## Heliyon 10 (2024) e32433

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Heliyon



journal homepage: www.cell.com/heliyon

# **Research** article

# Role of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes in melanoma prognosis and treatment strategies: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Mattia Garutti <sup>a,\*,1</sup>, Rachele Bruno <sup>b,1</sup>, Jerry Polesel <sup>c</sup>, Maria Antonietta Pizzichetta <sup>a,d</sup>, Fabio Puglisi <sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> CRO Aviano, National Cancer Institute, IRCCS, 33081, Aviano, Italy

<sup>b</sup> Department of Medicine, University of Udine, 33100, Udine, Italy

<sup>c</sup> Unit of Cancer Epidemiology, Centro di Riferimento Oncologico di Aviano (CRO) IRCCS, 33081, Aviano, Italy

<sup>d</sup> Department of Dermatology, University of Trieste, 34123, Trieste, Italy

#### ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Lymphocytes Tumor-infiltrating-lymphocytes TILS Melanoma Meta-analysis

#### ABSTRACT

Purpose: Numerous studies underscore the relevance of tumor-infiltrating-lymphocytes (TILs) as important prognostic factors for melanoma. This meta-analysis aims to provide a comprehensive literature overview elucidating their role in predicting patient outcomes, specifically investigating the association between TIL density and prognosis.

Methods: From an initial pool of 6094 records, 16 met the eligibility criteria, encompassing a collective cohort of 16021 patients, Data on TIL counts, clinical characteristics, and survival metrics (5-year overall survival [5yOS], 10-year overall survival [10yOS], and 5-year melanomaspecific survival [5vMSS]) were extracted from each study and expressed as proportions. Results were graphically presented using forest plots, reporting the estimates from individual studies, summary estimates, and corresponding 95 % confidence intervals (CI).

Results: Analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in 5yOS concerning subgroup differences However, 10yOS and 5yMSS did not exhibit statistical significance. Nonetheless, a consistent trend emerged indicating a higher survival rate corresponding to increased immune cell density, ranging from absent TILs to brisk levels.

Conclusions: TILs present potential as a readily applicable prognostic factor. Yet, further investigations into their density and phenotypic subpopulation characteristics could enhance our understanding of their predictive value in tailoring optimal patient-specific therapies.

## 1. Introduction

Among skin cancers, melanoma is the third most common form [1]. It originates from the malignant transformation of melanocytes [2]. The annual incidence of malignant melanoma in Europe ranges from 5 to 12/100'000 in Mediterranean countries to 12-35/100'000 in Nordic countries, while it can exceed 50/100'000 in Australia or New Zealand [3,4]. While the average age at diagnosis is 65 years old, this cancer can occur in individuals of any age [5]. Histologically, melanoma can be classified into different subtypes, with common forms encompassing Superficial Spreading Melanoma, Nodular Melanoma, Lentigo Maligna Melanoma, and

\* Corresponding author.

Available online 6 June 2024 2405-8440/© 2024 Published by Elsevier Ltd.



E-mail address: mattia.garutti@cro.it (M. Garutti).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e32433

Received 13 March 2024; Received in revised form 11 May 2024; Accepted 4 June 2024

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

#### Acral Lentiginous Melanoma [3,6–9].

Understanding the role of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs) in melanoma helps to elucidate the mechanisms behind the local immune response against the tumor and its potential implications for disease progression and treatment outcomes. The activation of TILs and their ability to directly kill cancer cells or release immune-stimulatory molecules actively contribute to the suppression and control of the tumor growth [10–12]. TILs are primarily composed of various types of immune cells, including effector and suppressor T cells, B cells, natural killer cells, macrophages, dendritic cells, and myeloid-derived suppressor cells [13,14]. Their infiltration into the tumor microenvironment initiates a sophisticated interplay with the malignant cells, influencing the dynamics of the disease [13–17].

Different methods of classification for the immune infiltrate have been described. According to standard Clark's system, TILs are classified as "brisk" when observed throughout the substance of the vertical growth phase (diffuse) or when present and infiltrating across the entire base of the vertical growth phase (peripheral). If TILs are noted in one or more foci of the vertical growth phase, they are categorized as "non brisk", while "absent" is assigned when lymphocytes are entirely lacking or when present but fail to infiltrate the melanoma [18]. The 1989 Clark classification remains the primary method in use. However, the Melanoma Institute Australia (MIA) has introduced an innovative approach to categorize these immune cells, establishing a four-level scoring system ranging from 0 to 3. This method is determined by assessing both the density (categorized as mild, moderate, or marked) and distribution (described as focal, multifocal, or diffuse across the entire tumor extent) of lymphocytes infiltrating and disrupting tumor nests and/or in direct contact with tumor cells. TILs grades were then defined as follows: grade 0 indicates the absence of TILs, grade 1 means either a mild or moderate focal infiltrate or a mild multifocal TILs presence, grade 2 encompasses a marked focal infiltrate, a moderate or marked multifocal presence, or a mild diffuse TILs infiltrate, and grade 3 denotes a moderate or marked diffuse TILs infiltrate, and grade 3 denotes a moderate or marked diffuse TILs infiltrate, and grade 3 denotes a moderate or marked diffuse TILs infiltrate, and grade 3 denotes a moderate or marked diffuse TILs infiltrate, and grade 3 denotes a moderate or marked diffuse TILs infiltrate, and grade 3 denotes a moderate or marked diffuse TILs infiltrate, and grade 3 denotes a moderate or marked diffuse TILs infiltrate, and grade 3 denotes a moderate or marked diffuse TILs infiltrate, and grade 3 denotes a moderate or marked diffuse TILs infiltrate, and grade 3 denotes a moderate or marked diffuse TILs infilt

Moreover, recent advancements in immunotherapy have highlighted the importance of the immune system in controlling cancer, leading to the investigation of both the prognostic and therapeutic utility of TILs in melanoma [21–25]. Immunotherapeutic approaches, such as immune checkpoint inhibitors, adoptive cell transfer therapies, and cytokine-based therapies, aimed to enhance the activity of TILs, have exhibited promising results in melanoma treatment. These therapies work by blocking inhibitory pathways or by reintroducing expanded populations of TILs into the patient to bolster the immune response against tumor cells [26].

Recognizing the importance of TILs extends beyond their involvement in the local immune response to the tumor; as they also serve as cost-effective predictive biomarkers. With this understanding, we conducted a meta-analysis to investigate the prognostic value of TILs. Establishing the relationship between TILs' density within the tumor and its potential as prognostic and predictive marker is crucial for selecting tailored therapies and enhancing the management of melanoma patients through personalized care.

# 2. Materials and methods

#### 2.1. Search strategy and selection criteria

The Medline (PubMed) database was used to search for pertinent articles published in peer-reviewed journals, with the latest search update conducted on October 31, 2023. A systematic search was undertaken to identify published studies exploring the potential relationship between density of TILs in primary malignant melanoma and histopathological criteria possibly associated with survival. Only English articles were considered by submitting the following query: "("tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes" OR "tumor infiltrating lymphocytes") AND melanoma".

