



The Risk of Immune-Related Thyroid Dysfunction Induced by PD-1/PD-L1 Inhibitors in Cancer Patients: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Rodabe N Amaria, University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, United States

Reviewed by:

Anne Jarry, Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale (INSERM), France Chunxia Su, Shanghai Pulmonary Hospital, China

*Correspondence:

Guohai Su guohaisu0531@126.com Yuping Sun 13370582181@163.com

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Cancer Immunity and Immunotherapy, a section of the journal Frontiers in Oncology

Received: 14 February 2021 Accepted: 25 June 2021 Published: 12 July 2021

Citation:

Tian Y, Li R, Liu Y, Li M, Song Y, Zheng Y, Gao A, Wen Q, Su G and Sun Y (2021) The Risk of Immune-Related Thyroid Dysfunction Induced by PD-1/PD-L1 Inhibitors in Cancer Patients: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front. Oncol. 11:667650. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2021.667650 Yuan Tian^{1,2†}, Ran Li^{3†}, Yan Liu^{4†}, Meng Li⁵, Yuxiao Song⁶, Yan Zheng^{7,8}, Aiqin Gao¹, Qing Wen⁹, Guohai Su^{10*} and Yuping Sun^{1,11*}

¹ Department of Oncology, Jinan Central Hospital Affiliated to Shandong University, Jinan, China, ² Special Care Department of Proton Therapy Center, Shandong Cancer Hospital and Institute, Shandong First Medical University and Shandong Academy of Medical Sciences, Jinan, China, ³ Department of Oncology, Jinan Central Hospital, Weifang Medical University, Weifang, China, ⁴ Qilu Hospital of Shandong University, Jinan, China, ⁵ Human Resources Department, Jinan Central Hospital Affiliated to Shandong University, Jinan, China, ⁶ Jinan Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Jinan, China, ⁷ Research Center of Translational Medicine, Jinan Central Hospital Affiliated to Shandong First Medical University, Jinan, China, ⁸ Research Center of Translational Medicine, Jinan Central Hospital, Cheeloo College of Medicine, Shandong University, Jinan, China, ⁹ Jinan Clinical Research Center of Shandong First Medical University, Jinan, China, ¹⁰ Department of Cardiovascular Diseases, Jinan Central Hospital Affiliated to Shandong University, Jinan, China, ¹¹ Department of Oncology, Jinan Central Hospital Affiliated to Shandong First Medical University, Jinan, China, ¹¹ Department of Oncology, Jinan Central Hospital Affiliated to Shandong First Medical University, Jinan, China, ¹¹ Department of Oncology, Jinan Central Hospital Affiliated to Shandong First Medical University, Jinan, China, ¹¹ Department of Oncology, Jinan Central Hospital Affiliated to Shandong First Medical University, Jinan, China

Background: Thyroid dysfunction is common for cancer patients receiving PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitor therapies. To clarify the incidence risk of thyroid dysfunction would be important for guiding anti-PD-1 and anti-PD-L1 immunotherapy. Therefore, the updated meta-analysis was conducted to evaluate the incidence risk of thyroid dysfunction caused by PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors.

Methods: PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitor related clinical trials were collected by a systematic search of the PubMed. Some relevant studies were identified by a manual search. The incidence risk of all grades and grades 3-5 was analyzed and evaluated by random effect model. The Newcastle Ottawa Scale was used for the quality assessment of all clinical trials.

Results: Forty-three clinical trials were collected. Compared with chemotherapy, the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades was significantly higher (OR=7.15, 95%CI:[4.85, 10.55], $I^2 = 40\%$, Z=9.91(P < 0.00001)) in PD-1/PD-L1 group. Similar results could also be noted, when the control group was placebo or CTLA-4. When PD-1/PD-L1 was combined with other treatments for cancer patients, the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades was also significantly increased. Similar to the analysis results of hypothyroidism, PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors played the same role in increasing the risk of hyperthyroidism and thyroiditis. Few significant analysis results was noted, when the risk of thyroid dysfunction of grades 3-5 was assessed.

