BMJ Open Investigation of the optimal platinumbased regimen in the postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy setting for early-stage resected non-small lung cancer: a Bayesian network metaanalysis

Lan-Lan Pang ^(D), ¹ Jia-Di Gan, ¹ Yi-Hua Huang, ¹ Jun Liao, ¹ Yi Lv, ² Wael Abdullah-Sultan Ali, ¹ Li Zhang, ¹ Wen-Feng Fang¹

ABSTRACTS

To cite: Pang L-L, Gan J-D, Huang Y-H, *et al.* Investigation of the optimal platinum-based regimen in the postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy setting for early-stage resected non-small lung cancer: a Bayesian network meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2022;**12**:e057098. doi:10.1136/ bmjopen-2021-057098

Prepublication history and additional supplemental material for this paper are available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/ bmjopen-2021-057098).

Received 08 September 2021 Accepted 17 May 2022

Check for updates

© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2022. Re-use permitted under CC BY. Published by BMJ.

¹Department of Medical Oncology, State Key Laboratory of Oncology in South China, Collaborative Innovation Center for Cancer Medicine, Sun Yatsen University Cancer Center, Guangzhou, China ²Zhongshan School of Medicine, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China

Correspondence to Dr Wen-Feng Fang; fangwf@sysucc.org.cn **Objective** This study aimed to compare the efficacy and safety of different platinum adjuvant chemotherapy regimens for early-stage resected non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC).

Design Systematic review with network meta-analysis of randomised trials.

Data sources PubMed, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library, Web of Science and Scopus Google Scholar were searched through 12 March 2021.

Eligibility criteria Eligible randomised controlled trials (RCTs) comparing the postoperative platinum chemotherapy regimen with the observation-controlled group or comparing two platinum chemotherapy regimens head-to-head were included.

Data extraction and synthesis The primary outcome was the efficacy of adjuvant chemotherapy regimens including relapse-free survival (RFS), overall survival (OS), 2-year, 3-year, 5-year RFS rate and OS rate. The secondary outcome was the rate of grade 3–4 toxicity assessments. Cochrane Handbook (V.5) was used for the risk of bias assessment. Analyses were performed using R software V.4.3.1.

Results 20 RCTs with a sample size of 5483 were enrolled in meta-analysis. The chemotherapy group had a significant RFS and OS advantage compared with the observation group (HR 0.67; 95% Cl 0.56 to 0.81, p<0.0001; HR 0.80; 95% Cl, 0.73 to 0.88, p<0.0001, respectively). Compared with the observation arm, only the 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' regimen had a significant RFS and OS advantage (HR 0.63; 95% Cl 0.43 to 0.87; HR 0.74; 95% Cl 0.63 to 0.87, respectively) while the remaining chemotherapy regimens had no significant difference of efficacy compared with the observation group. In terms of the safety of adjuvant chemotherapy, the incidence of haematological toxicities and nausea/vomiting was not significantly higher in the 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' arm than in other chemotherapy group.

Conclusion This study summarised the adjuvant cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens for patients with early-stage resected NSCLC. Our analysis may provide

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- ⇒ The Bayesian network meta-analysis provided access to directly compare the efficacy and safety of different adjuvant chemotherapy regimens for non-small-cell lung cancer patients.
- \Rightarrow It is difficult to determine the optimal subgroup populations who may obtain the benefit from certain cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens.
- ⇒ We did not incorporate any targeted or immunebiological therapy into the analysis due to the openloop of interventions.
- ⇒ This study could not present a subgroup analysis stratified by postoperative radiotherapy or not as it was undertaken according to every centre's policy.

some guiding significance for the clinicians when determining the optimal chemotherapy regimen.

INTRODUCTION

Lung cancer is the most common cause of cancer-related deaths worldwide and patients with non-small lung cancer (NSCLC) account for almost 85% of all cases.^{1 2} Complete surgical resection is recognised as the standard treatment for patients with early-stage NSCLC. However, 30%-70% of patients ultimately experience local or distant relapse and the 5-year survival rate ranges from only 30% to 60%.^{3 4} The presence of micrometastases, which could not be detected by conventional diagnostic techniques, increases the rate of relapse and exerts a negative impact on the survival of patients.⁵ Therefore, adjuvant postoperative systematic therapy is necessary for patients experiencing surgical resection.

A pooled analysis conducted by the Lung Adjuvant Cisplatin Evaluation (LACE) Collaborative Group suggested that cisplatin-based adjuvant chemotherapy yield an absolute overall survival (OS) benefit of 5.40% at 5 years.⁶ In light of this promising data, the American Society of Clinical Oncology guidelines recommended the cisplatin-based adjuvant postoperative chemotherapy regimen as the standard treatment for early-stage NSCLC patients.⁷ However, the optimal adjuvant chemotherapy regimen has not yet been determined. 'Cisplatin_vinorelbine' has shown its promising efficacy compared with the observation group and is recognised as the standard adjuvant chemotherapy regimen currently.⁸ ⁹ In addition, several randomised controlled trials (RCTs) have also investigated the feasibility, efficacy and safety of cisplatin plus non-vinorelbine third-generation drug as the postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy.¹⁰⁻¹² Among them, 'cisplatin_pemetrexed' is characterised as having promising efficacy and an acceptable safety profile in comparison with 'cisplatin_ vinorelbine'.^{12 13} Thus, despite the lack of level 1 data concerning the efficacy of cisplatin plus vinorelbine, it was still recommended by the National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines as the optional postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy regimen for non-squamous NSCLC.¹⁴ Meanwhile, although carboplatin-based adjuvant regimens have not yet been recommended by guidelines, it might be a favourable choice for patients with comorbidities and unsuited to receive cisplatin when accompanied by the late toxicity.¹⁵¹⁶

Recent advances in individualised treatment based on molecular and biological profiling have shaped the future of postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy. Substantial numbers of patients benefit from the corresponding adjuvant regimen. The patients unsuited to adjuvant cytotoxicity chemotherapy may benefit from the firstgeneration tyrosine kinase inhibitor (TKI) but serval clinical trials showed poor outcomes of TKI adjuvant therapy until the advent of ADJUVANT study.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ However, individualisation could not apply to all NSCLC patients and those patients inapplicable to it have no choice but receive platinum adjuvant chemotherapy.

Postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy setting for early-stage resected NSCLC is of great significance for the oncological community in routine clinical practice. However, it seems difficult to conduct large RCT to figure out the preferred platinum chemotherapy regimen and using the published data might be an alternative option. Hence, we conducted this systematic review and network meta-analysis (NMA) aiming to compare the efficacy and safety of different platinum adjuvant chemotherapy regimens.

METHODS

This systematic review and NMA was performed in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guidelines for RCTs (The PRISMA statement) (online supplemental material 1).

Data sources

Two authors (LP and JG) independently searched the records in the electronic database of PubMed, EMBASE, and The Cochrane Library, Web of Science and Scopus Google Scholar. The searching terminal date was 12 March 2021. Searching terms were focused on NSCLC, adjuvant chemotherapy and platinum. If necessary, an additional manual search of related literature in the reference list would be carried out to enrol any relevant publications. The datasets used in this analysis could be obtained from the corresponding author on request. Records were imported into Endnote V.X9 software to eliminate duplications. The detailed strategy was presented in online supplemental material 2.

Trial selection criteria and trial identification

Two authors (LP and Y-HH) independently reviewed the title, abstracts and keywords of identified citations to select appropriate articles for a full review. Any disagreement was resolved by consensus or through the judgement of a senior author (WF). Trials would be eligible only if meeting all the following criteria: (1) patients with completely resected NSCLC (squamous and nonsquamous) at stage IB-IIIA; (2) Eligible RCTs comparing the postoperative platinum chemotherapy regimen with observation-controlled group or those concerning two platinum chemotherapy regimens head-to-head comparison; given that vinorelbine, etoposide, pemetrexed, docetaxel, paclitaxel, gemcitabine, vindesine are currently commonly used in the routine clinical practice, the counterpart of the platinum doublet including these above-mentioned drugs were considered eligible; and a platinum triplet must be a platinum doublet combined with anti-angiogenesis drug; (3) full-text publications or conference abstract and (4) non-language restrictions. Publications would be disregarded if meeting any of the following criteria: (1) any single perioperative chemotherapy, neoadjuvant chemotherapy, maintenance chemotherapy or radiochemotherapy; (2) chemonaive patients with advanced, incurable or recurrent NSCLC and (3) no RCTs including reviews, case series or retrospective trials.

Outcomes and data extraction

Two authors (LP and JL) independently performed data extraction and any discrepancies were eliminated by consensus. Data for eligible trials related to basic characteristics were extracted, including: trial/author name, publication year, country of origin/multi-centres, sample size per group, chemotherapy regimen, administration dose of each treatment and number of cycles, follow-up time, phases II/III, basic patients' characteristics (age, sex ratio, stage, pathology, performance status).

The primary outcome was the efficacy of adjuvant chemotherapy regimens including relapse-free survival (RFS), OS, 2-year, 3-year, 5-year RFS rate and OS rate. RFS was defined as the interval from day of randomised assignment to disease recurrence or death, whichever occurred first, while OS referred to the time from randomisation to death from any cause.

The secondary outcomes were the rate of grade 3–4 toxicity assessment, including haematological (anaemia, neutropaenia, febrile neutropaenia and thrombocytopaenia) and non-haematological (nausea/vomiting) adverse events. No additional information was requested from the authors. Also, Parmar's method would be used to obtain survival if necessary.

Quality and risk of bias assessment

Two researchers (LP and JG) independently assessed the risk of bias of enrolled trials according to the recommendations of the Cochrane Handbook of Systematic Reviews of Interventions (V.5, http://handbook.cochrane.org).²⁰ Disagreements were resolved by discussion.

Data synthesis and analysis

For RFS and OS, the logarithm of HR and their SE were pooled into analysis through a Bayesian multiple treatment NMA with random effects. As for the dichotomous variables, OR with 95% CI was applied to calculate. When a network diagram indicated two or more independent loops, only the loop containing 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' was selected for further analysis.

Random effects and consistency model was computed using Markov chain Monte Carlo methods with Gibbs sampling based on simulations of 50000 iterations and 20000 adaptions in each of 4 chains. For a forest plot, 'observation' was chosen as the common reference comparator in the analysis of RFS and OS while 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' was applied in the analysis of chemotherapy toxicity. A league table for the survival analysis was presented with the logarithm of HR and their 95% CI. The surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA), represents the percentage of efficacy achieved by an agent compared with an imaginary agent that is always the best without uncertainty (ie, SUCRA=100%).²¹ Namely, the SUCRA value would be 1 if treatment is certain to be the best and 0 if it is certain to be the worst. Higher SUCRA scores correspond to a higher ranking for extending survival.

All analyses in this article were performed using R software V.4.3.1 and the gemtc package version 0.8 that interfaces with JAGS V.4.3.0 for computing a Markov chain.

Patient and public involvement

Patients and the public were not involved in the design or planning of the study.