The selection criteria for studies included: (a) Observational studies (retrospective or prospective) or clinical trials (randomized or non-randomized), (b) focusing on melanoma, (c) studies with a sample size of at least 14 patients, and (d) providing information on TILs obtained from the initial biopsy/surgery. Reviews, systematic reviews, meta-analysis, case reports, and case series were excluded. In Studies that utilized classifications different from that of Clark [18] were also excluded. The retrieved articles were screened and selected by two independent authors (R.B. and M.G.) according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. This selection process yielded 16 eligible records.

For each included study, the risk of bias was assessed according to the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale.

#### 2.2. Data extraction

The parameters considered for inclusion in the study encompassed: author, year of publication, study design, total number of patients and categorization by Breslow thickness, 5-year overall survival (5yOS), 10-year overall survival (10yOS), 5-year disease-free-survival (5yDFS), and 5-year melanoma specific survival (5yMSS). Additionally, details regarding disease-free-survival, histological subtype, ulceration, positive sentinel lymph node, lymphatic infiltration, and vascular invasion can be found in the supplementary materials.

#### 2.3. Statistical analysis

The number of cases by TILs and clinical characteristics were extracted from each study, as well as 5yOS, 10yOS, and 5yMSS expressed as proportions. Summary estimates of these proportions, encompassing survival outcomes, were computed along with their corresponding 95 % confidence intervals (CI) utilizing random-effects models of DerSimonian and Laird [27]. These models integrate both within-study and between-study variabilities, assigning weights to each study proportional to its precision. The statistical heterogeneity among studies was assessed using the  $I^2$  and  $t^2$  statistics [27]. To evaluate publication bias, a funnel plot analysis was

conducted [28]. The results of the meta-analysis were graphically represented through forest plots, delineating estimates from individual studies, summary estimates, and their corresponding 95 % CI. Statistical significance was established for p-values less than 0.05.

# 3. Results

Based on PubMed publications, our research identified 6094 records, of which 16 met the eligibility criteria, totalling 16021 samples [12,13,29–42](Fig. 1). The primary study characteristics were outlined in Table 1. Notably, all studies exhibited a low risk of bias, scoring  $\geq$ 6 out of 8 on the Newcastle-Ottawa scale.

# 3.1. Overall survival

Data on 5-year overall survival (Fig. 2) were available for five studies [12,30,33,39,42]. Patients exhibited an 84 % survival rate with brisk TILs (95 % CI: 71–91 %), 68 % (95 % CI: 57–78 %) with non-brisk TILs, and 61 % (95 % CI: 48–72 %) with absent TILs. While subgroup differences reached statistical significance (p = 0.02), significant heterogeneity (p < 0.01) was observed across all examined groups.

When analyzing the 10-year overall survival (based on only two available studies [12,30]; see Fig. 3), patients exhibited a 79 % survival rate (95 % CI: 26–98 %) with brisk infiltrates, 51 % (95 % CI: 39–64 %) with non-brisk infiltrates, and 40 % (95 % CI: 17–69 %) with absent infiltrates. Subgroup differences did not reach statistical significance (p = 0.43), primarily due to sparse data. Moreover, significant heterogeneity (p < 0.01) was observed among the three considered groups.

### 3.2. Melanoma Specific Survival

The MSS according to TILs category is shown in Fig. 4. Patients with brisk TILs exhibited a 94 % MSS rate (95 % CI: 88–97 %), those with non-brisk TILs showed a 90 % MSS rate (95 % CI: 82–94 %), and patients with absent TILs experienced an 88 % MSS rate (95 % CI: 77–94 %). However, subgroup differences did not reach statistical significance (p = 0.34), and significant heterogeneity (p < 0.01) was evident across all three groups.

## 3.3. Breslow thickness

Breslow I (i.e.,  $T \le 1 \text{ mm}$ ) was more frequently observed among patients with brisk TILs (52 %; 95 % CI: 26–78 %), followed by those with non-brisk TILs (47 %; 95 % CI: 21–74 %) and patients with absent TILs (43 %; 95 % CI: 20–69 %; Fig. 5). A similar trend was noticed for Breslow II (1.0–2.0 mm), which was more prevalent in brisk TILs (26 %; 95 % CI:14–45 %) compared to non-brisk TILs (20 %; 95 % CI: 10–36 %) and absent TILs (19 %; 95 % CI: 11–30 %).

Conversely, an inversion of this trend emerged concerning Breslow III (2–4 mm) and Breslow IV (T > 4 mm). Only 11 % (95 % CI: 6–20 %) of patients with brisk TILs, 15 % (95 % CI: 9–24 %) with non-brisk TILs, and 17 % (95 % CI: 10–26 %) with absent TILs presented with Breslow III thickness. Moreover, 4 % (95 % CI: 1–15 %) of patients with brisk TILs, 10 % (95 % CI: 6–18 %) with non-



Fig. 1. PRISMA flow chart of study inclusion process [43].

#### Table 1

Samples enrolled in the meta-analysis.

Publication	Country	Period	Patients				NOS score <sup>a</sup>
			Total	Brisk	Non-brisk	Absent	
Vita et al.	Romania	2023	79	26	47	6	6
Morrison et al.	USA	2022	3201	691	1691	745	7
Straker et al.	USA	2022	1017	87	759	171	7
Zaladonis et al.	USA	2021	669	51	359	259	6
Yang et al.	USA	2021	2624	274	1916	434	6
Gata et al.	Romania	2020	114	68	46	0	6
Saldanha et al.	UK	2017	655	161	464	30	6
Weiss et al.	China	2016	1241	523	330	388	6
Dionizy et al.	Poland	2015	104	52	34	18	6
Thomas et al.	USA	2013	2827	509	2108	690	6
Burton et al.	USA	2011	515	100	415	0	7
Rao et al.	USA	2010	293	40	156	97	6
Mandalà et al.	Italy	2009	1251	114	436	701	6
Taylor et al.	USA	2007	887	51	641	195	7
Tuthill et al.	USA	2002	259	30	98	131	7
Clemente et al.	Italy	1996	285	47	133	105	8

<sup>a</sup> NOS: Newcaste-Ottawa Scale.