1

Conclusion: Whether used alone or in combination with other anti-tumor drugs, PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors increased the risk of thyroid dysfunction, especially for hypothyroidism. Furthermore, PD-1/PD-L1 was better than chemotherapy and CTLA-4 in increasing the risk of thyroid dysfunction.

Keywords: thyroid dysfunction, PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors, cancer, meta-analysis, risk

INTRODUCTION

Programmed cell death protein 1 (PD-1) and its ligand (PD-L1) inhibitors, developed to overcome the immune escape mechanisms of cancer progression and manipulate the immune system to recognize and attack cancer cells, have been widely used for cancers (1). While achieving satisfactory clinical anti-tumor treatment effects, more and more drug-induced toxic and side effects have also been reported, and more and more attention has been drawn from clinicians (1–3). Treatment guidelines for PD-1/PD-L1 related side effects have been made and used to guide clinical works (2).

Thyroid dysfunction was one of the common toxic side effects of PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors and had been reported in plenty of clinical trials (4-50). Moreover, It was reported that the incidence of PD-1/PD-L1 induced thyroid dysfunction was related to the clinical response and the prognosis of patients (51, 52). Therefore, clarifying the incidence risk of PD-1/PD-L1 related thyroid dysfunction would be of great significance for guiding clinical immunotherapy and judging the prognosis (51, 52). Although thyroid dysfunction might appear in different forms (53), hyperthyroidism, hypothyroidism, and thyroiditis were still the most common manifestations (1), which were also reported most frequently in clinical trials (4-50). Due to more and more clinical trials investigating the clinical efficacy and safety of PD-1/PD-L1 in cancer patients have been finished in recent two years (4-23), we conducted this updated metaanalysis to reassess the incidence risk of PD-1/PD-L1 induced hyperthyroidism, hypothyroidism, and thyroiditis.

METHOD

The process of the meta-analysis was put into practice followed the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) (54).

Types of Enrolled Studies

Clinical trials, involving PD-1 or PD-L1 inhibitors, were identified by the PubMed search. Hematological malignancies

were excluded first. Phase III clinical trials for all kinds of cancer patients would be taken as the priority. Clinical trials, reported with partial results or belonging to other phases, would be arranged in an alternative location. For all clinical trials included in the study, the control group was necessary, but there was no specific requirement for the treatment regimen of them. The results of the enrolled clinical trial must be reported in English.

Search Strategy

Just as proposed by the PRISMA, keywords (neoplasm, cancer, precancer, malignant, premalignant, tumor, PD-1, PD-L1, and clinical trial) for search were set according to the PICOS (participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design) guidelines (54). The range of published time was set between Nov 23, 2010 and Nov 23, 2020. Four members of us were appointed for eligibility assessment and data extraction. In the case of duplicated reports of the same clinical trial, only one of them was used for the final analysis, and others would be included in the systematic review. The corresponding authors (Yuping Sun and Guohai Su) had the right to deal with all results and disagreements.

Evaluation of Study Quality and Publication Bias

Assessment for publication bias and risk of bias of individual trials were finished by Funnel plots, Egger's test, Harbord's test, and the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS) (54–59). Risk of bias summary, including selection bias, performance bias, detection bias, attrition bias, reporting bias and other bias, would be checked and shown in a single figure. A *P-value* of <0.05 was used as the cut-off value for statistical significance.

Outcome and Exposure of Interest

Baseline characteristics of all enrolled clinical trials, including duplicating reported ones, would be collected and summarized in a table. Grading of thyroid dysfunction, including hyperthyroidism, hypothyroidism, and thyroiditis, ranging from 1 (mild symptoms that do not interfere with activities of daily living) to 5 (fatal thyroid toxicities), was collected and gathered in excel tables. Dichotomous data would be given a priority, and other types of data would be collected first and then converted into dichotomous data.