RESULTS

The search process, study characteristics and quality assessment

A total of 3432 records yielded after searching the database and 1991 records were left to be identified after removing 1692 duplications. Then, 1905 irrelevant citations were eliminated by skimming their title, abstracts



Figure 1 Flow diagram of enrolled studies selection.

and keywords, leaving 86 articles to be considered potentially eligible. Sixty-nine articles were further excluded for irrelevant to topic (n=45); non-RCTs (n=11); nonaccessible outcome (n=9); non-accessible text (n=4) and 17 articles were enrolled into analysis after skimming their full text. Additionally, three studies were included by browsing the references. Finally, 20 studies with a sample size of 5483 were enrolled into meta-analysis (figure 1).

Table 1 shows the basic characteristics of enrolled studies and participants. These studies were conducted in countries worldwide, most of which were Japan²²⁻²⁶ and China,^{27-29 30} followed by France,^{31 32} Germany,³³ Italy,³⁴ USA,³⁵ UK³⁶ and North Carolina.¹⁰ Noteworthy, three of them were conducted in multicountries.^{37–39} Eleven studies compared the postoperative platinum chemotherapy regimen with the observation-controlled group while the remaining nine studies comparing two platinum chemotherapy regimens head-to-head. Chemotherapy regimens included 'cisplatin_vinorelbine', 'cisplatin_pemetrexed', 'cisplatin_gemcitabine', 'cisplatin vindesine', 'cisplatin_etoposide', *cisplatin* _docetaxel', 'carboplatin_gemcitabine', 'carboplatin_ pemetrexed', 'carboplatin_paclitaxel', 'carboplatin_ docetaxel_endostar', 'carboplatin_docetaxel', 'cisplatin _vinorelbine_endostar'. The median follow-up time ranged from 20.2 to 116 months. Of note, we have noticed four well-designed RCTs during the process of eligible trial selection.^{40–43} Nevertheless, we could not obtain the specific outcomes in the subgroup populations per treatment regimens from these clinical trials, whereas only the outcomes concerning the comparison between the

Table 1 Basic	characterist.	ics of enroll	ed studies and participants							
	Publication	Country of		Sample fo	/ledian ollow-up			Patients characteristics		
Trail	year	region	Chemotherapy regimes	size (I	months)	Phase	Radiotherapy	(Pathology; stage, PS)	Age	Sex
ANITA ³⁷	2006	Multicentre	Cisplatin 100 mg/m ² + vinorelbine 30 mg/m ² vs observation	840 (407 vs 7 433)	6	≡	Not mandatory.	NSCLC; stage IB–IIIA	59 (32–75) vs 59 (18–75)	85% vs 87%
Big-lung-trial ³⁶	2003	UK	Cisplatin 80 mg/m ² + vinorelbine 30mg/m ² vs observation	66 (37 vs 5 29)	8.8	ı	Not mandatory	NSCLC; stage I–III	/	/
CALGB 9633 ¹⁰	2004	North Carolina	Carboplatin (AUC-6) +paclitaxel 200 mg/m ² vs observation	344 (173 vs 7 171)	4	=	Not mentioned	NSCLC; T2 with pathologically negative lymph nodes	61 (34–78) vs 62 (40–81) (range)	65% vs 63%
CSLC0201 ²⁸	2016	China	Carboplatin +docetaxelvs observation	82 (43 vs 1 39)	32		Not mentioned	NSCLC; stage IB-IIIA	1	/
NATCH ³⁹	2010	Multi Centre	Carboplatin (AUC-6.0) +paclitaxel 200mg/ m ² vs observation	212) 212)	5	≡	Postoperative radiotherapy was allowed in patients with pathologic N2 disease.	NSCLC; stage IA with tumour size more than 2cm, IB, II or T3N1	64 (33–81) vs 64 (36–89) (range)	86% vs 88%
Barlesi <i>et al</i> ³¹	2015	France	Cisplatin 75 mg/m ² + gemcitabine 1250mg/ m ² vs cisplatin 75 mg/m ² + docetaxel 75 mg/m ²	136 (67 vs 2 69)	0.2	ı	Not mandatory.	NSCLC; stage IB-III	57 (44–74) vs 57 (36–71)	75% vs 74%
HOT0703 ²²	2020	Japan	Cisplatin 40 mg/m ² + gemcitabine 1000mg/ m ² vs carboplatin (AUC-5) + gemcitabine 1000 mg/m ²	102 (51 vs 6 51)	9.6	=	Not mentioned	NSCLC; stage IB-IIIA	63 (40-72) vs 64 (36–74) (range)	67% vs 63%
IALT ³²	2004	France	Cisplatin 100 mg/m ² + vinorelbine 30 mg/m ² vs observation	500 (248 vs 4 262)	9.2	I	Not allowed.	NSCLC; stage I, II or III	/	/
JBR10 ³⁵	2005;2010	North American	Cisplatin + vinorelbine vs observation	482 (240 vs 1 242)	11.6	=	Not mentioned	NSCLC; stage IB (T2N0) or II (T1-2N1)	61 (35-82) vs 60.5 (34-78)	64% vs 66%
JCOG9304 ²³	2003	Japan	Cisplatin 80 mg/m ² + vindesine 3 mg/m ² vs observation	159 (59 vs - 60)		ı	Not mentioned	NSCLC;N2	62 (41-75) vs62 (43-74)	68% vs 62%
Jing Wang <i>et al</i> ² ⁹	2012	China	Cisplation 80 mg/m ² + vinorelbine 30 mg/m ² vs observation	451 (225 vs 4 226)	9	I	Not mentioned	NSCLC; stage I, II and IIIA	55 (38–83) vs 58 (38–82)	71% vs 75%
JIPANG ²⁴	2020	Japan	Cisplatin 75 mg/m ² + pemetrexed 500 mg/ m ² vs cisplatin 80 mg/m ² + vinorelbine 25 mg/m ²	804 (402 vs 4 402)	5.2	≡	Not allowed	Non-squamous NSCLC; N2 stage II or IIIA	65 (58–69) vs 64 (57–67)	60% vs 58%
Roselli <i>et al</i> ³⁴	2006	Italy	Cisplatin 100 mg/m ² + etoposide 120 mg/m ² vs observation	140 (70 vs 4 70)	0.31	I	Not mentioned	NSCLC; stage IB disease (pT2N0)	64.7±9.9 vs 62.9±9.2	91% vs 76%
JLCSSG ²⁵	1993	Japan	Cisplatin 80 mg/m² + vindesine 3 mg/m² vs observation	181 (90 vs 3 91)	1.2	ı	Not mentioned	NSCLC; stage III	56.3±9.1 vs 58.9±8.4	77%S. 87%
Chen <i>et al</i> ¹¹	2015	China	Cisplatin 75 mg/m ² + docetaxel 75 mg/m ² vs cisplatin 75 mg/m ² + gemcitabine 1250 mg/ m^2	92 (45 vs 2 47)	N	ı	Not mentioned	NSCLC; stage II–III	55 (32–67) vs 56 (31–67) (range)	84% vs 87%
Schmid-Bindert et a/ ³⁸	2015	Germany, France, and Spain	Cisplatin 75 mg/m ² + pemetrexed 500 mg/ m ² vs carboplatin (AUC-5) + pemetrexed 500 mg/ m ²	112 (63 vs - 59)		=	Not-mentioned	NSCLC; stage IB, IIA or IIB	61 (44–75) vs 59 (43–69)	78% vs 70%
TORG0503 ²⁶	2019	Japan	Cisplatin 80 mg/m ² + docetaxel 60 mg/m ² vs carboplatin AUC-6+Paclitaxel 200mg/m2	111 (58 vs - 53)		=	Not mentioned	NSCLC; stage IB, II and IIIA	63 (33-70) vs 59 (34-70)	60% vs 66%
										Continued

6

Table 1	Continued									
Trail	Publication year	Country of region	Chemotherapy regimes	Sample size	Median follow-up (months)	Phase	Radiotherapy	Patients characteristics (Pathology; stage, PS)	Age	Sex
TREAT ³³	2015	German	Cisplatin 50 mg/m² + vinorelbine 25 mg/ m² vs cisplatin 75 mg/m² + pemetrexed 500 mg/m²	132 (67 vs 65)	36 m	=	Not allowed	NSCLC; stages IB, IIA, IIB,	58 (40–73) vs 60 (38–74)	72%vs 77%
Yanzhuo Y;	ang et a/ ³⁰ 2012	China	Carboplatin (AUC=5–6) + docetaxel 75 mg/ $m^2 + \ensuremath{m}$ and the model of the model of the contract of the model of the mode	76 (38 vs 38)	22	ı	Not mentioned	NSCLC; stage IB-III	55.6 (36-74) vs 60.2 (45-77)	31% vs 27%
Chen <i>et al</i> ⁶	2017	China	Cisplatin 75 mg/m ² + vinorelbine 25 mg/ m^2 + endostar 7.5 mg/m ² vs cisplatin+vinorelbine	250 (125 vs 125)	60	=	Not mentioned	NSCLC; stage IB to IIIA	58 (33-75) vs 55.5 (37-71)	66% vs 67%
AUC, area u	nder the curve; NSCLC, non	1-small cell lung c	cancer, PS, performance status.							

observation group and 'cisplatin _vinorelbine' were available in "BLT" (Big-lung-trial) or "IALT" (International Adjuvant Lung Trial) trial.^{32 36} Given that the objective of the present work was to investigate the optimal platinumbased regimen in the postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy setting for early-stage resected NSCLC, we only enrolled the BLT and IALT while leaving the remaining four RCTs out.

Based on the Cochrane Risk of Bias evaluation, one of the enrolled studies had a high risk of selection bias due to its quasi-randomised setting while nearly half the studies did not clarify the randomisation methods in detail. One study had a high risk of performance bias while nearly all of the studies did not mention using the blind design or not. Attrition and reporting bias did not exist in the enrolled studies except one whose bias could not be evaluated due to a conference abstract (online supplemental figure 1A,B).

Primary outcome: RFS

Ten studies were enrolled to analyse the RFS of platinum postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy compared with the observation group. We found that the chemotherapy group had a significant RFS advantage compared vs the observation group (HR 0.67; 95% CI 0.56 to 0.81; $I^2=64\%$, p<0.0001) (figure 2A). Moreover, in terms of 2years RFS rate, 3years RFS rate and 5years RFS rate, the chemotherapy arm presented higher RFS rate in comparison with the observation arm (OR 1.62, 95% CI 1.20 to 2.18, $I^2=68\%$, p=0.0016; OR= 1.50, 95% CI 1.11 to 2.03, $I^2=72\%$, p=0.0081; OR 1.49, 95% CI 1.09 to 2.04, $I^2=69\%$, p=0.0132; respectively) (figure 2B–D).