Study Pa	atients				5-ye	ar OS	(95% CI)
Brisk							
Yang et al, 2021	274					0.85	(0.80-0.89)
Burton et al, 2011	100					0.95	(0.89-0.98)
Rao et al, 2010	40					0.72	(0.56-0.85)
Tuthill et al, 2002	30					1.00	(0.88-1.00)
Clemente et al, 1996	47				-	0.77	(0.62-0.88)
Subtotal (Random effects)	491					0.84	(0.71-0.91)
Heterogeneity: $l^2$ =76%, $\tau^2$ =0.66	6, p<0.01						
Non–Brisk							
Yang et al, 2021	1916				+	0.74	(0.72-0.76)
Burton et al, 2011	415			_		0.84	(0.80-0.87)
Rao et al, 2010	156		_	╘╘╴		0.54	(0.46-0.62)
Tuthill et al, 2002	98			_ +	_	0.71	(0.61-0.80)
Clemente et al, 1996	133		_	•		0.53	(0.44-0.61)
Subtotal (Random effects)	2718			$\langle \rangle$		0.68	(0.57-0.78)
Heterogeneity: $l^2$ =95%, $\tau^2$ =0.4	1, p<0.01						
Absent							
Yang et al, 2021	418				4	0.71	(0.66-0.75)
Rao et al, 2010	97			-		0.54	(0.43-0.64)
Tuthill et al, 2002	131				-	0.71	(0.62 - 0.79)
Clemente et al, 1996	105					0.37	(0.28-0.47)
Subtotal (Random effects)	751		-		-	0.61	(0.48-0.72)
Heterogeneity: $l^2$ =93%, $\tau^2$ =0.43	3, p<0.01						
Total (Random effects)	3960					0 71	(0 63-0 78)
Heterogeneity: $l^2=93\%$ $\tau^2=0.69$	9. p<0.01					÷., i	(0.00 0.10)
Test for subgroup differences:	p=0.02 0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8 1		

Fig. 2. Forest plot for 5-year overall survival according to TILs category.

brisk TILs, and 14 % (95 % CI: 8–22 %) with absent TILs were classified as stage IV (Fig. 5). Overall, a tendency toward thicker tumors was observed among patients with absent TILs compared to those with brisk TILs, although subgroup differences did not reach statistical significance (p = 0.20).

# 3.4. Additional findings

The main objective of this meta-analysis is to investigate whether tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes are able to predict survival among patients with cutaneous melanoma. However, the data gathered from existing studies allow for an assessment of the association between TILs grades (classified as brisk, non-brisk, and absent) and other prognostic histopathological and clinical features of the tumor.

Study P	Patients		10-year OS	(95% CI)
Brisk		;		
Tuthill et al, 2002	30	-	0.93	(0.78-0.99)
Clemente et al, 1996	47		0.55	(0.40-0.70)
Subtotal (Random effects)	) 77		0.79	(0.26-0.98)
Heterogeneity: $l^2$ =89%, $\tau^2$ =2.6	63, p<0.01			
Non–Brisk				
Tuthill et al, 2002	98		0.58	(0.48-0.68)
Clemente et al, 1996	133	<b></b>	0.45	(0.36-0.54)
Subtotal (Random effects)	) 231		0.51	(0.39-0.64)
Heterogeneity: $l^2$ =74%, $\tau^2$ =0.1	0, p=0.05			
Absent				
Tuthill et al, 2002	131		0.55	(0.46-0.64)
Clemente et al, 1996	105		0.27	(0.19-0.36)
Subtotal (Random effects)	236		0.40	(0.17-0.69)
Heterogeneity: $l^2=95\%$ , $\tau^2=0.6$	69, p<0.01			
Total (Random effects)	544		0.55	(0.36-0.73)
Heterogeneity:/2=87%, $\tau^2$ =0.8	3. p<0.01			
Test for subgroup differences	:p=0.43 0	0.2 0.4 0.6 0.	8 1	

Fig. 3. Forest plot for 10-year overall survival according to TILs category.

Study	Patients				5-year	MSS	(95% CI)
Brisk					1		
Morrison et al. 2022	691					0.91	(0.88-0.93)
Straker Ir et al 2022	87					0.92	$(0.84 \ 0.97)$
Thomas et al. 2013	509					0.97	(0.95 - 0.98)
Subtotal (Random effect	s) 1287				-	0.94	(0.88-0.97)
Heterogeneity: $l^2=88\%$ $\tau^2=$	0.38 p<0.01					••••	(0.00 0.01)
	0.00, p 10.01				1		
Non-Brisk							
Morrison et al, 2022	1691				-+	0.85	(0.84-0.87)
Straker Jr et al, 2022	759					0.87	(0.85 - 0.90)
Thomas et al, 2013	2108				+	0.94	(0.93-0.95)
Subtotal (Random effect	ts) <b>4558</b>				-	0.90	(0.82-0.94)
Heterogeneity: $l^2=97\%$ , $\tau^2=$	0.27, p<0.01						. ,
0							
Absent							
Morrison et al, 2022	745					0.79	(0.75-0.81)
Straker Jr et al, 2022	171					0.89	(0.83-0.93)
Thomas et al, 2013	690					0.93	(0.91-0.95)
Subtotal (Random effect	ts) <b>1606</b>				-	0.88	(0.77-0.94)
Heterogeneity: $l^2=97\%$ , $\tau^2=$	, 0.43. p<0.01						,
<b>C P</b>					1		
Total (Random effects)	7451					0.91	(0.86-0.94)
Heterogeneity: $l^2=96\%$ , $\tau^2=$	0.37, p<0.01	I	I				. ,
Test for subgroup difference	es: p=0.34 0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8 1		

Fig. 4. Forest plot for Melanoma Specific Survival according to TILs category.

Data reporting estimates pertaining to 5-year disease free survival, ulceration, sentinel lymph node involvement, lymphatic invasion, and vascular invasion can be found in Supplementary Materials.

# 4. Discussion

Melanoma, acknowledged as the most aggressive form skin cancer, is an immunogenic tumor [3,5,10,44–47]. Thus, through the review of studies conducted to date, this meta-analysis aims to assess the association between TILs and patient outcomes, investigating whether their density is related to prognosis.

Accurate prognostic prediction is crucial in selecting appropriate therapies. However, the current dearth of robust biomarkers poses

