanoma, renal cell carcinoma) and ICI agents used (i.e. ipilimumab, tremelimumab, nivolumab) in these studies are similar to other studies with far lower grade 3-4 toxicity. The study by Ribas et al. reported all grade 3-4 toxicities and not treatment-related grade 3-4 toxicities.\textsuperscript{56} One study by Hodi et al. from 2014 did have high treatment-related grade 3-4 toxicities.\textsuperscript{47} Trials involving combination nivolumab with concurrent ipilimumab showed high toxicity,\textsuperscript{63, 65, 71} a result confirmed in Figure 3E, where nivolumab + ipilimumab shows significant increase in toxicity compared to all other ICIs except ipilimumab and tremelimumab alone.

The ICI + RT studies showed high heterogeneity and a smaller sample size than the ICI alone studies. Our meta-regression showed no differences in grade 3-4 toxicities with respect to timing of ICI + RT administration or the irradiated site (Figures 3A and 3B). There was an
outlier for ICI + RT grade 3-4 toxicity at 68.2%, 2-3 times as high as similar studies with anti-CTLA4 + RT treatment.9

The trend toward targeted immune checkpoint inhibitors has significantly improved outcomes in malignancies once solely treated by radiation therapy or chemotherapy, with fewer severe side effects than chemotherapy.3 By blocking anti-inflammatory signals from malignant cells, ICIs increase helper and CD8+ T cell activation, allowing for recognition and destruction of malignant cells.72 At the same time, ICIs are systemic agents and the haphazard activation of immune cells throughout the body by ICIs explains their toxicities. This may even be a target for personalized medicine, as some patients may be predisposed to certain toxicities.73

There are several proposed mechanisms by which combination ICI + RT therapy can enhance the activity of the ICI resulting in a synergistic effect. In addition to RT causing radiation-induced damage to malignant cell DNA and other cellular components, the resultant clearance of damaged tumor cells by antigen-presenting cells (APCs) increases subsequent activation of T cells by APCs, facilitated by disruption of inhibitory CTLA4 and PDL/PDL1 signals.10 For instance, stereotactic radiosurgery (SRS) is theorized to sensitize CD8+ T cells to tumor-specific antigens, and thus act as an in vivo “vaccine.”72 An immune response can sometimes be induced systemically, leading to the so-called abscopal effect.22 We may also ask if there is an “abscopal toxicity” due to sensitization of CD8+ T cells to self-antigens; this would be one possible way RT could enhance ICI toxicity.74 As subjective and clinician-dependent as toxicity grading already is, singling out toxicities caused by the combination of ICI + RT may be infeasible.

Hypofractionated or ablative RT are being investigated for increased pro-immunogenic properties and enhancing the abscopal effect, however there may be risks for increased toxicity...
as discussed above. There are several case reports of an abscopal effect when ICI is combined with RT in the human and animal models.\textsuperscript{24, 75, 76} There are also preclinical studies which show that conventional RT may have anti-immunogenic properties through induction of regulatory T cells, so further investigation of the fractionation of RT is needed to explore its effect on the immune response.\textsuperscript{77} Unfortunately, we were unable to evaluate the effect of various fractionation schemes as we did not have patient-level data. There is evidence that fractionation plays a role in toxicity, however this conclusion was made for cetuximab + RT and not ICI + RT.\textsuperscript{78} This highlights the need for high quality randomized controlled trials with various fractionations of RT in ICI + RT to further investigate the effect of fractionation on toxicities.

There were numerous other limitations to our studies. There was high heterogeneity in the studies included in our meta-analysis. However, our aim was to assess all possible toxicity from all permutations of combination ICI + RT, so this heterogeneity is expected. We addressed the heterogeneity by using a random effects model over a fixed effects model. There were no individual patient-level data. Many of the studies of ICI + RT treatment were primarily concerned with melanoma metastases to the brain, whereas the ICI alone data pooled results from a variety of cancer sites, thus we are unable to confidently generalize our ICI + RT results to other cancers and ICI + RT regimens. Another possible source of bias in our analysis could be under-reporting of toxicity in retrospective compared to prospective studies. We also were not able to control for the effect of ICI agent or dosage, and this may have affected the toxicities of experimental treatments such as the nivolumab + ipilimumab trials,\textsuperscript{65, 71} or trials which focused on effects of ICI dosing.\textsuperscript{59} Some of the differences we observed (e.g. higher rates of toxicity in melanoma vs NSCLC trials) may be related to the greater use of CTLA4-targeted therapy in melanoma trials. There were almost ten times as many patients in the ICI alone studies (13,956)
as in the ICI + RT studies (1,442). We thus may not have had sufficient statistical power to
distinguish effects of various factors on ICI + RT toxicity. Clinicians await the results of clinical
trials such as NCT03601455 (durvalumab/tremelimumab with RT) and NCT03604991
(nivolumab/ipilimumab with RT).