Fifteen clinical trials were enrolled to investigate the RFS of several chemotherapy regimens for patients with earlystage resected NSCLC. In the network evidence figure, each node represents a type of treatment. Solid lines connect treatments that are directly compared in at least one study. The thickness of connections varies based on the number of studies involved in a comparison. Network evidence of the comparisons for the best adjuvant chemotherapy concerning the RFS was shown in figure 3A. Almost all platinum chemotherapy has a direct comparison with 'observation' except 'cisplatin_docetaxel', 'cisplatin_pemetrexed', 'cisplatin_vinorelbine_endostar' and 'carboplatin_docetaxel_endostar'. Furthermore, the number of trials that compared 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' vs 'observation' ranked the first. Furthermore, compared with the observation arm, only the 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' regimen had a significant RFS advantage (HR 0.63; 95% CI 0.43 to 0.87) while there was no significant difference between the remaining chemotherapy regimens and the observation group-'carboplatin_docetaxel' (HR 0.58; 95% CI 0.24 to 1.4); 'carboplatin_docetaxel_endostar' (HR 0.42; 95% CI 0.05 to 3.8); 'carboplatin_paclitaxel' (HR 0.88; 95% CI 0.51 to 1.50); 'cisplatin_docetaxel' (HR 1.40; 95% CI 0.49 to 3.90); 'cisplatin_etoposide' (HR 0.53; 95% CI 0.23 to 1.30); 'carboplatin_pemetrexed' (HR 0.62; 95% CI 0.29 to 1.20); 'cisplatin_vindesine'

.

A										We	ight	Weight
Study	т	Έs	seTE		Hazard Rati	o (HR)	HR		95% CI	(fi)	xed) (I	random)
ANITA	-0.2	27 0.0	0898		4 -1		0.76	[0.6	64; 0.91 [°]	31	.5%	16.6%
BLT	-0.4	3 0.3	3342				0.65	0.3	34; 1.25	j 2	2.3%	5.5%
CALGB9633	-0.2	22 0.	1270				0.80	0.6	32; 1.03] 15	5.7%	14.3%
CSLC0201	-0.5	54 0.2	2904		-		0.58	[0.3	3; 1.02	j 3	8.0%	6.7%
IALT	-0.2	24 0.	1194				0.79	[0.6	3; 1.00] 17	.8%	14.8%
JBR.10	-0.5	51 0.1	1436				0.60	[0.4	5; 0.79] 12	2.3%	13.3%
Jing Wang et.al, 201	2 -1.1	2 0.2	2165 —	æ	-		0.33	[0.2	21; 0.50] 5	5.4%	9.4%
Mario Roselli et.al, 2	006 -0.6	63 0.2	2473				0.53	[0.3	33; 0.86] 4	.2%	8.2%
JLCSSG	0.0	0 0.	1804				1.00	[0.7	70; 1.42] 7	.8%	11.2%
Fixed effect model					\diamond		0.71	[0.6	5; 0.79	100	0.0%	
Random effects mo	del				\diamond		0.67	[0.5	6; 0.81	i		100.0%
Heterogeneity: I ² = 64	%, $\tau^2 = 0$.	0435,	p < 0.0'	1								
					0.5 1	2						
В	Experime	ental	Co	ontrol						v	Neiaht	Weight
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Odds	s Ratio (OR)		OR	95%	CI	(fixed)	(random)
ANITA	247	433	193	407		[1.47	[1.12; 1.	93]	34.2%	18.6%
CALGB9633	130	173	116	171		- E		1.43	[0.90; 2.	30]	11.6%	14.2%
NATCH	108	210	106	210		<u>₽</u> _}:		1.04	[0.71; 1.	52]	20.6%	16.2%
JBR.10	185	242	136	240			-	2.48	[1.68; 3.	67]	12.9%	16.0%
Jing Wang et.al, 2012	200	225	174	226			-	2.39	[1.42; 4.	02]	7.7%	13.2%
JLCSSG	52 40	70 90	35 43	70 91				2.89	[1.42; 5.	89] 60]	3.6% 9.5%	9.8% 11.9%
Fixed effect model		1443		1415		\$		1.58	[1.35; 1.	84] 1	00.0%	
Random effects model	2 0 4057					$\langle $		1.62	[1.20; 2.	18]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: $T = 68\%$, τ	= 0.1057	, <i>p</i> < 0	.01		02 05	1 2	5					
С					0.2 0.0		0					
Study	Experim	ental	Co	ontrol	Odd	a Batic(OB)			050/		Weight	Weight
Study	Events	TOLAI	Events	TOLAI	Ouu	S RALIO(OR)		UK	95%	-01	(lixeu)	(random)
ANITA	218	433	171	407				1.40	[1.07; 1	.84]	31.3%	17.8%
CALGB9633	116	173	99	171	_			1.48	[0.95; 2	.30]	11.7%	14.4%
NATCH	125	210	132	210				0.87	[0.59; 1	.29]	19.1%	15.4%
JBR.10 Jing Wang at al. 2012	1/1	242	128	240				2.11	[1.45; 3	.07]	13.5%	15.7%
Mario Roselli et al. 2012	93	225	27	220				1.95	[1.31, 2	.90J	3 2%	15.3%
II CSSG	33	90	38	91				0.81	[1.03, 0 [0.44 [.] 1	471	8.6%	11.4%
120000	00	00	00	51	-			0.01	[0.44, 1	. – ,]	0.070	11.470
Fixed effect model		1443		1415				1.48	[1.27; 1	.72] 1	100.0%	
Random effects model	$\frac{2}{2} = 0.1122$		01				_	1.50	[1.11; 2	.03]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: $T = 72\%$, τ	= 0.1133	, <i>p</i> < t	0.01		0.2 0.5	1 2	5					
D												
	Experime	ental	Co	ontrol							Weigh	t Weight
Study	Events 1	Fotal	Events	Total	Odds	s Ratio (OR))	OR	95%	%CI	(fixed	l) (random)
ANITA	190	433	143	407				1.44	[1.09;	1.91]	33.2%	6 19.4%
CALGB9633	90	173	82	171	-	1 6		1.18	[0.77;	1.80]	15.9%	6 16.2%
NATCH	77	210	72	210	-			1.11	[0.74;	1.66]	18.3%	6 16.7%
JBR.10	147	242	117	240		<u> </u>		1.63	[1.13; 3	2.33]	18.5%	6 17.6%
Mario Roselli et.al, 2006	39	70	14	70				5.03	[2.37; 1	0.67]	2.5%	6 9.9%
JLCSSG	27	90	33	91				0.75	[0.40;	1.40]	9.2%	6 12.1%
CSLC0201	27	43	16	39		6 8	-	2.43	[1.00;	5.90]	2.5%	6 8.1%
Fixed effect model	÷	1261		1228		\$		1.42	[1.21;	1.67]	100.0%	6
Random effects model						Ċ		1.49	[1.09; 2	2.04]	_	- 100.0%

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 69\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.1134$, p < 0.01



ſ

(HR 1.00; 95% CI 0.45 to 2.20); 'cisplatin_vinorelbine_ endostar' (HR 0.60; 95% CI 0.24 to 1.40) (figure 3B). In addition, according to the league table, no significant difference was observed in the remaining comparisons, for example, 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' and 'cisplatin_pemetrexmed'. (figure 3C). In the rank of NMA, the biggest



В

Α

Compared with observation			
carboplatin_docetaxel			0.58 (0.24, 1.4)
carboplatin_docetaxel_endosta	r ——		- 0.42 (0.047, 3.8)
carboplatin_paclitaxel		<u> </u>	0.88 (0.51, 1.5)
cisplatin_docetaxel		O	- 1.4 (0.49, 3.9)
cisplatin_etoposide			0.53 (0.23, 1.3)
cisplatin_pemetrexed		-	0.62 (0.29, 1.2)
cisplatin_vindesine		—	1.0 (0.45, 2.2)
cisplatin_vinorelbine		-0	0.63 (0.43, 0.87)
cisplatin_vinorelbine_endostar			0.60 (0.24, 1.4)
	0.04		
	0.04	1	4



carboplatin_ docetaxel									
1.37 (0.19, 10.16)	carboplatin_ docetaxel_ endostar								
0.66 (0.23, 1.9)	0.48 (0.05, 4.53)	carboplatin_ paclitaxel							
0.42	0.31	0.63	cisplatin_						
(0.11, 1.68)	(0.03, 3.44)	(0.26, 1.57)	docetaxel						
1.1	0.8	1.66	2.62	cisplatin_					
(0.32, 3.84)	(0.08, 8.14)	(0.6, 4.56)	(0.68, 10.11)	etoposide					
0.94	0.7	1.42	2.25	0.86	cisplatin_				
(0.31, 3.14)	(0.07, 6.97)	(0.61, 3.71)	(0.67, 8.44)	(0.3, 2.77)	pemetrexed				
0.58	0.43	0.88	1.39	0.53	0.62	cisplatin_			
(0.17, 1.95)	(0.04, 4.28)	(0.33, 2.29)	(0.37, 5.13)	(0.16, 1.72)	(0.2, 1.7)	vindesine			
0.93	0.68	1.39	2.21	0.84	0.98	1.59	cisplatin_		
(0.36, 2.51)	(0.07, 6.23)	(0.75, 2.78)	(0.75, 6.84)	(0.34, 2.2)	(0.51, 1.78)	(0.68, 3.94)	vinorelbine		
0.97 (0.28, 3.54)	0.72 (0.07, 7.46)	1.46 (0.54, 4.26)	2.32 (0.61, 9.36)	0.88 (0.26, 3.15)	1.03 (0.36, 2.78)	1.67 (0.52, 5.69)	1.05 (0.47, 2.37)	cisplatin_ vinorelbine_ endostar	
0.58	0.42	0.88	1.39	0.53	0.62	1	0.63	0.6	observation
(0.24, 1.43)	(0.05, 3.74)	(0.51, 1.5)	(0.49, 3.94)	(0.22, 1.25)	(0.28, 1.19)	(0.45, 2.22)	(0.43, 0.87)	(0.24, 1.41)	obser ration



Figure 3 (A) Network evidence of the comparisons for the best adjuvant chemotherapy concerning RFS. In the network evidence figure, each node represents a type of treatment. Solid lines connect treatments that are directly compared in at least one study. The thickness of connections varies based on the number of studies involved in a comparison. (B) Forest plots of the comparisons for the different cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning RFS. (C) The league table of the comparisons for the different cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning RFS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning RFS. RFS, relapse-free survival; SUCRA, surface under the cumulative ranking curve.

SUCRA value holds the potential to be the best chemotherapy regimen in extending RFS. Our results showed that 'cisplatin_etoposide' (72.0%) was the most effective chemotherapy regime to improve RFS, followed by 'carboplatin_docetaxel_endostar' (69.30%),'carboplatin docetaxel' (65.31%), 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' (64.73%), 'cisplatin_pemetrexed' (64.2%),'cisplatin_vindesine' (64.2%), 'carboplatin_paclitaxel' (36.3%), 'carboplatin_ 'cisplatin_vinorelbine_endostar' vindesine' (27.6%),(23.0%) and 'cisplatin_docetaxel' (13.4%) (figure 3D). In terms of the 2-year RFS rate, 3-year RFS rate and 5-year RFS rate, 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' was an effective therapeutic method in improving 2-year RFS rate (OR 2.00, 95% CI 1.20 to 3.50); 'carboplatin_docetaxel' (OR 6.70, 95% CI 1.70 to 31.00) 'cisplatin_etoposide' (OR 3.30, 95% CI 1.20 to 9.10) and 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' (OR 1.70, 95% CI 1.10 to 2.90) had a significantly higher 3-year RFS rate than observation arm; wherase 'cisplatin_etoposide' (OR 5.10, 95% CI 1.70 to 16.00) was an effective method in improving 5-year RFS rate. However, there was no significant difference between the remaining chemotherapy regimens and observation arm concerning the RFS rate (online supplemental figure 2A–C).