Breslow		Breslow II	
Study	Proportion [95%]CI]	Study	Proportion [95%]CI]
TILs = Brisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 97%, τ <sup>2</sup> = 1,3409, p < 0.01	0.58 [0.52; 0.64] 0.80 [0.76; 0.83] 0.53 [0.43; 0.62] 0.18 [0.08; 0.31] <b>0.52 [0.26; 0.78]</b>	TiLs = Brisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 93\%, r^2 = 0.6236, p < 0.01$	0.24 [0.19; 0.30] 0.15 [0.12; 0.18] 0.22 [0.15; 0.31] 0.55 [0.40; 0.69] <b>0.26 [0.14; 0.45]</b>
TiLs = NonIBrisk         Yang et al, 2021         Thomas et al, 2013         Mandalà et al, 2009         Taylor et al, 2007         Random effects model         Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 100\%$ , $r^2 = 1.4500$ , $p < 0.01$	0.40 [0.37; 0.42] 0.66 [0.64; 0.68] 0.72 [0.68; 0.76] 0.15 [0.13; 0.18] 0.47 [0.21; 0.74]	TILs = Non@Brisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%, r^2 = 0.7066, p < 0.01$	0.24 [0.22; 0.26] 0.09 [0.08; 0.10] 0.14 [0.11; 0.18] 0.42 [0.38; 0.46] <b>0.20 [0.10; 0.36]</b>
TiLs = Absent Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$ , $\tau^2 = 1,2277$ , $\rho < 0.01$	0.39 [0.35; 0.44] 0.58 [0.55; 0.62] 0.67 [0.64; 0.71] 0.14 [0.09; 0.20] <b>0.43 [0.20; 0.69]</b>	TILs = Absent Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 96\%$ , $r^2 = 0.421$ , $\rho < 0.01$	0.25 [0.21; 0.29] 0.11 [0.09; 0.14] 0.12 [0.10; 0.15] 0.33 [0.26; 0.40] <b>0.19 [0.11; 0.30]</b>
Random effects model	0.47 [0.33; 0.62]	Random effects model	0.21 [0.15; 0.29]
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$ , $\tau^2 = 1.1190$ , $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi^2_2 = 0.23$ , df = 2 ( $p = 0.89$ )	1	0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.5086$ , $\rho < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi^2_2 = 0.78$ , df = 2 ( $\rho$ = 0.68)	1
Breslow III		Breslow IV	
Breslow III Study	Proportion [95%]]Cl]	Breslow IV Study	Proportion [95%]CI]
Breslow III           Study           TILs = Brisk           Yang et al, 2021           Thomas et al, 2013           Mandala et al, 2009           Taylor et al, 2007           Random effects model           Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 87%, T <sup>2</sup> = 0.3912, p < 0.01	Proportion [95%[]Cl] 0.05 [0.03; 0.07] 0.14 [0.06; 0.22] 0.22 [0.11; 0.35] 0.11 [0.06; 0.20]	Breslow IV Study TILs = Brisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 86\%, r^2 = .8508, p < 0.01$	Proportion [95%[ICI] 0.06 [0.04; 0.10] 0.00 [0.00; 0.01] 0.11 [0.06; 0.19] 0.06 [0.01; 0.16] 0.04 [0.01; 0.15]
Breslow III Study TILs = Brisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandala et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 87%, T <sup>2</sup> = 0.3912, p < 0.01 TILs = NonDBrisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandala et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 96%, T <sup>2</sup> = 0.2963, p < 0.01	Proportion [95%[]Cl] 0.11 [0.08; 0.16] 0.05 [0.03; 0.07] 0.14 [0.08; 0.22] 0.22 [0.11; 0.35] 0.11 [0.06; 0.20] 0.17 [0.15; 0.19] 0.14 [0.12; 0.15] 0.08 [0.06; 0.11] 0.26 [0.23; 0.30] 0.15 [0.09; 0.24]	Breslow IV Study TILs = Brisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalé et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 86\%, r^2 = .8508, p < 0.01$ TILs = NonIBrisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalé et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 97\%, r^2 = 0.4073, p < 0.01$	Proportion [95%[]Cl] 0.06 [0.04; 0.10] 0.01 [0.06; 0.01] 0.06 [0.01; 0.16] 0.04 [0.01; 0.15] 0.16 [0.14; 0.18] 0.08 [0.07; 0.09] 0.05 [0.03; 0.07] 0.17 [0.14; 0.20] 0.10 [0.06; 0.18]
Bresiow III Study TILs = Brisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Thomas et al, 2019 Taylor et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 87\%$ , $T^2 = 0.3912$ , $p < 0.01$ TILs = NonIBrisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Thomas et al, 2019 Taylor et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 96\%$ , $T^2 = 0.2663$ , $p < 0.01$	Proportion [95%]Cl] 0.11 [0.08; 0.16] 0.05 [0.03; 0.07] 0.14 [0.06; 0.22] 0.22 [0.11; 0.35] 0.11 [0.06; 0.20] 0.14 [0.12; 0.15] 0.08 [0.06; 0.11] 0.26 [0.23; 0.30] 0.15 [0.99; 0.24] 0.16 [0.13; 0.20] 0.13 [0.10; 0.16] 0.11 [0.09; 0.13] 0.32 [0.26; 0.39] 0.17 [0.10; 0.26]	Breslow IV Study TILs = Brisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 86\%, r^2 = .8508, p < 0.01$ TILs = NonIBrisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 97\%, r^2 = 6.4073, p < 0.01$	Proportion [95%[IC1] 0.06 [0.04; 0.10] 0.01 [0.06; 0.01] 0.11 [0.06; 0.19] 0.06 [0.01; 0.16] 0.04 [0.01; 0.15] 0.16 [0.14; 0.18] 0.08 [0.07; 0.09] 0.05 [0.03; 0.07] 0.17 [0.14; 0.20] 0.10 [0.06; 0.18] 0.20 [0.16; 0.24] 0.13 [0.11; 0.16] 0.07 [0.05; 0.09] 0.21 [0.15; 0.27] 0.14 [0.08; 0.22]
Breslow III Study TILs = Brisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandala et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 87\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.3912$ , $p < 0.01$ TILs = NonIBrisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandala et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 96\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.2663$ , $p < 0.01$ TILs = Absent Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Thomas et al, 2014 Thomas et al, 2015 Thomas et al, 2015 Mandala et al, 2019 Thomas et al, 2017 Thomas et al, 2017 Thoma	Proportion [95%[]Cl] 0.11 [0.08; 0.16] 0.05 [0.03; 0.07] 0.14 [0.08; 0.22] 0.22 [0.11; 0.35] 0.11 [0.06; 0.20] 0.17 [0.15; 0.19] 0.14 [0.12; 0.15] 0.08 [0.06; 0.11] 0.26 [0.23; 0.30] 0.15 [0.09; 0.24] 0.16 [0.13; 0.20] 0.13 [0.10; 0.16] 0.11 [0.09; 0.23] 0.17 [0.10; 0.26] 0.14 [0.11; 0.19]	Breslow IV Study TILs = Brisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 86\%, r^2 = 85508, p < 0.01$ TILs = NonIBrisk Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 97\%, r^2 = 6.4073, p < 0.01$ TILs = Absent Yang et al, 2021 Thomas et al, 2013 Mandalà et al, 2009 Taylor et al, 2007 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%, r^2 = 0.3159, p < 0.01$	Proportion [95%[ICI] 0.06 [0.04; 0.10] 0.01 [0.00; 0.01] 0.11 [0.06; 0.19] 0.06 [0.01; 0.16] 0.04 [0.01; 0.15] 0.16 [0.14; 0.18] 0.08 [0.07; 0.09] 0.55 [0.03; 0.07] 0.17 [0.14; 0.20] 0.10 [0.06; 0.18] 0.20 [0.16; 0.24] 0.31 [0.11; 0.16] 0.07 [0.05; 0.09] 0.21 [0.15; 0.27] 0.14 [0.08; 0.22] 0.09 [0.06; 0.14]

Fig. 5. Forest plot for prevalence of Breslow stage according to TILs category.

a challenge. As our comprehension of tumor biology advances, the staging system has undergone multiple revisions. Currently, the 8th edition American Joint Committee con Cancer (AJCC) melanoma staging system [48] stands as the most widely accepted framework for initial diagnosis. It aids in risk stratification for patients and provides guidance for treatment [48,49]. A comprehensive grasp of prognostic factors and the staging of cutaneous melanoma holds significance for initial case assessment, treatment planning, surveillance strategy formulation, and the design and analysis of clinical trials [48,50]. As a result, there is an ongoing search for new prognostic markers and the development of models aimed at refining the prediction of patient outcomes.