Assessment of Heterogeneity and Statistical Analysis

Heterogeneity of all the data, identified by Cochrane's Q statistic test, was assessed by the DerSimonian-Laird method and quantified by

Abbreviations: PD-1, Programmed Cell Death-1; PD-L1, Programmed Cell Death Ligand 1; PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; PICOS, Participants, Interventions, Comparisons, Outcomes, and Study design; N/A, No Available; HR, Hazard Ratios; OR, Odds Ratio; CI, Confidence Interval; RE, Random Effect; NSCLC, Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer; SCLC, Small Cell Lung Cancer; OSCC, Oesophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma; HNSCC, Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma; UC, Urothelial Cancer; BC, Breast Cancer; RCC, Renal Cell Carcinoma; NOS, Newcastle-Ottawa scale; TNBC, Triple-Negative Breast Cancer; GGOJC, Gastric or Gastro-Oesophageal Junction Cancer.

I² values (54, 59). Three different grades, including low, moderate, and high, were divided according to I² values (< 25%, 25-50%, and > 50%). All the process of analyses was finished by the software Review Manager 5.3. The random effect model (RE) was used to deal with all the data to calculate odds ratio (OR) and their corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI) (60). The fixed effects (FE) model was only used for calculation of the funnel plots. All reported *P* values are 2-sided, and *P*<0.05 was taken to indicate statistically significance. Subgroup and stratification analyses would be performed according to tumor types, treatment regimens, and PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors.

RESULTS

Literature Search Results

The PRISMA flow diagram was shown in (**Figure 1**), while the bias assessment summary of all enrolled clinical trials were provided in (**Supplementary Figure 1**). A total of 589 published studies was found by PubMed search, while 37 studies were gotten from the former published meta-analysis (61–63). After eligibility assessment, 5 articles were only used for

the systematic review (13, 20–23), while 42 articles were used for the final comprehensive analysis (4–12, 14–19, 24–50). The clinical trial 'CheckMate 067' (NCT01844505) was reported 4 times (47–50), while the clinical trial 'PACIFIC' (NCT02125461) was reported 2 times (45, 46).

Characteristics of Identified Trials

Forty-three clinical trials, including 1 phase I (20), 1 phase I/II (40), 3 phase II (6, 9, 41), 1 phase II/III (39), and 37 phase III (4, 5, 7, 8, 10–12, 14–19, 21–38, 42–50), were collected and listed in (**Table 1**). Among all of them, 25 clinical trials (involving 28 articles) was found to be PD-1 related (4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, 23, 25, 27–29, 32, 34–44, 47–50), while 18 clinical trials (involving 19 articles) was reported to be PD-L1 related (5, 8–13, 16, 17, 20–22, 24, 26, 30, 31, 33, 45, 46). PD-1 or PD-L1 inhibitors were prescribed as the first line treatment regimen in 22 clinical trials (7, 8, 10–12, 14, 16, 18, 20–23, 27, 29, 33, 36, 37, 41, 47–50), and previous therapy was found in the other 21 clinical trials (4–6, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 24–26, 28, 34, 35, 38–40, 42–46). In all the clinical trials included in the study, 8 tumor types are mainly involved, of which lung cancer accounts for the largest proportion (**Table 1**) (12–14, 16, 17, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, 39, 40, 42, 44–46).



TABLE 1 | Baseline characteristics of all enrolled clinical trials (N = 47 articles of 43 clinical trials).