Primary outcome: OS

To compare the efficacy of platinum chemotherapy arm with the observation arm in extending OS, we enrolled 10 studies into analysis. Our results showed that the OS in the chemotherapy group was significantly longer than the observation group (HR 0.80; 95% CI 0.73 to 0.88; I^2 =11%, p<0.0001) (figure 4A). As for 2-year OS rate, 3-year OS rate and 5-year OS rate, the chemotherapy group showed a significant survival advantage than the observation group (OR 1.31, 95% CI 1.06 to 1.61, I^2 =21%, p=0.0117; OR 2.24, 95% CI 1.13 to 4.45, I^2 =94%, p=0.0081; OR 1.36, 95% CI 1.08 to 1.72, I^2 =54%, p=0.0100; respectively) (figure 4B–D).

Moreover, 14 clinical trials with 8 treatment regimens were enrolled to investigate the optimum adjuvant chemotherapy regimens in extending OS. Network evidence of these chemotherapy regimens was shown in figure 5A. Almost all platinum chemotherapy has a direct comparison with 'observation' except 'cisplatin_docetaxel', 'cisplatin_pemetrexed' and 'cisplatin_vinorelbine_endostar'. Similar to RFS, the number of trials related to 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' comparing versus 'observation' also ranked the first in extending OS. Compared with the observation arm, only the 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' regimen had a significant OS advantage(HR 0.74; 95% CI 0.63 to 0.87) while there was no significant difference between the remaining chemotherapy regimens and the observation group--'carboplatin_paclitaxel' (HR 0.90; 95% CI 0.70 to 1.20); 'cisplatin_docetaxel' (HR 1.10; 95% CI 0.50 to 2.30); 'cisplatin_etoposide' (HR 0.80; 95% CI 0.44 to 1.40); 'cisplatin_pemetrexed' (HR 0.73; 95% CI 0.47 to 1.10); 'cisplatin_vindesine' (HR 1.00; 95% CI 0.69 to 1.40); 'cisplatin_vinorelbine_endostar' (HR 0.75; 95% CI 0.46 to 1.20) (figure 5B). Similar to RFS, as the league

table showed, there was no significant difference among these remaining paltimum chemotherapy regimens in improving OS for patients with early-stage resected NSCLC (figure 5C). In terms of the rank of NMA, we found that 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' (74.8%) was the most effective therapeutic arm for the improvement of OS, followed by 'cisplatin_pemetrexed' (74.1%), 'cisplatin_vinorelbine_endostar' (68.5%), 'cisplatin_etoposide' (59.2%), 'carboplatin_paclitaxel' (43.6%), 'cisplatin_vindesine' (28.5%), 'cisplatin_docetaxel' (27.0%) and 'observation' (24.3%) (figure 5D). In addition, 'cisplatin_etoposide' was an effective chemotherapy regimen to improve the 2-year OS rate (OR 2.90, 95% CI 1.10 to 8.30) and 5-year OS rate (OR 6.70, 95% CI 1.70 to 3.10) while 'cisplatin_ vinorelbine' had a significantly higher 5-year OS rate than observation arm (OR 1.70, 95% CI 1.10 to 2.90). However, there was no significant difference between the remain chemotherapy regimens and observation arm concerning 2-year OS rate, 3-year OS rate and 5-year OS rate (online supplemental figure 3A-C).

Secondary outcome: anaemia, neutropaenia,

thrombocytopaenia, febrile neutropaenia and nausea/vomiting Fifteen clinical trials were enrolled to compare the presence of anaemia among different adjuvant chemotherapy regimens. We found that the incidence of anaemia in the 'carboplatin_pemetrexed' arm was significantly higher than the 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' arm (Log OR=44.06, 95% CI 0.21 to 151.05). However, there was no significant difference between the remaining chemotherapy regimens and 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' (figure 6A).

As for neutropaenia, we enrolled 13 clinical trials to compare the safety of different adjuvant chemotherapy regimens. The neutropaenia was more frequently observed in patients receiving 'carboplatin_gemcitabine' (log OR 60.60, 95% CI 0.94 to 193.7), 'cisplatin_gemcitabine' (log OR 60.11, 95% CI 0.77 to 193.27) and 'cisplatin_docetaxel' (log OR 59.71, 95% CI 0.56 to 192.89) than cisplatin_vinorelbine'. However, the incidence of neutropaenia in the 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' group was not significantly higher than the remaining chemotherapy regimens group (figure 6B).

Also, as for thrombocytopaenia, we enrolled 11 clinical trials to investigate the safety of different adjuvant chemotherapy regimens. Patients medicated with 'carboplatin_pemetrexed' were significantly observed thrombocytopaenia compared with 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' (log OR 36.43, 95% CI 2.87 to 114.27). However, there was no significant difference between the remaining chemotherapy regimens and 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' (figure 6C).

In terms of febrile neutropaenia, six clinical trials were included. Our results showed that there was no significant difference between these chemotherapy regimens and 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' (figure 6D).

In addition, 14 clinical trials were enrolled to analyse the observation of nausea/vomiting in NSCLC patients receiving postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy. We found that compared with 'cisplatin_vinorelbine',