Our meta-analysis specifically included studies categorizing the density and distribution pattern of lymphocytes within the tumor as brisk, non-brisk, or absent, adhering to Clark's classification (1989)(18). The association between tumor-infiltrating-lymphocytes density and prognosis has been consistently observed. Overall survival refers to the period of time from the diagnosis of cancer until the death of the patient from any cause [51]. Regarding 5-year overall survival, several studies claim that the immune cells infiltrate is a statistically significant prognostic factor [12,30,34,39,52]. Instead, in certain instances, the difference in OS is only marginally significant across the three groups [33]. Investigation through a meta-analysis provided a quantitative synthesis of these reports, indicating that TILs present a statistically significant correlation with a favorable prognosis for the OS.

Regrettably, due to the limited dataset regarding 10-year overall survival, reliable data cannot be obtained through statistical analysis [12,30]. Despite this, it is possible to notice a positive trend between survival and immune infiltrate, where a higher density of TILs (absent, non-brisk and brisk) corresponds a better survival rate. Hopefully, additional studies aimed to investigate this relationship will contribute valuable insights.

Nevertheless, we observed a higher 5-year Melanoma Specific Survival when brisk TILs were present (94 % vs 88 %), although statistical significance was not reached. MSS survival refers to the percentage of patients who have not died from melanoma within 5 years. Its link to TILs could potentially play a significant role as part of personalized medicine, as their examination allows for the evaluation of an individual's specific immune response against cancer [34,40,41]. This means that by analyzing their quantity and activity, clinicians could tailor therapies on a personalized basis. Moreover, several studies have suggested a relationship between immune infiltration and tumor thickness. The Breslow classification is used to indicate the depth of melanoma invasion from the surface of the epidermis to the deepest point of tumor penetration into the skin. Thickness is then divided into four stages: T1  $\leq$  1 mm, T2 1.0–2.0 mm, T3 2–4 mm, T4 > 4 mm [53]. Based on the data available in this review, it seems that when the tumor is small or in its early stages, the immune system still has en effect, as evidenced by the higher presence of TILs in thinner melanoma [31,34,39]. In fact, Fig. 5 shows that Breslow I (T  $\leq$  1) is more frequently found among patients with brisk TILs, while Breslow IV (T > 4 mm) is more prevalent among those with absent TILs. It is established that one of the cancer's hallmarks is its ability to evade the immune system, which conversely endeavors to suppress its growth [54]. These findings further support the notion that when the tumor proliferates, it has found a way to elude the patient's defense response [11,55,56]. Still, this intricate relationship necessitates additional studies to fully comprehend how TILs density influences the development and progression of melanoma. Such insights could offer guidance for more precise therapeutic decisions, potentially enhancing treatment effectiveness and optimizing outcomes for individual cases.

An additional challenge regarding TILs is understanding whether, in addition to their role as prognostic markers, they also serve as predictive markers. Prognostic markers typically predict cancer outcomes, such as survival or disease recurrence, while predictive markers are specifically associated with treatment, identifying which patients are likely to benefit from a particular therapy.

Immunotherapy todays comprises different options: immunomodulatory strategies that enhance the body's natural anti-tumor immune response; vaccination protocols designed to sensitize the immune system against the autologous tumor; and adoptive cell transfer (ACT) which involves ex vivo expanded immune effector populations specifically targeting cancer antigens [11,57–59].

In recent years, the realm of melanoma immunotherapy has witnessed considerable progress, particularly following the unveiling of monoclonal antibodies targeting immune checkpoint inhibitors, notably cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated antigen 4 (CTLA-4) and programmed cell death protein 1 (PD-1) [22,60,61]. Nonetheless, approximately 60 % of patients fail to derive benefits from immunotherapy [62]. Based on these premises, the identification of predictive biomarkers for the selection of responders is an emerging need. On one hand, there exist expensive markers -such as tumor mutation burden, circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA), and specific mutations-that are not consistently available. On the other hand, less costly markers, like lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) and neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR), can be easily assessed via a blood sample. However, these markers have yet to demonstrate consistent predictive value [63].

Therefore, the importance of investingating whether TILs can contribute to the basis of a personalized medicine becomes evident. In this scenario, artificial intelligence, especially Machine Learning, can play a pivotal role in predicting melanoma prognosis. Its purpose is to scrutinize extensive datasets encompassing various patient information, including biomarkers [64], and build algorithms able of identifying pertinent features associated with melanoma progression, helping the creation of predictive models. However, further studies on the immune cells are necessary, including a more comprehensive investigation of features as density, localization, and phenotype, before definitive statements can be made regarding their role in treatment selection [65].

To provide a comprehensive understanding of the meta-analysis's reliability, it is crucial to consider the study's limitations. Primarily, the absence of a standardized and universally adopted classification system for TILs could introduce potential heterogeneity across studies. Given our decision to adhere to the Clark method, categorizing immune cells as brisk, non-brisk, and absent, it became necessary to exclude studies that employed different stratifications of TILs, such as the MIA grading system (0–3).

Stratification of the results is also a key limitation. Although the Clark classification is used in the eligible studies for a first layering, some of them later subdivide TILs as "present" (including brisk and non-brisk) and "absent" (40,66–69). To enhance data consistency, studies employing this criterion of subdivision were excluded.

It is important to note that biomarkers might exhibit different prognostic values across distinct histological subtypes and tumor stages. However, many studies did not specify stratification for these groups. Therefore, a more comprehensive categorization could provide deeper insights into distinctions among patients or tumor subgroups. Moreover, our analysis did not encompass treatment modalities due to limited mentions in the studies. Given that different therapies operate through distinct mechanisms, the prognostic significance of TILs is likely influenced by the employed therapy. Therefore, future analyses should incorporate various treatment modalities among patient to better understand the role of TILs. An in-depth description of TILs' phenotype is also crucial. Existing studies did not include stratification of lymphocytes based on their subpopulations, known to be diverse within the microenvironment mainly composed of effector T lymphocytes, regular T lymphocytes, natural killer cells, dendritic cells, and macrophages [10,66].