NO	Reference	NCT number	Drug Name	Treatment Regimen	Previous therapy	Phase	Involving Patients	Hypothyr-oidism	Hyperthyroidism	Thyroiditis	Tumor Type	
1	Huang et al. (4)	NCT03099382 (ESCORT)	Camrelizumab (PD-1)	Camrelizumab VS. Docetaxel	YES		448	41	N/A	N/A	OSCC	
2	Powles et al. (5)	NCT02302807 (IMvigor211)	Avelumab (PD-L1)	Avelumab VS. Placebo	YES	III	689	42	21	N/A	UC	
3	Zimmer et al. (6)	NCT02523313 (IMMUNED)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	Nivolumab VS. (Nivolumab + Ipilimumab)/ Placebo	YES	II	162	16	25	4	Melanoma	
4	Schmid et al. (7)	NCT03036488 (KEYNOTE-522)	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	(Pembrolizumab + (DC/EC)) VS. (Placebo + (DC/EC))	NO	III	1170	120	40	16	TNBC	
5	Mittendorf et al. (8)	NCT03197935 (IMpassion031)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	(Atezolizumab + nPDC) VS. (Placebo + nPDC)	NO	III	331	13	5	N/A	TNBC	
6	Emens et al. (9)	NCT02924883 (KATE2)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	(Atezolizumab + TE) VS. (Placebo + TE)	YES	II	200	N/A	2	N/A	BC	
7	Gutzmer et al. (10)	NCT02908672 (IMspire150)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	(Atezolizumab + VC) VS. (Placebo + VC)	NO	III	511	55	60	N/A	Melanoma	
8	Galsky et al. (11)	NCT02807636 (IMvigor130)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	(Atezolizumab + Chemotherapy) VS. (Atezolizumab/ Chemotherapy)	NO	III	807	99	55	N/A	UC	
9	Herbst et al. (12)	NCT02409342 (IMpower110)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	Atezolizumab VS. Chemotherapy (Platinum- based)	NO	III	549	31	15	N/A	NSCLC	
10	Reck et al. (13)	NCT02366143 (IMpower150)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	ACP VS. ABCP	YES	Ш	793	90	27	N/A	NSCLC	
11	Mok et al. (14)	NCT02220894 (KEYNOTE-042)	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. Chemotherapy (platinum-based)	NO	III	1251	86	43	10	NSCLC	
12	Cohen et al. (15)	NCT02252042 (KEYNOTE-040)	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. (Methotrexate, Docetaxel/ Cetuximab)	YES	III	480	46	6	N/A	HNSCC	
13	Paz-Ares et al. (16)	NCT03043872 (CASPIAN)	Durvalumab (PD-L1)	(Durvalumab + EP) VS. EP	NO	III	531	23	22	4	SCLC	
14	West et al. (17)	NCT02367781 (IMpower130)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	(Atezolizumab + CnP) VS. CnP	YES	III	705	71	24	N/A	NSCLC	
15	Burtness et al. (18)	NCT02358031 (KEYNOTE-048)	(PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. (Pembrolizumab + Chemotherapy)/ (Cetuximab + Chemotherapy)	NO		863	107	23	N/A	HNSCC	
16	Kato et al. (19)	NCT02569242 (ATTRACTION- 3)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	Nivolumab VS. Paclitaxel/Docetaxel	YES		417	2	N/A	N/A	OSCC	
17	Sullivan et al. (20)	NCT01656642	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	(Atezolizumab + vemurafenib) VS. (Atezolizumab + Cobimetinib + Vemurafenib)	NO	Ι	56	10	N/A	N/A	Melanoma	
18	Rini et al. (21)	NCT02420821 (IMmotion151)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	(Atezolizumab + Bevacizumab) VS. Sunitinib	NO	Ш	897	215	46	N/A	RCC	
19	Motzer (22)	NCT02684006 (JAVELIN Renal	Avelumab (PD-L1)	(Avelumab + Axitinib) VS. Sunitinib	NO		873	169	N/A	N/A	RCC	
20	Motzer et al. (23)	NCT02231749 (CheckMate 214)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	(Nivolumab + Ipilimumab) VS. Sunitinib	NO	111	1082	228	72	16	RCC	

Tian et al.