A Study	ŀ	TE :	seTE		Hazard Ratio (HR)	HR		95%C	V SI	Veight (fixed)	Weight (random)
ANITA	-0.	22 0.	0956			0.80	[0.6	66; 0.9	96]	22.4%	20.6%
BLT	-0.	58 0.	3424 -		* <u> </u>	0.56	[0.2	29; 1.1	10]	1.7%	2.0%
CALGB9633	-0.	19 0.	1335			0.83	[0.6	64; 1.0	08]	11.5%	11.9%
NATCH	-0.	01 0.	1403			0.99	[0.7	75; 1.3	30]	10.4%	10.9%
	-0.	13 0.	1296			0.88	[0.6	58; 1.1	[3]	12.2%	12.5%
	-0.	03 0	1420 2487			1.03	[0.3	52, U.S	21] 281	3 3%	3.8%
Jing Wang et al. 201	2 -0	40 0	0982		<u>+</u>	0.67	10.0	55° 0 8	311	21.3%	19.8%
Mario Roselli et.al. 2	006 -0.	22 0.	2711	_		0.80	[0.4	47: 1.3	361	2.8%	3.2%
JLCSSG	-0.	02 0.	2190			0.98	[0.6	64; 1.5	51]	4.3%	4.8%
Fixed effect model					\diamond	0.80	[0.7	3: 0.8	371 1	00.0%	
Random effects mo	del				\diamond	0.80	[0.7	3; 0.8	88]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 11^{\circ}$	%, $\tau^2 = 0$.0027	p = 0.3	₃₄ Г	1 1						
				0.	5 1 2						
B	Experim	nental Total	C	ontrol	Odds Ratio (OR)		OR	95	%CI	Weight (fixed)	t Weight
oludy	Lvento	Total	Lvento	Total	oudo nullo (on)		on		/001	(IIXCu)	, (rundoni)
ANITA	292	433	255	407	+	1	.23	[0.93;	1.64]	37.1%	28.3%
CALGB9633	156	173	144	171		1	.72	[0.90;	3.29]	6.2%	8.8%
JBR 10	139	242	143	240		1	26	[0.61,	1.30	15.5%	16.2%
JCOG9304	39	59	36	60		1	.30	[0.62;	2.74]	5.2%	6.9%
Jing Wang et.al, 2012	218	225	211	226		— 2	.21	[0.89;	5.54]	2.8%	4.7%
Mario Roselli et.al, 2006	58	70	44	70		2	.86	[1.30;	6.28]	3.3%	6.2%
JLCSSG	43	90	40	91		1	.17	[0.65;	2.09]	9.0%	5 10.4%
Fixed effect model Random effects model	2	1502		1475		1 1	.28 .31	[1.08; [1.06;	1.52] 1.61]	100.0%	- 100.0%
Hotorogonolty: $I^2 = 210/_{\odot} \pi^2$	0 0196	n - 0	26			1					
Heterogeneity: $T^2 = 21\%$, τ^2	- = 0.0186	6, p = 0	0.26		0.2 0.5 1 2	5					
Heterogeneity: /² = 21%, τ² C Study	² = 0.0186 Experime Events	6, <i>p</i> = 0 ental Total B	0.26 Co Events	ntrol Fotal	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	5 01	२	95	%CI	Weight (fixed)	t Weight (random)
Heterogeneity: /² = 21%, τ ² C Study ANITA	= 0.0186 Experime Events 260	6, <i>p</i> = 0 ental Total E 433	0.26 Co Events 1 220	ntrol Fotal 407	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	5 01	२ 8 [95 0.97;	5 %CI	Weight (fixed)	t Weight (random) 5 13.3%
C Study ANITA CALGB9633	² = 0.0186 Experime Events 260 138	ental Total E 433 173	0.26 Con Events 7 220 12	ntrol Fotal 407 171	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	5 01 - 52.2	२ 8 [4 [26	95 0.97; 5.09; 10	1.68	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 1.0%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9%
ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR 10	² = 0.0186 Experime Events 260 138 121 184	ental Total E 433 173 210 242	0.26 Con Events 1 220 12 123 156	htrol Fotal 407 171 210 240	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	5 01 - 52.2- 0.9- 1.7	२ 8 [4 [26 6 [1 [95 0.97; 5.09; 10 0.65; 1 15	1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 1.0% 20.4% 14.7%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0%
ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304	² = 0.0186 Experime Events 260 138 121 184 30	ental Total I 433 173 210 242 59	Con Events 7 220 12 123 156 29	407 171 210 240 60	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	1 5 1.2 - 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1	२ 8 [4 [26 6 [1 [1 [95 0.97; 3.09; 10 0.65; 1.15; 0.54;	1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 1.0% 20.4% 14.7% 5.5%	t Weight (random) 5 13.3% 5 11.9% 5 13.0% 5 13.0% 5 13.0% 5 13.0% 5 11.8%
ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012	Experime Events 260 138 121 184 30 185	ental Total I 433 173 210 242 59 225	0.26 Con Events 220 12 123 156 29 140	ntrol Total 407 171 210 240 60 226	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	1 5 01 52.24 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8	२ 8 [4 [26 6 [1 [1 [4 [95 0.97; 5.09; 10 0.65; 1.15; 0.54; 1.84;	1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 1.0% 20.4% 14.7% 5.5% 9.7%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 11.8% 12.9%
ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006	Experime Events 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43	ental Total E 433 173 210 242 59 225 70 90	226 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46	ntrol Fotal 407 171 210 240 60 226 70 91	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	1 5 09 52.2 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9	R [4 [26 6 [1 [4 [8 [0]	95 0.97; 5.09; 1(0.65; 1.15; 0.54; 1.84; 1.20; 0.50;	1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 1.0% 20.4% 14.7% 5.5% 9.7% 3.7%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 12.9% 12.4%
ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG	² = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43	ental Total E 433 173 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502	226 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46	407 171 210 240 60 226 70 91	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	1 5 09 1.2 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9 0.9	R [4 [20 6 [1 [4 [8 [0 [2 [95 (0.97; (0.09; 10 (0.65; (1.15; (0.54; (1.20; (0.50; 1.65)	1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60	Weight (fixed)] 35.5%] 1.0%] 20.4%] 14.7%] 5.5%] 9.7%] 9.4%	Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 11.8% 12.9% 11.8% 12.4%
Heterogeneity: /* = 21%, * C Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model	* = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43	ental Total E 433 173 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502	226 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46	407 171 210 240 60 226 70 91 1475	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	1 5 0f 1.2 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9 0.9 0.9 1.9 2.2	R [4 [20 6 [1 [4 [8 [0 [2 [95 0.97; 5.09; 10 0.65; 1.15; 0.54; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13;	1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 20.4% 20.4% 5.5% 9.7% 3.7% 9.4% 100.0%	 Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 14.8% 12.9% 11.8% 12.4% 10.0%
Heterogeneity: l ² = 21%, τ ² Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: l ² = 94%, τ ²	² = 0.0186 Experime 260 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994,	ental Total E 433 173 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 , $p < 0.0$	226 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46	ntrol Fotal 407 171 210 240 60 226 70 91 1475	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	5 09 1.2 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9 1.9 2.2	R [8 [6 [1 [1 [4 [8 [0 [2 [4 [95 0.97; 0.09; 10 0.65; 1.15; 1.54; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13;	1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 20.4% 20.4% 5.5% 9.7% 3.7% 9.4% 100.0%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 11.8% 12.4% 12.4%
Heterogeneity: I ² = 21%, τ ² C Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I ² = 94%, τ ²	 = 0.0186 Experime Events 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994, 	ental Total E 433 173 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 , $p < 0.0$	226 Events 7 220 123 156 29 140 39 46	407 171 210 240 60 226 70 91 1475	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	5 09 1.2 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9 1.9 2.2 1.9 2.2	R [8 [6 [1 [1 [4 [8 [0 [2 [95 0.97; 5.09; 10 0.65; 1.15; 0.54; 1.84; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13;	1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 20.4% 20.4% 5.5% 9.7% 3.7% 9.4% 100.0%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0%
Heterogeneity: I ² = 21%, τ ² C Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I ² = 94%, τ ² D	 = 0.0186 Experime Events 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994, Experime 	ental Total E 433 173 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 p < 0.0	226 Events 7 220 123 156 29 140 39 46	1770 171 210 240 60 226 70 91 1475 0.01 control	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	5 09 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.8 0.9 0.9 1.9 2.2	R [4 [266 [1 [4 [8 [0 [2 [95 0.97; 3.09; 10 0.65; 1.15; 0.54; 1.84; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13;	1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 1.0% 20.4% 20.4% 14.7% 5.5% 9.7% 9.7% 9.4% 140.0%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 10.0%
Heterogeneity: I ² = 21%, τ ² C Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I ² = 94%, τ ² D Study	 = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994, Experime Events 	ental Total E 433 173 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 , p < 0.0	226 Events 7 220 123 156 29 140 39 46 	1770 171 210 240 60 226 70 91 1475 0.01 Total	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	5 0F 1.2: 52.2: 0.9: 1.7 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 2.2: 1.9: 2.2: 000	R [266 [4 [266 [1 [1 [4 [88 [0 [2 [4 [0 R	95 (0.97; (0.65; (1.15; (0.54; (1.84; (1.20; (0.50; (1.65; (1.13; 95%	%CI 1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 1.0.% 20.4% 2.0.4% 14.7% 5.5% 9.7% 9.7% 9.4% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 11.8% 12.9% 11.8% 12.4% 12.4% 100.0% Weight (random)
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$, τ^2 Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, τ^2 D Study ANITA	 = 0.0186 Experime Events 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994 Experime Events 220 	s, $p = 0$ ental Total I 433 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 $p_0 = 0.0$ ental Total 433	220 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46 	ntrol Fotal 407 171 210 240 60 226 70 91 1475 0.01 0.01 Total 407	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1 Odds Ratio (OR)	5 09 1.24 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9 1.9 2.2 100 00	R 8 [4 [26 6 [1 [1 [4 [8 [0 [2 [2 [4 [0] 2] 0] 0] 0] 0] 0] 0] 0] 0	95 0.97; 1.09; 10 0.65; 1.15; 0.54; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13; 95% 1.07: 1	%CI 1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45 6 CI	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 20.4% 20.4% 14.7% 5.5% 9.7% 9.7% 9.4% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Weight (fixed) 28.0%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 12.4% 12.4% 100.0% Weight (random) 17.2%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$, τ^2 Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, τ^2 D Study ANITA CALGB9633	 = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994, Experime Events 220 104 	s, $p = 0$ ental Total I 433 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 total Total 433 173	220 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46 	ntrol Fotal 407 171 210 240 60 226 70 91 1475 0.01 0.01 Total 407 171	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR)	5 09 1.2 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9 1.9 2.2 100 00 00	8 [8 [4 [6 [1 [4 [8 [0 [2 [44 [0 [2 [44 [0 [10 [95 0.97; 1.09; 1(0.65; 1.15; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13; 95%	%CI 1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45 6 CI .85] .68]	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 1.0% 20.4% 20.4% 14.7% 5.5% 9.7% 3.7% 9.4% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 12.9% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 100.0% Weight (random) 17.2% 12.8%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$, τ^2 Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, τ^2 D Study ANITA CALGB9633 CSLC0201	 = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994, Experime Events 220 104 33 	s, p = 0 ental Total I 173 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 ental Total 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 173 433 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 17	220 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46 01 Co Events 172 99 24	1407 171 240 60 226 70 91 1475 1475 0.01 0.0	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 0 1	5 09 1.2 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9 1.9 2.2 000 00 1.0 1.0 00 00	8 [4 [26] 6 1 1 [4 [8 [90 [2 [44 [00 [2 [44 [00 [00 [00 [00 [00 [95 0.97; 0.09; 10 0.65; 1.15; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13; 95% 1.07; 1 0.71; 1 0.71; 1 0.79; 5	%Cl 1.68 94.59 1.422 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45 6 6 6 6 8 5 1.68 1.68 1.68 1.68	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 1.0% 20.4% 14.7% 5.5% 9.7% 3.7% 9.4% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 128.0% 12.8% 12.8%	Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 11.8% 12.4% 12.4% 100.0% Weight (random) 17.2% 12.8% 4.7%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$, τ^2 Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, τ^2 D Study ANITA CALGB9633 CSLC0201 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 JER 20	 = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994, Experime Events 220 104 33 95 167 	s, p = 0 ental Total I 433 173 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 ental Total 433 173 433 210 242 25 70 90 1502 ental 433 173 242 25 70 90 25 25 70 90 25 25 25 20 25 20 25 20 20 22 25 70 90 25 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	226 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46 	407 171 240 60 226 70 91 1475 1475 0.01 Total 407 171 39 210	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1	5 0F 1.2: 52.2: 0.9: 1.7 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 2.2: 100 00 00 00 00 00	8 [4 [26] 6 [11 [4 [00 [2 [44 [00 2 100 [002 [002 [95 0.97; 0.09; 10 0.65; 1.15; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13; 95% 1.07; 1 0.79; 5 0.69; 1 0.50; 1 0.50; 1 0.54; 1.15; 1.5	%CI 1.68 94.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45 6 6 6 8 5.37 1.50 1.50 1.57 1.57 1.57 1.57 1.57 1.57 1.57 1.57	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 20.4% 20.4% 5.5% 5.5% 9.7% 3.7% 9.4% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 128.0% 12.8% 1.9% 12.8% 1.9%	Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 11.8% 12.4% 12.4% 100.0% Weight (random) 17.2% 12.8% 4.7% 14.0%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$, τ^2 Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, τ^2 D Study ANITA CALGB9633 CSLC0201 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304	 = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994, Experime Events 220 104 33 95 167 17 	s, p = 0 ental Total I 433 173 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 ental Total 433 173 433 173 433 210 242 59 90 1502 ental 433 173 25 90 25 1502 1502 173 25 175 25 175 26 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175	226 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46 	407 171 210 240 60 226 70 91 1475 1475 0.01 0 001 0 001 0 001 0 001 0 001 0	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1	5 0 1.2: 5 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 2.2: 1.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1.1 1.2 2.4: 0.9: 1.2: 2.2: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 1.9: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 1.9: 2.2: 1.00 0.9: 1.1 1.9: 2.4: 1.00 0.9: 1.9: 1.1 1.9: 1.00 0.0: 1.9: 1.9: 1.00 0.0: 1.9: 1.0: 1.9: 1.0: 1.9: 1.0: 1.0: 1.1 1.0: 1.0	R [26] 4 [26] 1 [1 [8 [8 [90 [2 [44 [00 [2 [00 [95 0.97; 0.05; 1.15; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13; 95% 1.07; 1 0.71; 1 0.79; 5 0.69; 1 1.30; 2 0.32; 1	%CI 1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45 6 6 8 5 1 6 8 5 1 .68] .50] .51]	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 20.4% 20.4% 5.5% 9.7% 3.7% 9.4% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 11.8% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 100.0% Weight (random) 17.2% 12.8% 4.7% 14.0% 14.3% 6.5%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$, τ^2 Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, τ^2 D Study ANITA CALGB9633 CSLC0201 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012	 = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994, Experime Events 220 104 33 95 167 7 94 	s, $p = 0$ ental Total I 433 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 ental Total 433 173 43 210 242 59 225 70 90 242 59 225 59 225	226 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46 	171 240 60 226 70 91 1475 1475 0.01 000 1475 171 39 210 240 60 226	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1	5 09 1.2 52.2 0.9 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9 1.9 2.2 1.9 000 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	R [26] 4 [26] 1 [1 [8 [8 [8 [90 [95 0.97; 0.05; 1.15; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13; 95% 1.07; 1 0.71; 1 0.79; 5 0.69; 1 1.30; 2 0.32; 1 1.28; 2	%CI 1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45 6 6 8 5 1 6 8 5 1 .68] .50] .51] 2.73] 2.51] 2.82	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 20.4% 20.4% 5.5% 9.7% 3.7% 9.4% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 11.8% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 100.0% Weight (random) 17.2% 12.8% 4.7% 14.3% 6.5% 13.7%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$, τ^2 Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, τ^2 D Study ANITA CALGB9633 CSLC0201 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006	 = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994, Experime Events 220 104 33 95 167 7 94 43 	s, $p = 0$ ental Total I 433 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 ental Total 433 173 43 210 242 59 225 70 90 242 59 225 59 225 70 242 59 225 70 225 70 90	226 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46 01 Cc Events 172 99 24 99 24 94 130 22 24 99	407 171 210 240 60 226 70 91 1475 0.01 0 001 Total 407 171 39 210 240 60 226 70	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1	5 0 1.2: 5 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 2.2: 1.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1.1 2.2: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 2.2: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 0.9: 1.9: 2.2: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 0.9: 1.9: 1.9: 1.9: 1.9: 1.0: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 1.0: 2.4: 0.9: 1.9: 1.0: 1.9: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 1.1 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 1.0: 2.4: 1.0: 1.0: 1.0: 1.0: 1.0: 1.0: 2.1: 0.0: 0.0: 1.0: 2.1: 0.0: 0.0: 1.0: 2.1: 0.0: 0.0: 0.0: 1.0: 2.1: 0.0: 0.0: 1.0: 2.1: 0.0: 0.0: 1.0: 1.0: 0.0: 0.0: 1.0: 1.0: 1.0: 0.0: 0.0: 1.0: 1.0: 1.0: 0.0:	R [4 [26] 6 [11 [4 [4 [6 [11 [2 [44 [00 [2 [44 [002 [870 [900 [925 [95 0.97; 0.65; 1.15; 1.84; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13; 95% 1.07; 1 0.71; 1 0.79; 5 0.69; 1 1.30; 2 0.32; 1 1.28; 2 1.14; 4	%CI 1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45 6 6 6 8 5 1 .68] .50] 2.73 1.51] 2.73 1.51] 2.82] 4.43	Weight (fixed) 35.5% 20.4% 20.4% 5.5% 9.7% 3.7% 9.4% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10.0% 128.0% 128.0% 12.8% 1.9% 16.5% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0%	Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 11.8% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 100.0% Weight (random) 17.2% 12.8% 4.7% 14.3% 6.5% 13.7% 7.8%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$, τ^2 Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, τ^2 D Study ANITA CALGB9633 CSLC0201 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG	* = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 * = 0.8994, Experime Events 220 104 33 95 167 17 94 43 32	s, $p = 0$ ental Total I 433 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 ental Total 433 173 43 210 242 59 225 70 90 433 210 242 59 225 70 90 242 59 225 70 90 90	226 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46 01 Cc Events 172 99 24 99 24 99 24 130 22 62 29 37	407 171 210 240 60 226 70 91 1475 0.01 001 Total 407 171 39 210 240 60 226 70 91	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1	5 0F 1.2: 52.2: 0.9: 1.1 2.8: 2.4: 0.9: 2.2: 1.0 2.2: 1.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.0	R [26] 4 [26] 6 [1] 11 [1] 48 [1] 22 [2] 44 [1] 00 [2] 24 [2] 002 [2] 88 [1] 700 [2] 881 [1]	95 0.97; 0.65; 1.15; 0.54; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13; 95% 1.07; 1 0.79; 5 0.69; 1 1.30; 2 0.32; 1 1.28; 2 1.14; 4 0.44; 1	%CI 1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.27 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 1 6 6 1 6 1 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Weight (fixed)] 35.5%] 10.0%] 20.4%] 14.7%] 5.5%] 9.7%] 9.4%] 100.0%] Weight (fixed) 28.0% 12.8% 1.9% 16.5% 13.0% 5.0% 11.6% 3.6% 7.6%	Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 14.9% 12.8% 4.7% 14.0% 14.3% 6.5% 13.7% 7.8% 9.0%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$, τ^2 Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, τ^2 D Study ANITA CALGB9633 CSLC0201 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model	 = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994 Experime Experime 220 104 33 95 167 17 94 43 32 	s, $p = 0$ ental Total I 433 173 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 p < 0.0 1502 433 173 242 59 225 70 90 433 173 242 59 225 70 90 225 70 90 1545	226 Events 7 220 12 123 156 29 140 39 46 01 Co Events 172 99 24 99 24 130 22 62 29 37	171 240 60 226 70 91 1475 0.01 0.0	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1	5 0F 1.2 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9 1.9 2.2 1.9 1.9 2.2 1.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1. 1.1 2.2 1.1 1.1 2.2 1.1 1.1 2.2 1.1 2.2 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.4 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.4 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.4 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 2.2 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.7 1.1 1.9 1.0 1.0 1.1 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0	R [26] 8 [1] 11 [1] 14 [1] 15 [1] 16 [1] 17 [1] 18 [1] 190 [1] 106 [1] 107 [1] 108 [1] 1090 [1] 101 [1] 102 [1] 103 [1] 104 [1] 105 [1] 106 [1] 107 [1] 108 [1] 1090 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010 [1] 1010	95 0.97; 0.05; 1.15; 0.54; 1.84; 1.20; 0.50; 1.65; 1.13; 95% 1.07; 1 0.79; 5 0.69; 1 1.30; 2 0.32; 1 1.28; 2 1.14; 4 0.44; 1 1.20; 1	 %CI 1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.24 3.9 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45 68 6.87 6.87 6.81 6.87 6.81 6.82 6.81 6.82 6.81 6.82 6.81 6.82 6.81 6.82 6.81 6.81 6.81 6.82 6.81 6.81 6.81 6.81 6.82 6.81 6.81 6.81 6.82 6.81 6.81 6.81 6.82 6.81 6.81 6.81 6.81 6.82 6.81 6.81	Weight (fixed)] 35.5%] 10.0%] 20.4%] 20.4%] 14.7%] 5.5%] 9.7%] 9.7%] 9.4%] 14.7%] 9.4%] 14.7%] 9.4%] 14.7%] 9.4%] 14.7%] 100.0%	 Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 12.9% 12.4% 12.4% 10.0% Weight (random) 17.2% 12.8% 4.7% 14.0% 14.3% 6.5% 13.7% 7.8% 9.0%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$, τ^2 Study ANITA CALGB9633 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, τ^2 D Study ANITA CALGB9633 CSLC0201 NATCH JBR.10 JCOG9304 Jing Wang et.al, 2012 Mario Roselli et.al, 2006 JLCSSG Fixed effect model Random effects model Mario Roselli et.al, 2006	 = 0.0186 Experime 260 138 121 184 30 185 53 43 = 0.8994, Experime Experime 220 104 33 95 167 17 94 43 32 	s, $p = 0$ ental Total I 210 242 59 225 70 90 1502 p < 0.0 ental Total 433 173 225 70 90 1502 433 217 242 59 225 70 90 242 59 225 70 90 1545	226 Events 7 220 123 156 29 140 39 46 01 Cc Events 172 99 24 94 130 22 62 29 37	171 240 240 60 226 70 91 1475 0.01	0.2 0.5 1 2 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1 Odds Ratio (OR) 0.1 1 10 1	5 0F 1.2 52.2 0.9 1.7 1.1 2.8 2.4 0.9 1.9 2.2 1.9 1.9 2.2 1.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	R [26] 8 [1] 11 [1] 14 [1] 15 [1] 16 [1] 17 [1] 18 [1] 190 [1] 106 [1] 106 [2] 107 [1] 108 [1] 1090 [2] 110 [1] 111 [1]	95 (0.97; (0.65; (1.15; (0.54; (1.20; (0.50; (1.65; (1.13; (0.70; 1) (0.79; 5) (0.69; 1) (1.30; 2) (0.32; 1) (1.30; 2) (0.32; 1) (1.28; 2) (0.44; 1) (1.20; 1) (1.20; 1) (1.08; 1)	1.68 04.59 1.42 2.54 2.54 2.57 4.39 5.10 1.60 2.22 4.45 6 6 6 6 7 1 6 7 1 6 7 1 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Weight (fixed)] 35.5%] 1.0%] 20.4%] 20.4%] 14.7%] 5.5%] 9.7%] 9.7%] 9.4%] 14.7%] 9.4%] 100.0% [100.0% 12.8% 13.0% 5.0% 11.6% 3.6% 7.6%	t Weight (random) 13.3% 11.9% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 13.0% 12.9% 12.9% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 10.0% Weight (random) 17.2% 12.8% 4.7% 14.0% 14.3% 6.5% 13.7% 7.8% 9.0% 100.0%