## 5. Conclusions

To date, a significant body of evidence suggests that tumor-infiltrating-lymphocytes serve as critical prognostic factors for patients with melanoma, influencing treatment choices, postoperative care, and survival rate. This meta-analysis provides a literature overview about the role of TILs in predicting melanoma outcome. Our analysis, based on key studies, revealed that only the 5-year overall survival reached statistical significance when tested for subgroup differences. Nonetheless, there is a noticeable trend indicating improved survival with increasing immune cells density (from absent TILs to brisk). Additionally, a comprehensive characterization of TILs, coupled with a universal accepted staging system, could serve as a valuable tool for clinicians, aiding them in selecting appropriate treatment strategies and managing melanoma patients with a focus on tailored therapeutic approaches.

Furthermore, machine learning has emerged as a transformative force in medicine due to its ability to analyze vast medical

#### M. Garutti et al.

datasets. Our study provides evidence that TILs perform different functions in melanoma. They could potentially serve as therapeutic targets and aid in predicting and optimizing responses to melanoma immunotherapy. Therefore, integrating TILs into a prognostic and/or predictive algorithm could help develop a model capable of predicting cancer prognosis and response to immunotherapy. However, for further exploration of tumor-infiltrating-lymphocytes as predictive biomarkers in clinical practice, future research is crucial. Establishing a standardized stratification system based on the same TILs classification, which also incorporates TILs subtypes, is essential for advancing this field.

#### Funding

This work was supported by the Italian Ministry of Health (Ricerca Corrente).

## CRediT authorship contribution statement

Mattia Garutti: Writing – review & editing, Validation, Supervision, Project administration, Methodology, Data curation, Conceptualization. Rachele Bruno: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Investigation, Data curation. Jerry Polesel: Writing – review & editing, Visualization, Validation, Supervision, Software, Methodology, Formal analysis, Data curation. Maria Antonietta Pizzichetta: Writing – review & editing, Validation, Supervision. Fabio Puglisi: Writing – review & editing, Validation, Supervision.

#### Declaration of competing interest

M.G. reports receipts of honoraria or consultation fees from Novartis, Eli Lilly, PierreFabre, Roche, MSD, Daichii Sankyo, Organon and travel fees from Daichii Sankyo, all outside the submitted work. F.P. reports the receipt of grants/research support from Astra-Zeneca, Eisai, and Roche, and receipts of honoraria or consultation fees from Amgen, Astra-Zeneca, Daichii Sankyo, Celgene, Eisai, Eli Lilly, Gilead, GSK, Ipsen, MSD, Novartis, Pierre-Fabre, Pfizer, Roche, Seagen, Takeda, Menarini, and Viatris, all outside the submitted work.

#### Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e32433.

## References

- M. Perez, J.A. Abisaad, K.D. Rojas, M.A. Marchetti, N. Jaimes, Skin cancer: primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention. Part I, J. Am. Acad. Dermatol. 87 (2) (2022 Aug) 255–268.
- [2] G. Turcu, R.I. Nedelcu, D.A. Ion, A. Brînzea, M.D. Cioplea, L.B. Jilaveanu, et al., CEACAM1: expression and role in melanocyte transformation, Dis. Markers 2016 (2016) 1–8.
- [3] D.E. Elder, B.C. Bastian, I.A. Cree, D. Massi, R.A. Scolyer, The 2018 world Health organization classification of cutaneous, mucosal, and uveal melanoma: detailed analysis of 9 distinct subtypes defined by their evolutionary pathway, Arch. Pathol. Lab Med. 144 (4) (2020 Apr 1) 500–522.
- [4] L.M. Hollestein, S.A.W. Van Den Akker, T. Nijsten, H.E. Karim-Kos, J.W. Coebergh, E. De Vries, Trends of cutaneous melanoma in The Netherlands: increasing incidence rates among all Breslow thickness categories and rising mortality rates since 1989, Ann. Oncol. 23 (2) (2012 Feb) 524–530.
- [5] O. Michielin, A.C.J. Van Akkooi, P.A. Ascierto, R. Dummer, U. Keilholz, Cutaneous melanoma: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up, Ann. Oncol. 30 (12) (2019 Dec) 1884–1901.
- [6] G. Briatico, P. Mancuso, G. Argenziano, C. Longo, L. Mangone, E. Moscarella, et al., Trends in cutaneous melanoma mortality in Italy from 1982 to 2016, Int. J. Dermatol. 61 (10) (2022 Oct) 1237–1244.
- [7] D.C. Whiteman, W.J. Pavan, B.C. Bastian, The melanomas: a synthesis of epidemiological, clinical, histopathological, genetic, and biological aspects, supporting distinct subtypes, causal pathways, and cells of origin: the melanomas, Pigment Cell Melanoma Res. 24 (5) (2011 Oct) 879–897.
- [8] M. Bobos, Histopathologic classification and prognostic factors of melanoma: a 2021 update, Ital J Dermatol Venereol 156 (3) (2021 Jul). https://www.minervamedica.it/index2.php?show=R23Y2021N03A0300. (Accessed 20 December 2023).
- [9] S. Carr, C. Smith, J. Wernberg, Epidemiology and risk factors of melanoma, Surg. Clin. 100 (1) (2020 Feb) 1–12.
- [10] M. Antohe, R. Nedelcu, L. Nichita, C. Popp, M. Cioplea, A. Brinzea, et al., Tumor infiltrating lymphocytes: the regulator of melanoma evolution, Oncol. Lett. (2019 Jan 16) (Review), http://www.spandidos-publications.com/10.3892/ol.2019.9940. (Accessed 19 November 2023).
- [11] T. Schatton, R.A. Scolyer, J.F. Thompson, M.C. Mihm, Tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes and their significance in melanoma prognosis, in: M. Thurin, F. M. Marincola (Eds.), Molecular Diagnostics for Melanoma, Humana Press, Totowa, NJ, 2014, pp. 287–324 (Methods in Molecular Biology; vol. 1102), https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-62703-727-3\_16. (Accessed 14 November 2023).
- [12] C.G. Clemente, M.C. Mihm, R. Bufalino, S. Zurrida, P. Collini, N. Cascinelli, Prognostic value of tumor infiltrating lymphocytes in the vertical growth phase of primary cutaneous melanoma, Cancer 77 (7) (1996 Apr 1) 1303–1310.
- [13] S.A. Weiss, S.W. Han, K. Lui, J. Tchack, R. Shapiro, R. Berman, et al., Immunologic heterogeneity of tumor-infiltrating lymphocyte composition in primary melanoma, Hum. Pathol. 57 (2016 Nov) 116–125.
- [14] A. Mantovani, P. Allavena, A. Sica, F. Balkwill, Cancer-related inflammation, Nature 454 (7203) (2008 Jul 24) 436-444.
- [15] M.R. Bernsen, J.H.S. Diepstra, P. Van Mil, C.J. Punt, C.G. Figdor, G.N. Van Muijen, et al., Presence and localization of T-cell subsets in relation to melanocyte differentiation antigen expression and tumour regression as assessed by immunohistochemistry and molecular analysis of microdissected T cells, J. Pathol. 202 (1) (2004 Jan) 70–79.
- [16] F. Piras, R. Colombari, L. Minerba, D. Murtas, C. Floris, C. Maxia, et al., The predictive value of CD8, CD4, CD68, and human leukocyte antigen-D-related cells in the prognosis of cutaneous malignant melanoma with vertical growth phase, Cancer 104 (6) (2005 Sep 15) 1246–1254.