Frontiers in Oncology | www.frontiersin.org

(Continued)

Thyroid Dysfunction and PD1/PD-L1 Inhibitors

TABLE 1 | Continued

NO	Reference	NCT number	Drug Name	Treatment Regimen	Previous therapy	Phase	Involving Patients	Hypothyr-oidism	Hyperthyroidism	Thyroiditis	Tumor Type
21	Barlesi et al. (24)	NCT02395172 (JAVELIN Lung 200)	Avelumab (PD-L1)	Avelumab VS. Docetaxel	YES		758	22	5	3	NSCLC
22	Shitara et al. (25)	NCT02370498 (KEYNOTE-061)	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. Paclitaxel	YES	III	570	24	13	N/A	GGOJC
23	Hida et al. (26)	NCT02008227	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	Atezolizumab VS. Docetaxel	YES	III	101	4	3	N/A	NSCLC
24	Gandhi et al. (27)	NCT02578680 (KEYNOTE-189)	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. Placebo	NO	III	607	32	22	1	NSCLC
25	Eggermont et al. (28)	NCT02362594	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. Placebo	YES	III	1011	87	58	17	Melanoma
26	Paz-Ares et al. (29)	NCT02775435 (KEYNOTE-407)	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. Placebo	NO	III	558	27	22	4	NSCLC
27	Socinski et al. (30)	NCT02366143 (IMpower150)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	(Atezolizumab + BCP) VS. BCP	NO	III	787	65	21	N/A	NSCLC
28	Schmid et al. (31)	NCT02425891 (IMpassion130)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	(Atezolizumab + Nab-Paclitaxel) VS. (Placebo +Nab-Paclitaxel)	NO	III	890	97	26	N/A	TNBC
29	Hellmann et al. (32)	NCT02477826 (CheckMate 227)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	Nivolumab VS. (Nivolumab + Ipilimumab)/ Chemotherapy	NO		1537	92	N/A	N/A	NSCLC
30	Horn et al. (33)	NCT02763579 (IMpower133)	Atezolizumab (PD-L1)	Atezolizumab VS. Placebo	NO	III	394	26	16	N/A	NSCLC
31	Bellmunt et al. (34)	NCT02256436 (KEYNOTE-045)	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. (Platinum-based + Paclitaxel, Docetaxel, or Vinflunine)	YES	III	521	20	11	2	UC
32	Kang et al. (35)	NCT02267343 (ONO-4538-12, ATTRACTION-2)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	Nivolumab VS. Placebo	YES	III	491	11	2	1	GGOJC
33	Schachter et al. (36)	NCT01866319 (KEYNOTE-006)	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. Ipilimumab	NO	III	811	55	N/A	N/A	Melanoma
34	Reck et al. (37)	NCT02142738 (KEYNOTE-024)	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. Chemotherapy	NO	III	304	16	14	4	NSCLC
35	Ferris et al. (38)	NCT02105636 (CheckMate 141)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	Nivolumab VS. Chemotherapy	YES		347	10	2	2	HNSCC
36	Herbst et al. (39)	NCT01905657 (KEYNOTE-010)	Pembrolizumab (PD-1)	Pembrolizumab VS. Docetaxel	YES	11/111	991	57	35	2	NSCLC
37	Antonia et al. (40)	NCT01928394 (CheckMate 032)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	Nivolumab VS. (Nivolumab+Ipilimumab)	YES	1/11	213	14	12	N/A	SCLC
38	Hodi et al. (41)	NCT01927419 (CheckMate 069)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	lpilimumab VS. (Nivolumab + Ipilimumab)	NO	II	140	22	N/A	2	Melanoma
39	Borghaei et al. (42)	NCT01673867 (CheckMate 057)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	Nivolumab VS. Docetaxel	YES		555	19	4	1	NSCLC

Frontiers in Oncology | www.frontiersin.org

(Continued)