Figure 4 (A) The efficacy of platinum-based postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy in improving the OS compared with the observation group. (B) A 2-year OS rate of the chemotherapy arm compared with the observation arm. (C) A 3-ear OS rate of the chemotherapy arm compared with the observation arm. (D) A 5-year OS rate of the chemotherapy arm compared with the observation arm. OS, overall survival.

Α



В



C
C
carbonlati

docetaxel									
1.4 (0.19, 10.25)	carboplatin_ docetaxel_ endostar								
0.66 (0.23, 1.9)	0.48 (0.05, 4.67)	carboplatin_ paclitaxel							
0.42 (0.11, 1.68)	0.3 (0.03, 3.47)	0.63 (0.26, 1.57)	cisplatin_ docetaxel						
1.1 (0.32, 3.81)	0.78 (0.08, 8.43)	1.65 (0.6, 4.56)	2.61 (0.67, 10.04)	cisplatin_ etoposide					
0.95 (0.31, 3.14)	0.68 (0.07, 7.09)	1.42 (0.61, 3.68)	2.26 (0.66, 8.36)	0.86 (0.3, 2.76)	cisplatin_ pemetrexed				
0.58 (0.17, 1.95)	0.42 (0.04, 4.4)	0.88 (0.33, 2.29)	1.38 (0.37, 5.13)	0.53 (0.16, 1.71)	0.62 (0.2, 1.71)	cisplatin_ vindesine			
0.93 (0.36, 2.51)	0.67 (0.07, 6.36)	1.39 (0.75, 2.76)	2.21 (0.75, 6.85)	0.85 (0.34, 2.21)	0.98 (0.51, 1.78)	1.59 (0.68, 3.93)	cisplatin_ vinorelbine		
0.97 (0.28, 3.56)	0.7 (0.07, 7.71)	1.46 (0.54, 4.28)	2.32 (0.6, 9.34)	0.89 (0.27, 3.13)	1.03 (0.36, 2.79)	1.67 (0.52, 5.67)	1.05 (0.47, 2.36)	cisplatin_ vinorelbine_ endostar	
0.58 (0.23, 1.44)	0.42 (0.05, 3.84)	0.88 (0.51, 1.5)	1.39 (0.48, 3.94)	0.53 (0.23, 1.25)	0.62 (0.28, 1.19)	1 (0.45, 2.22)	0.63 (0.43, 0.87)	0.6 (0.24, 1.4)	observation



Figure 5 (A) Network evidence of the comparisons for the best adjuvant chemotherapy concerning OS. (B) Forest plots of the comparisons for the different cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (C) The league table of the comparisons for the different cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCRA value of every cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning OS. (D) SUCR

A



Figure 6 (A) Forest plots of the comparisons for the different cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning the presence of anaemia. (B) Forest plots of the comparisons for the different cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning the presence of neutropaenia. (C) Forest plots of the comparisons for the different cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning the presence of thrombocytopaenia. (D) Forest plots of the comparisons for the different cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning the presence of the presence of febrile neutropaenia. (E) Forest plots of the comparisons for the different cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning the presence of the presence of febrile neutropaenia. (E) Forest plots of the comparisons for the different cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens concerning the presence of nausea/vomiting.