- [17] F. Azimi, R.A. Scolyer, P. Rumcheva, M. Moncrieff, R. Murali, S.W. McCarthy, et al., Tumor-infiltrating lymphocyte grade is an independent predictor of sentinel lymph node status and survival in patients with cutaneous melanoma, J. Clin. Oncol. 30 (21) (2012 Jul 20) 2678–2683.
- [18] W.H. Clark, D.E. Elder, D. Guerry, L.E. Braitman, B.J. Trock, D. Schultz, et al., Model predicting survival in stage I melanoma based on tumor progression, JNCI J Natl Cancer Inst 81 (24) (1989 Dec 20) 1893–1904.
- [19] F.D.M.D. Santos, F.C.D. Silva, J. Pedron, R.D. Furian, C. Fortes, R.R. Bonamigo, Association between tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes and sentinel lymph node positivity in thin melanoma, An. Bras. Dermatol. 94 (1) (2019 Feb) 47–51.
- [20] C.A. Angeramo, F. Laxague, E.D. Armella, Catán J. Rodríguez, F.A. Vigovich, N.A. Mezzadri, et al., Tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes in patients with melanoma: which is its prognostic value? Indian J Surg Oncol 12 (4) (2021 Dec) 770–775.
- [21] J. Weber, M. Mandala, M. Del Vecchio, H.J. Gogas, A.M. Arance, C.L. Cowey, et al., Adjuvant nivolumab versus ipilimumab in resected stage III or IV melanoma, N. Engl. J. Med. 377 (19) (2017 Nov 9) 1824–1835.
- [22] A.M.M. Eggermont, V. Chiarion-Sileni, J.J. Grob, R. Dummer, J.D. Wolchok, H. Schmidt, et al., Prolonged survival in stage III melanoma with ipilimumab adjuvant therapy, N. Engl. J. Med. 375 (19) (2016 Nov 10) 1845–1855.
- [23] A.M.M. Eggermont, C.U. Blank, M. Mandala, G.V. Long, V. Atkinson, S. Dalle, et al., Adjuvant pembrolizumab versus placebo in resected stage III melanoma, N. Engl. J. Med. 378 (19) (2018 May 10) 1789–1801.
- [24] G.V. Long, A. Hauschild, M. Santinami, V. Atkinson, M. Mandalà, V. Chiarion-Sileni, et al., Adjuvant dabrafenib plus trametinib in stage III BRAF -mutated melanoma, N. Engl. J. Med. 377 (19) (2017 Nov 9) 1813–1823.
- [25] D. Iacono, M. Cinausero, L. Gerratana, V. Angione, C.A. Scott, G. De Maglio, et al., Tumour-infiltrating lymphocytes, programmed death ligand 1 and cyclooxygenase-2 expression in skin melanoma of elderly patients: clinicopathological correlations, Melanoma Res. 28 (6) (2018 Dec) 547–554.
- [26] N. Lee, L.R. Zakka, M.C. Mihm, T. Schatton, Tumour-infiltrating lymphocytes in melanoma prognosis and cancer immunotherapy, Pathology 48 (2) (2016 Feb) 177–187.
- [27] S.L.T. Normand, Meta-analysis: formulating, evaluating, combining, and reporting, Stat. Med. 18 (3) (1999 Feb 15) 321-359.
- [28] J.A.C. Sterne, M. Egger, Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis: guidelines on choice of axis, J. Clin. Epidemiol. 54 (10) (2001), 1046–55.
   [29] O. Vita, A. Jurescu, A. Văduva, R. Cornea, M. Cornianu, S. Tăban, et al., Invasive cutaneous melanoma: evaluating the prognostic significance of some
- parameters associated with lymph node metastases, Medicina (Mex). 59 (7) (2023 Jul 3) 1241.
  [30] R.J. Tuthill, J.M. Unger, P.Y. Liu, L.E. Flaherty, V.K. Sondak, Risk assessment in localized primary cutaneous melanoma: a southwest oncology group study evaluating nine factors and a test of the Clark logistic regression prediction model, Am. J. Clin. Pathol. 118 (4) (2002 Oct) 504–511.
- [31] R.C. Taylor, A. Patel, K.S. Panageas, K.J. Busam, M.S. Brady, Tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes predict sentinel lymph node positivity in patients with cutaneous melanoma, J. Clin. Oncol. 25 (7) (2007 Mar 1) 869–875.
- [32] M. Mandalà, G.L. Imberti, D. Piazzalunga, M. Belfiglio, R. Labianca, M. Barberis, et al., Clinical and histopathological risk factors to predict sentinel lymph node positivity, disease-free and overall survival in clinical stages I–II AJCC skin melanoma: outcome analysis from a single-institution prospectively collected database, Eur. J. Cancer 45 (14) (2009 Sep) 2537–2545.
- [33] U.N.M. Rao, S.J. Lee, W. Luo, M.C. Mihm, J.M. Kirkwood, Presence of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes and a dominant nodule within primary melanoma are prognostic factors for relapse-free survival of patients with thick (T4) primary melanoma, Am. J. Clin. Pathol. 133 (4) (2010 Apr 1) 646–653.
- [34] N.E. Thomas, K.J. Busam, L. From, A. Kricker, B.K. Armstrong, H. Anton-Culver, et al., Tumor-infiltrating lymphocyte grade in primary melanomas is independently associated with melanoma-specific survival in the population-based genes, environment and melanoma study, J. Clin. Oncol. 31 (33) (2013 Nov 20) 4252–4259.
- [35] P. Donizy, M. Kaczorowski, A. Halon, M. Leskiewicz, C. Kozyra, R. Matkowski, Paucity of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes is an unfavorable prognosticator and predicts lymph node metastases in cutaneous melanoma patients, Anticancer Res. (2015).
- [36] G. Saldanha, K. Flatman, K.W. Teo, M. Bamford, A novel numerical scoring system for melanoma tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes has better prognostic value than standard scoring, Am. J. Surg. Pathol. 41 (7) (2017 Jul) 906–914.
- [37] Gata VA, Kubelac PM, Buiga R, Vlad IC, Valean D, Muntean MV, et al. The Value of Tumor Infiltrating Lymphocytes as Prognostic Factor for Lymph Node Status and Survival Amongst Patients with Cutaneous Malignant Melanoma.
- [38] A. Zaladonis, J. Farma, M. Hill, M. Hotz, K. Meller, T. Board, et al., A retrospective, observational analysis of tumor infiltrating lymphocytes and tumor regression in melanoma, J. Surg. Res. 267 (2021 Nov) 203–208.
- [39] J. Yang, J.W. Lian, Y.P. Chin, Harvey, L. Wang, A. Lian, G.F. Murphy, et al., Assessing the prognostic significance of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes in patients with melanoma using pathologic features identified by natural language processing, JAMA Netw. Open 4 (9) (2021 Sep 22) e2126337.
- [40] S. Morrison, G. Han, F. Elenwa, J.T. Vetto, G. Fowler, S.P. Leong, et al., Is there a relationship between TILs and regression in melanoma? Ann. Surg Oncol. 29 (5) (2022 May) 2854–2866.
- [41] R.J. Straker, K. Krupp, C.E. Sharon, A.S. Thaler, N.J. Kelly, E.Y. Chu, et al., Prognostic significance of primary tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes in a contemporary melanoma cohort, Ann. Surg Oncol. 29 (8) (2022 Aug) 5207–5216.
- [42] A.L. Burton, B.A. Roach, M.P. Mays, A.F. Chen, B.A.R. Ginter, A.M. Vierling, et al., Prognostic significance of tumor infiltrating lymphocytes in melanoma, Am. Surg. 77 (2) (2011 Feb) 188–192.
- [43] M.J. Page, J.E. McKenzie, P.M. Bossuyt, I. Boutron, T.C. Hoffmann, C.D. Mulrow, et al., The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews, BMJ n71 (2021 Mar 29).
- [44] B. Mukherji, Immunology of melanoma, Clin. Dermatol. 31 (2) (2013 Mar) 156-165.
- [45] H. Tsao, The transformation rate of moles (melanocytic nevi) into cutaneous melanoma: a population-based estimate, Arch. Dermatol. 139 (3) (2003 Mar 1) 282.
- [46] C. Bevona, Cutaneous melanomas associated with nevi, Arch. Dermatol. 139 (12) (2003 Dec 1) 1620.
- [47] A. Bulman, M. Neagu, C. Constantin, Immunomics in skin cancer improvement in diagnosis, prognosis and therapy monitoring, Curr. Proteonomics 10 (3) (2013 Oct 1) 202–217.
- [48] E.Z. Keung, J.E. Gershenwald, The eighth edition American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) melanoma staging system: implications for melanoma treatment and care, Expert Rev. Anticancer Ther. 18 (8) (2018 Aug 3) 775–784.
- [49] S. Rashid, M. Shaughnessy, H. Tsao, Melanoma classification and management in the era of molecular medicine, Dermatol. Clin. 41 (1) (2023 Jan) 49-63.
- [50] D. Ogata, K. Namikawa, A. Takahashi, N. Yamazaki, A review of the AJCC melanoma staging system in the TNM classification (eighth edition), Jpn. J. Clin. Oncol. 51 (5) (2021 Apr 30) 671–674.
- [51] Delgado A, Guddati AK. Clinical Endpoints in Oncology a Primer.
- [52] F. Tas, K. Erturk, Coexistence of regression and tumor infiltrating lymphocytes is associated with more favorable survival in melanoma, J. Cancer Res. Clin. Oncol. 147 (9) (2021 Sep) 2721–2729.
- [53] J.E. Gershenwald, R.A. Scolyer, K.R. Hess, V.K. Sondak, G.V. Long, M.I. Ross, et al., Melanoma staging: evidence-based changes in the American Joint committee on cancer eighth edition cancer staging manual: melanoma staging: AJCC 8 <sup>th</sup> edition, CA A Cancer J. Clin. 67 (6) (2017 Nov) 472–492.
- [54] D. Hanahan, R.A. Weinberg, Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation, Cell 144 (5) (2011 Mar) 646–674.
- [55] M.Y. Mapara, M. Sykes, Tolerance and cancer: mechanisms of tumor evasion and strategies for breaking tolerance, J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol 22 (6) (2004 Mar 15) 1136–1151.
- [56] K.A. Hogquist, T.A. Baldwin, S.C. Jameson, Central tolerance: learning self-control in the thymus, Nat. Rev. Immunol. 5 (10) (2005 Oct) 772–782.
- [57] S.L. Goff, M.E. Dudley, D.E. Citrin, R.P. Somerville, J.R. Wunderlich, D.N. Danforth, et al., Randomized, prospective evaluation comparing intensity of lymphodepletion before adoptive transfer of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes for patients with metastatic melanoma, J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol 34 (20) (2016 Jul 10) 2389–2397.
- [58] N.P. Restifo, M.E. Dudley, S.A. Rosenberg, Adoptive immunotherapy for cancer: harnessing the T cell response, Nat. Rev. Immunol. 12 (4) (2012 Apr) 269–281.