Based on our random effects models, adding RT to ICI therapy does not increase
incidence of grade 3-4 toxicities and the combination treatment is safe for use across a variety of
ICI agents and for CNS melanoma metastases, NSCLC, and prostate cancer. The safety of
concurrent administration of ICI + RT is of interest, as there is preliminary clinical evidence that
concurrent administration improves overall survival over non-concurrent ICI + RT. For patients
receiving an ICI, anti-CTLA4 agents such as ipilimumab and tremelimumab are associated with
worse grade 3-4 toxicities. Existing data and this analysis support combining ICI and SRS in
certain patient populations. Due to the hypothesis-generating nature of this study, further
prospective studies are needed to validate this treatment combination.
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FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1: PRISMA flow diagram

Figure 2: Forest plots and summary

A. The grade 3-4 toxicities for ICI therapy alone, with 95% confidence intervals. Each row represents a different prospective clinical trial which used an ICI (Therapy) for a malignancy (Histology). An overall random effects estimate is provided in bold. Test statistics are shown on the bottom left. Our meta-analysis shows 22.3% (95% CI: 18.1-26.9%) of patients receiving ICI alone experience grade 3-4 toxicities. Note the high heterogeneity present, with $I^2=97\%$ and Cochran’s Q-test showing significance at the $p < 0.01$ level.

B. The grade 3-4 toxicities for ICI + RT, with 95% confidence intervals. Each row represents an arm of a given study which used an ICI (Therapy) for a malignancy (Histology) as well as radiation (Irradiated Sites) with varying timing of ICI administration with respect to radiation (Timing). An overall random effects estimate is provided in bold. Test statistics are shown on the bottom left. Our meta-analysis shows 16.3% (11.1-22.3%) of patients receiving ICI + RT experience grade 3-4 toxicities. High heterogeneity is also present here, with $I^2=84\%$ and Cochran’s Q-test showing significance at the $p < 0.01$ level.

C. 95% confidence intervals for grade 3-4 toxicities for ICI alone and ICI + RT (blue). ICI + RT is further stratified by concurrency of ICI and RT administration (orange). $I^2, \chi^2$ are shown, with * indicating significant heterogeneity ($p<0.05$). Full numerical values with summary of data are shown in Supplemental Table 1. Note that the 95% confidence interval of ICI + RT grade 3-4 toxicities lies well within that of the ICI alone estimates.
**Figure 3: Stratification by factors**

Blue bars indicate ICI + RT while orange bars indicate ICI alone. * indicates statistical significance to the level of $\alpha < 0.05$. Full data are shown in Supplemental Table 2. We show the meta-regression estimates of grade 3-4 toxicities with errorbars showing 95% confidence intervals) stratified by:

A. timing of RT with respect to ICI administration. All the 95% confidence intervals overlap and there were no significant differences.

B. site which was irradiated. This variable was coded with a focus on radiation directed at the brain and radiation directed elsewhere. All the 95% confidence intervals overlap and there were no significant differences.

C. immune signaling axis targeted by the ICI used. There are significant differences in the ICI alone groups ($\alpha<0.05$), with treatments including anti-CTLA4 therapy causing increased toxicity compared to treatments without anti-CTLA4 therapy.

D. histologically determined origin of the malignancy. There are no significant differences except for between NSCLC and melanoma ($\alpha<0.05$). Histology does not appear to play a significant role in toxicity experienced.

E. the specific ICI agent(s) used. There are significant differences between therapies that contain anti-CTLA4 agents (i.e. ipilimumab, tremelimumab) compared to those that do not ($\alpha<0.05$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: PICOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICI alone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICI+RT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study design</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Few studies characterize combined immunotherapy and radiation
• Toxicities similar after adding radiation to immunotherapy
• Anti-CTLA4 associated with more toxicity than anti-PD1/PDL1
• No significant difference based on timing of immunotherapy and radiation