N	Reference	NCT number	Drug Name	Treatment Regimen	Previous therapy	Phase	Involving Patients	Hypothyr-oidism	Hyperthyroidism	Thyroiditis	Tumor Type
40	Weber et al. (43)	NCT01721746 (CheckMate 037)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	Nivolumab VS. (Dacarbazine/Paclitaxel + Carboplatin)	YES	=	370	15	9	N/A	Melanoma
41	Brahmer et al. (44)	NCT01642004 (CheckMate 017)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	Nivolumab VS. Docetaxel	YES	=	260	Ŋ	N/A	N/A	NSCLC
42 43	Antonia et al. (45) Antonia et al. (46)	NCT02125461 (PACIFIC)	Durvalumab (PD-L1)	Durvalumab VS. Placebo	YES	≡	602	59	36	N/A	NSCLC
44 45 47	Larkin et al. (47) Wolchok et al. (48) Hodi et al. (49) Larkin et al. (50)	NCT01844505 (CheckMate 067)	Nivolumab (PD-1)	Nivolumab VS. (Nivolumab + Ipilimumab)/ Ipilimumab	Q	≡	937	100	52	17	Melanoma
N/A, Urotl GGC	No Available; RCC, Rer 'helial Carcinoma; OSCC VC, Gastric or Gastro-C	nal Cell Carcinoma; N 2, Oesophageal Squ Desophageal Junctio	VSCLC, Non Small (Jamous Cell Carcin M Cancer; CnP, Ca	Dell Lung Cancer; HNSCC, Head-and-Neck Squan oma; HNSCC, Head-and-Neck Squamous Cell C rboplatin+nab-paclitaxel; nPDC, nab-paclitaxel+ d	nous Cell Carci carcinoma; RCC oxorubicin +cyc	noma; SCI C, Renal C slophospha	C, Small Ce C, Small Ce Sell Carcinom amide; TE, Tr	l Lung Cancer; TNBC, ⁻ a; DC, Doxorubicin+C, astuzumab + Emtansin	Triple-Negative Breast Car vclophosphamide; EC, EC e; VC, Vemurafenib + Cot	rcer; BC, Breast Co birubicin+Cyclophoc bimetinib; BCP, Bev	ncer; UC, phamide; acizumab

Risk of Bias

Bias assessment summary was provided in (Supplementary Figure 1). High attrition bias was only found in 1 articles (Supplementary Figure 1) (47), while unclear risk was identified in 21 articles (4, 8, 9, 13, 18–22, 25, 26, 30, 32, 36, 40, 41, 43–47). Publication bias assessment was displayed in the form of funnel plots, which were provided in the supplement (Supplementary Figures 2–6).

Risk of Hypothyroidism

Hypothyroidism was identified in 42 clinical trials (4–8, 10–50), 36 of which were used for the final meta-analysis (4–8, 10–12, 14–19, 24–50). For high attrition bias, one reported results of CheckMate 067 was excluded (**Table 1**) (47).

Compared with chemotherapy (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy), the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades was significantly higher (OR=7.15, 95%CI:[4.85, 10.55], $I^2 = 40\%$, Z=9.91(P <0.00001); Figure 2A) (4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 24-26, 32, 34, 37-39, 42-44). Subgroup analysis suggested that PD-1 appeared to be associated with a higher incidence risk of hypothyroidism (OR=8.34, 95%CI:[5.24, 13.28], I² = 37%, Z=8.94(P <0.00001); Supplementary Figure 7) (4, 14, 15, 18, 19, 25, 32, 34, 37-39, 42-44). Further stratification of subgroup analysis suggested that this risk trend was especially obvious in NSCLC subgroup (PD-1 VS. Docetaxel), when the control group was Docetaxel (OR=25.35, 95%CI:[7.95, 80.78], I² = 0%, Z=5.47 (P < 0.00001)) (Chi² = 20.89, df=8(P=0.007), I² = 61.67%; Figure 2A) (39, 42, 44). Through subgroup analysis, moderate heterogeneity ($I^2 = 40\%$, Figure 2A) was considered to be mainly caused by one of NSCLC subgroups (PD-L1 VS. Docetaxel) ($I^2 =$ 67%, Figure 2A) (24, 26). No obvious publication bias was found in the funnel plot (Supplementary Figure 2A). No significant results was noted (OR=3.18, 95%CI:[0.64, 15.77], I² = 0%, Z=1.41 (P = 0.16); Figure 3A), when the risk of hypothyroidism of grades 3-5 was assessed (14, 15, 24, 32). The corresponding funnel plot was shown in the supplement (Supplementary Figure 3A) (14, 15, 24, 32).