#### M. Garutti et al.

- [59] A. Villani, L. Potestio, G. Fabbrocini, G. Troncone, U. Malapelle, M. Scalvenzi, The treatment of advanced melanoma: therapeutic update, Int. J. Mol. Sci. 23 (12) (2022 Jun 7) 6388.
- [60] F. Zito Marino, P.A. Ascierto, G. Rossi, S. Staibano, M. Montella, D. Russo, et al., Are tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes protagonists or background actors in patient selection for cancer immunotherapy? Expet Opin. Biol. Ther. 17 (6) (2017 Jun 3) 735–746.
- [61] S.L. Topalian, C.G. Drake, D.M. Pardoll, Immune checkpoint blockade: a common denominator approach to cancer therapy, Cancer Cell 27 (4) (2015 Apr) 450–461.
- [62] B. Shum, J. Larkin, S. Turajlic, Predictive biomarkers for response to immune checkpoint inhibition, Semin. Cancer Biol. 79 (2022 Feb) 4–17.
- [63] E. Chatziioannou, J. Roßner, T.N. Aung, D.L. Rimm, H. Niessner, U. Keim, et al., Deep learning-based scoring of tumour-infiltrating lymphocytes is prognostic in primary melanoma and predictive to PD-1 checkpoint inhibition in melanoma metastases, EBioMedicine 93 (2023 Jul) 104644.
- [64] J. Kong, D. Ha, J. Lee, I. Kim, M. Park, S.H. Im, et al., Network-based machine learning approach to predict immunotherapy response in cancer patients, Nat. Commun. 13 (1) (2022 Jun 28) 3703.
- [65] O. Hamid, H. Schmidt, A. Nissan, L. Ridolfi, S. Aamdal, J. Hansson, et al., A prospective phase II trial exploring the association between tumor microenvironment biomarkers and clinical activity of ipilimumab in advanced melanoma, J. Transl. Med. 9 (1) (2011 Dec) 204.
- [66] M. Neagu, C. Constantin, S. Zurac, Immune parameters in the prognosis and therapy monitoring of cutaneous melanoma patients: experience, role, and limitations, BioMed Res. Int. 2013 (2013) 1–13.