'carboplatin_gemcitabine' (log OR 45.59, 95% CI 1.29 to 154.91), 'cisplatin_docetaxel' (log OR 44.90, 95% CI 1.36 to 154.30), 'cisplatin_gemcitabine' (log OR 45.38, 95% CI 1.70 to 154.96) had a higher incidence of nausea/vomiting. However, the nausea/vomiting was more frequently observed in patients receiving 'cisplatin_ vinorelbine' than 'carboplatin_pemetrexed' (log OR -27.02, 95% CI -92.63 to -1.18). Furthermore, there was no significant difference between the remaining chemotherapy regimens and 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' (figure 6E).

DISCUSSION

Recent advances in precision medicine have shaped the future of adjuvant therapy for patients with completely resected NSCLC.¹⁹ However, for patients not applicable to targeted therapy or immunotherapy, cytotoxicity chemotherapy is still recommended by guidelines as the standard of care. It is of great significance to investigate the best platinum regimen in the postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy setting for early-stage NSCLC. Our results showed that adjuvant postoperative chemotherapy was beneficial to improve the RFS and OS compared with the observation arm. Among these chemotherapy regimens, the 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' arm was an effective therapeutic method to improve survival with tolerable toxicity; wherase the 'cisplatin_pemetrexed' arm did not show advantage over the other therapeutic methods in improving survival. Also, the 'cisplatin_etoposide' arm contributed to improving the RFS and OS rate for patients with resected NSCLC.

A meta-analysis, published in 1995, demonstrated that postoperative chemotherapy had a significant advantage in 5-year survival compared with the observation group, which opened up a new era of postoperative chemotherapy.⁴⁴ Of note, an updated analysis published in 2010 further confirmed the clinical value of postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy, with or without radiotherapy, for patients with operable NSCLC.⁴⁵ Moreover, a pooled analysis also indicated the promising role of cisplatinbased adjuvant chemotherapy on the 5-year survival.⁶ Based on these findings, it is universally acknowledged that adjuvant cytotoxicity chemotherapy integrating platinum and third-generation agents is conducive to the improvement of postsurgical survival for NSCLC patients. In this study, the survival benefit was also observed in the platinum adjuvant chemotherapy setting. The adjuvant chemotherapy regimens were not limited to cisplatinbased chemotherapy, which extended to cisplatin/carboplatin in combination with other third-generation agents. Furthermore, the peak recurrence of patients with earlystage NSCLC is 2 years later after surgery and a higher 5-year RFS rate represented the lower possibility of postoperative relapse. In our study, not only 5-year RFS and OS benefit but the improvement of RFS, OS, 2-year RFS and OS rate, and 3-year RFS and OS rate were observed in the adjuvant chemotherapy group. These significant survival advantages could be explained in part by the fact

that postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy could decrease the presence of micrometastases of cancer cells.

High heterogeneity existed in evaluating the RFS and OS rate between the chemotherapy and observation group. Given that heterogeneity in some analyses may impose a distinct effect on the synthesis results, the mechanisms behind it deserve to be figured out. More importantly, this heterogeneity may implicate the optimal subgroup of patients who could obtain the clinical benefits from postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy. As the JCOG9304²³ indicated, postoperative cisplatin with vindesine chemotherapy did not show efficacious in cases of resected N2 NSCLC. Meanwhile, the JLCSSG trial also failed to elucidate the therapeutic benefits of postoperative cisplatin plus vindesine chemotherapy, since the eligible patients in the trial were limited to be stage III.²⁵ Therefore, it is reasonable to infer that patients with stage III (T3 or any N2) may derive very limited benefits from the adjuvant 'cisplatin_vindesine'.

According to the subgroup analysis conducted by LACE in 2010, 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' was an effective therapeutic method for the improvement of survival with a manageable toxicity profile.⁸ Over the few decades, the introduction of the other third-generation cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens such as pemetrexed and docetaxel have brought into the development of platinum adjuvant chemotherapy.¹⁰⁻¹² Noteworthy, regardless of the absence of level one data in the adjuvant setting, due to its gold status in non-squamous advanced NSCLC with superior efficacy and low tolerability, 'cisplatin_pemetrexed' is still reasonably recommended as a standard of care for patients with early-stage resectable non-squamous NSCLC.¹³¹⁴ However, our results indicated that 'cisplatin pemetrexed' did not show its significant survival advantages over the observation arm in the adjuvant setting. In addition, a subgroup analysis conducted by a large clinical trial-ECOG1505, did not find a significant difference among the four platinum-based chemotherapy regimens : 'cisplatin_vinorelbine', 'cisplatin_docetaxel', 'cisplatin_gemcitabine' and 'cisplatin_pemetrexed'.⁴⁶ Of note, the absolute effect of adjuvant cytotoxicity chemotherapy on stage IB and squamous patients is still under debated.^{10 47} Hence, it seemed that the 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' arm still played a vital role in the adjuvant setting for patients with NSCLC since its efficacy was not influenced by the histology or stage.⁸ By contrast, the negative results of 'cisplatin_pemetrexed' implies the restrictions of its application in the adjuvant chemotherapy setting for patients with squamous. Moreover, some biomarkers such as the excision repair cross-complementation group 1, b-tubulin and mucin hold the potential to predict the efficacy of cytotoxicity chemotherapy in the adjuvant setting.^{48–50} Therefore, the heterogeneity of biological characteristics of each patient imposed confounding factors to the comparisons of different chemotherapy regimens.

According to our analysis, 'cisplatin_etoposide', the gold chemotherapy regimens for small cell lung cancer,

did have a significantly higher survival rate over observation arm in the patients with early-stage resectable NSCLC. Roselli *et al* conducted a 10-year follow-up clinical trials to demonstrate the effect of 'cisplatin_etoposide' on the reduction of recurrences and the extension of long-term survival, which enrolled only patients with stage I NSCLC and adopted the relatively high dose of cisplatin (100 mg/ m²) and etoposide (120 mg/m²).³⁴ Hence, considering the potential bias, the positive results of 'cisplatin_etoposide' need to be interpreted with caution.

Antiangiogenic therapy, such as bevacizumab and endostar, hold the potential to improve the efficacy of adjuvant chemotherapy probably through inhibiting the growth of micrometastatic cancer cells and increasing the sensitivity of tumour cells to chemotherapy.^{27 51 52} However, our results showed that the combination of chemotherapy regimens and endostar did not show advantage over a single platinumbased chemotherapy arm. Furthermore, according to the results of ECOG1505 trial, there was no significant difference between the adjuvant chemotherapy with or without bevacizumab for patients with resected NSCLC.⁴⁶ One of the reasons to explain these negative results might be the heterogeneity in the expression of vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF). Patients with high VEGF expression tend to obtain more benefits from antiangiogenic therapy than the low VEGF expression ones.²⁷

In terms of the safety of adjuvant chemotherapy, the incidence of haematological toxicities and nausea/vomiting, which was greatly influenced by the dose and schedules, were not significantly higher in the 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' arm than other chemotherapy. Noteworthy, the schedules in the adjuvant setting was quite different from the one utilised in the advanced NSCLC patients.⁵³ Therefore, 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' could be recommended as an adjuvant cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimen with an acceptable safety profile. On the contrary, the incidence of anaemia and thrombocytopaenia in the 'carboplatin_pemetrexed' group was significantly higher than the 'cisplatin_vinorelbine' group. Both the 'carboplatin' and 'pemetrexed' are characterised as relatively safe cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens and recommended to be utilised for patients with medical commodities. The contradictory outcomes could be explained in part by the relatively lower dose of 'cisplatin_vinorelbine'.

To the best of our knowledge, this study was the first to directly compare the efficacy and safety of different adjuvant chemotherapy regimens for NSCLC patients. Despite the strengths, it was evident that there still existed some limitations in this study. First, for nearly half of the enrolled studies, the risk of bias in certain items remained unclear and the quality of them could not be evaluated. Secondary, due to the lack of specific data, the subgroup analysis stratified by stage and pathology could not be performed. Thus, it is difficult to determine the optimal subgroup populations who may obtain the most benefits from certain cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens. Furthermore, we did not incorporate any targeted or immunebiological therapy into the analysis due to the open-loop of interventions. Last but not at least, although the absolute effect of radiotherapy for patients with completely resected NSCLC was presented recently, we did not conduct a subgroup analysis stratified by postoperative radiotherapy or not as it was undertaken according to every centre's policy.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study summarised the adjuvant cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimens for patients with early-stage resected NSCLC. Research on adjuvant cytotoxicity chemotherapy might be an out-of-date topic but numerous NSCLC patients could obtain benefit from the optimal cytotoxicity chemotherapy regimen. 'Cisplatin_vinorelbine' had a significant survival advantage with a relatively good safety profile in the adjuvant setting while the 'cisplatin_pemetrexed' arm was not superior to the other therapeutic methods in improving survival. Our analysis may provide some guiding significance for the clinicians when determining the optimal chemotherapy regimen.

Acknowledgements This work was financially supported by the Chinese National Natural Science Foundation Project (81772476). We thank all the co-authors for their contributions to this study.

Contributors W-FF: conceptualisation; L-LP, JG and Y-HH: Data curation; L-LP and J-DG: Formal analysis; W-FF: Funding acquisition; L-LP: Investigation; L-LP: Methodology; W-FF: Project administration; L-LP: Resources; L-LP: Software, LZ and W-FF: Supervision; J-DG: Validation; L-LP: Visualisation; All authors, L-LP, J-DG, Y-HH, JL, YL, WA-SA, LZ, W-FF: Roles/writing-original draft; all authors L-LP, J-DG, Y-HH, JL, YL, WA-SA, LZ and W-FF: writing-review and editing. W-FF is responsible for the overall content as guarantor.

Funding This work was supported by the Chinese National Natural Science Foundation Project (81772476).

Competing interests None declared.

Patient and public involvement Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement No data are available. Data are available in a public, open access repository. All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as online supplementary information.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported (CC BY 4.0) license, which permits others to copy, redistribute, remix, transform and build upon this work for any purpose, provided the original work is properly cited, a link to the licence is given, and indication of whether changes were made. See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

ORCID iD

Lan-Lan Pang http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4932-8117

Open access

REFERENCES

- Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, *et al.* Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2021;71:209–49.
- 2 Zappa C, Mousa SA. Non-small cell lung cancer: current treatment and future advances. *Transl Lung Cancer Res* 2016;5:288–300.
- 3 Mountain CF. Revisions in the international system for staging lung cancer. *Chest* 1997;111:1710–7.
- 4 Goldstraw P, Chansky K, Crowley J, *et al.* The IASLC lung cancer staging project: proposals for revision of the TNM stage groupings in the forthcoming (eighth) edition of the TNM classification for lung cancer. *J Thorac Oncol* 2016;11:39–51.
- 5 Rosell R, Felip E, Maestre J, et al. The role of chemotherapy in early non-small-cell lung cancer management. Lung Cancer 2001;34:63–74.
- 6 Pignon J-P, Tribodet H, Scagliotti GV, et al. Lung adjuvant cisplatin evaluation: a pooled analysis by the LACE Collaborative Group. J Clin Oncol 2008;26:3552–9.
- 7 Cancer Care Ontario and American Society of clinical oncology adjuvant chemotherapy and adjuvant radiation therapy for stages I-IIIA resectable non-small-cell lung cancer guideline. *J Oncol Pract* 2007;3:332–5.
- 8 Douillard J-Y, Tribodet H, Aubert D, *et al.* Adjuvant cisplatin and vinorelbine for completely resected non-small cell lung cancer: subgroup analysis of the lung adjuvant cisplatin evaluation. *J Thorac Oncol* 2010;5:220–8.
- 9 Postmus PE, Kerr KM, Oudkerk M, et al. Early and locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC): ESMO clinical practice guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol 2017;28:iv1–21.
- 10 Strauss GM, Herndon JE, Maddaus MA, et al. Adjuvant paclitaxel plus carboplatin compared with observation in stage lb non-smallcell lung cancer: CALGB 9633 with the cancer and leukemia group B, radiation therapy Oncology group, and North central cancer treatment group study groups. J Clin Oncol 2008;26:5043–51.
- 11 Chen Q, Ji X, Zhou X, et al. Clinical observation of docetaxel or gemcitabine combined with cisplatin in the chemotherapy after surgery for stage II-III non-small cell lung cancer. Pak J Med Sci 2015;31:1095–8.
- 12 Kreuter M, Vansteenkiste J, Fischer JR, *et al.* Randomized phase 2 trial on refinement of early-stage NSCLC adjuvant chemotherapy with cisplatin and pemetrexed versus cisplatin and vinorelbine: the treat study. *Ann Oncol* 2013;24:986–92.
- 13 Scagliotti GV, Parikh P, von Pawel J, et al. Phase III study comparing cisplatin plus gemcitabine with cisplatin plus pemetrexed in chemotherapy-naive patients with advanced-stage non-small-cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol 2008;26:3543–51.
- 14 Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, et al. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin 2018:68:394–424.
- 15 Ardizzoni A, Boni L, Tiseo M, et al. Cisplatin- versus carboplatinbased chemotherapy in first-line treatment of advanced non-smallcell lung cancer: an individual patient data meta-analysis. J Natl Cancer Inst 2007;99:847–57.
- 16 Gridelli C, Maione P, Rossi A, et al. Chemotherapy of advanced NSCLC in special patient population. Ann Oncol 2006;17 Suppl 5:v72–8.
- 17 Goss GD, O'Callaghan C, Lorimer I, et al. Gefitinib versus placebo in completely resected non-small-cell lung cancer: results of the NCIC CTG BR19 study. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:3320–6.
- 18 Kelly K, Altorki NK, Eberhardt WEE, et al. Adjuvant erlotinib versus placebo in patients with stage IB-IIIA non-small-cell lung cancer (radiant): a randomized, double-blind, phase III trial. J Clin Oncol 2015;33:4007–14.
- 19 Zhong W-Z, Wang Q, Mao W-M, et al. Gefitinib versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin as adjuvant treatment for stage II-IIIA (N1-N2) EGFRmutant NSCLC (ADJUVANT/CTONG1104): a randomised, openlabel, phase 3 study. *Lancet Oncol* 2018;19:139–48.
- 20 Higgins JPT. Cochrane Handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. Cochrane collaboration. 10, 2011.
- 21 Salanti G, Ades AE, Ioannidis JPA. Graphical methods and numerical summaries for presenting results from multiple-treatment metaanalysis: an overview and tutorial. J Clin Epidemiol 2011;64:163–71.
- 22 Fukumoto S-I, Oizumi S, Harada M, et al. A randomized phase II trial of cisplatin plus gemcitabine versus carboplatin plus gemcitabine in patients with completely resected non-small cell lung cancer: Hokkaido lung cancer clinical study Group trial (HOT0703). Cancer Chemother Pharmacol 2020;86:117–27.
- 23 Tada H, Tsuchiya R, Ichinose Y, et al. A randomized trial comparing adjuvant chemotherapy versus surgery alone for completely

resected pN2 non-small cell lung cancer (JCOG9304). Lung Cancer 2004;43:167–73.

- 24 Kenmotsu H, Yamamoto N, Yamanaka T, et al. Randomized phase III study of pemetrexed plus cisplatin versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin for completely resected stage II to IIIA Nonsquamous non-small-cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol 2020;38:2187–96.
- 25 Ohta M, Tsuchiya R, Shimoyama M, et al. Adjuvant chemotherapy for completely resected stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. Results of a randomized prospective study. The Japan clinical Oncology Group. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 1993;106:703–8.
- 26 Kubota K, Kunitoh H, Šeto T, et al. Randomized phase II trial of adjuvant chemotherapy with docetaxel plus cisplatin versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin in patients with completely resected non-small cell lung cancer: TORG 0503. Lung Cancer 2020;141:32–6.
- 27 Chen Z, Luo Q, Zhou Z, *et al.* Endostar in combination with postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy prolongs the disease free survival of stage IIIA NSCLC patients with high VEGF expression. *Oncotarget* 2017;8:79703–11.
- 28 Zhong W-Z, Yang X-N, Yan H-H, et al. P1.05-046 Randomized Study of Adjuvant Docetaxel vs. Observation for Completely Resected Stage IB-IIIa NSCLC with 11 Years' Median Follow-Up. Journal of Thoracic Oncology 2017;12:S642–3.
- 29 Wang J, Liu F, Huang D-X, et al. Post-Operative treatment with cisplatin and vinorelbine in Chinese patients with non-small cell lung cancer: a clinical prospective analysis of 451 patients. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2012;13:4505–10.
- 30 YY-zhuo et.al. Recombinant human endostatin combined with TP regimen as postoperative adjuvant treatment for non-small-cell lung cancer. *Med J Chin PLA* 2012;37.
- 31 Barlesi F, Chouaid C, Crequit J, *et al*. A randomized trial comparing adjuvant chemotherapy with gemcitabine plus cisplatin with docetaxel plus cisplatin in patients with completely resected nonsmall-cell lung cancer with quality of life as the primary objective. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg* 2015;20:783–90.
- 32 Dunant A, Pignon J-P, Le Chevalier T. Adjuvant chemotherapy for non-small cell lung cancer: contribution of the International adjuvant lung trial. *Clin Cancer Res* 2005;11:5017s–21.
- 33 Kreuter M, Vansteenkiste J, Fischer JR, *et al.* Three-Year followup of a randomized phase II trial on refinement of early-stage NSCLC adjuvant chemotherapy with cisplatin and pemetrexed versus cisplatin and vinorelbine (the treat study). *J Thorac Oncol* 2016;11:85–93.
- 34 Roselli M, Mariotti S, Ferroni P, et al. Postsurgical chemotherapy in stage lb nonsmall cell lung cancer: long-term survival in a randomized study. Int J Cancer 2006;119:955–60.
- 35 Winton T, Livingston R, Johnson D, et al. Vinorelbine plus cisplatin vs. observation in resected non-small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med 2005;352:2589–97.
- 36 Waller D, Peake MD, Stephens RJ, et al. Chemotherapy for patients with non-small cell lung cancer: the surgical setting of the big lung trial. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2004;26:173–82.
- 37 Douillard J-Y, Rosell R, De Lena M, et al. Adjuvant vinorelbine plus cisplatin versus observation in patients with completely resected stage IB-IIIA non-small-cell lung cancer (Adjuvant Navelbine International Trialist Association [ANITA]): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2006;7:719–27.
- 38 Schmid-Bindert G, Engel-Riedel W, Reck M, et al. A randomized phase 2 study of pemetrexed in combination with cisplatin or carboplatin as adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with completely resected stage lb or II non-small-cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer* 2015;90:397–404.
- 39 Felip E, Rosell R, Maestre JA, et al. Preoperative chemotherapy plus surgery versus surgery plus adjuvant chemotherapy versus surgery alone in early-stage non-small-cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol 2010;28:3138–45.
- 40 A randomized controlled study of postoperative adjuvant chemoimmunotherapy of resected non-small cell lung cancer with IL2 and LAK cells: H.Kimura, Y.Yamaguchi, T.Fujisawa, M.Baba, and M.Shiba Institute of Pulmonary Cancer Research, School of Medicine, Chi %J Lung Cancer 1991.
- 41 Park JH. P2-202: postoperative adjuvant therapy for stage IIIA non small cell lung cancer. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 2007;2:S651.
- 42 Park JH, Lee C-T, Lee HW, et al. Postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy for stage I non-small cell lung cancer. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2005;27:1086–91.
- 43 Scagliotti GV, Fossati R, Torri V, et al. Randomized study of adjuvant chemotherapy for completely resected stage I, II, or IIIA non-smallcell lung cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 2003;95:1453–61.
- 44 Chemotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer: a meta-analysis using updated data on individual patients from 52 randomised

clinical trials. non-small cell lung cancer Collaborative group. *BMJ* 1995;311:899–909.

- 45 , Arriagada R, Auperin A, *et al*, NSCLC Meta-analyses Collaborative Group. Adjuvant chemotherapy, with or without postoperative radiotherapy, in operable non-small-cell lung cancer: two metaanalyses of individual patient data. *Lancet* 2010;375:1267–77.
- 46 Wakelee HA, Dahlberg SE, Keller SM, et al. Adjuvant chemotherapy with or without bevacizumab in patients with resected non-small-cell lung cancer (E1505): an open-label, multicentre, randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2017;18:1610–23.
- 47 Scagliotti G, Hanna N, Fossella F, et al. The differential efficacy of pemetrexed according to NSCLC histology: a review of two phase III studies. Oncologist 2009;14:253–63.
- 48 Friboulet L, Olaussen KA, Pignon J-P, et al. Ercc1 isoform expression and DNA repair in non-small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med 2013;368:1101–10.
- 49 Graziano SL, Gu L, Wang X, et al. Prognostic significance of mucin and p53 expression in stage lb non-small cell lung cancer: a laboratory companion study to CALGB 9633. J Thorac Oncol 2010;5:810–7.
- 50 Reiman T, Lai R, Veillard AS, et al. Cross-Validation study of class III beta-tubulin as a predictive marker for benefit from adjuvant chemotherapy in resected non-small-cell lung cancer: analysis of four randomized trials. Ann Oncol 2012;23:86–93.
- 51 Folkman J. Antiangiogenesis in cancer therapy--endostatin and its mechanisms of action. *Exp Cell Res* 2006;312:594–607.
- 52 Limaverde-Sousa G, Sternberg C, Ferreira CG. Antiangiogenesis beyond VEGF inhibition: a journey from antiangiogenic single-target to broad-spectrum agents. *Cancer Treat Rev* 2014;40:548–57.
- 53 Caffo O, Dipasquale M, Murgia V, et al. An evaluation of the pharmacokinetics and clinical use of vinorelbine for NSCLC treatment. Expert Opin Drug Metab Toxicol 2013;9:1037–51.