Compared with placebo (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo), the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades was significantly higher (OR=6.32, 95%CI:[4.01, 9.95], $I^2 = 20\%$, Z=7.96(*P* <0.00001); Figure 2B) (5, 6, 27–29, 33, 35, 46). Through subgroup analysis, low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 20\%$, Figure 2B) was considered to be mainly caused by one of NSCLC subgroups (PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy) ($I^2 = 26\%$, Figure 2B) (33, 46). No obvious publication bias was found in the corresponding funnel plot (Supplementary Figure 2B). No significant results was noted (OR=2.42, 95%CI:[0.50, 11.75], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=1.09(*P* =0.27); Figure 3B), when the risk of hypothyroidism of grades 3-5 was calculated (5, 27, 29, 45). The corresponding funnel plot was shown in the supplement (Supplementary Figure 3B) (5, 27, 29, 45).

When PD-1/PD-L1 combined with chemotherapy was compared with chemotherapy (PD-1/PD-L1+Chemotherapy VS. Chemotherapy), the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades was found to be significantly higher (OR=4.70, 95%CI:[3.05, 7.23], $I^2 = 47\%$, Z=7.02(*P* <0.00001); **Figure 2C**) in the PD-1/

FABLE 1 | Continued

+Carboplatin+Paclitaxel; ACP, Atezolizumab + Carboplatin + Paclitaxel; ABCP, Atezolizumab + Bevacizumab + Carboplatin + Paclitaxel

							В П
Study or Subgroup	PD-1/PD-L1 Events Total	Chernotherapy Events Tot	Weight	Odds Ratio A-H, Random, 95% Cl	Ode Year M-H, Rar	ds Ratio idom, 95% Cl	PD-1170-L1 Placebo Odda Ratio PD-1070-L1 P0-1070-L1 PD-1070-L1 PD-
14.1 PD-L1 VS. Docetax Barlesi F,et al.2018 Hida T,et al.2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Hieterogeneity. Tau* = 3.4 Test for overall effect. Z =	el(NSCLC) 22 393 3 56 449 25 12; Chi ^a = 3.00, df = 1 1.41 (P = 0.16)	0 36 1 4 41 1 P = 0.08); I ^a = 6	5 1.7% 5 2.4% 0 4.1%	44.27 [2.68, 732.55] 2.49 [0.25, 24.80] 9.55 [0.42, 219.12]	2018 2018		2.2.169 1VS. However, Hard 2010 27 45 2.2.169 1VS. However, Hard 2010 16 5.255 3.161.012.016
1.4.2 PD-1 VS. Decetaxe Borghaei H,et al.2015 Brahmer J,et al.2015 Herbst RS,et al.2016A Herbst RS,et al.2016B Subtotal (95% CI)	(INSCLC) 19 287 5 131 28 339 28 343 1100	0 28 0 12 1 30 1 30 101	3 1.7% 9 1.6% 9 3.1% 9 3.1% 5 9.4%	39.00 [2.34, 649.22] 11.26 [0.62, 205.77] 27.73 [3.75, 205.08] 27.38 [3.70, 202.46] 25.35 [7.95, 80.78]	2015 2015 2016 2016		22.2 P01 VLS PiceologNCLO 4 24.4 149% 7.51 [2.68,21.64] (216) → 4.22.9 PV VLS Pice + CILL&AddAdammal + 4.22.9 PV VLS Pice + CILL&AddAdammal + 4.22.9 PV VLS Pice + CILL&AddAdammal + + 4.22.9 PV VLS Pice + CILL&AddAdammal +
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = 1.4.3 PD-1 VS. Chemoth	80 10; Chi# = 0.41, df = 3 5.47 (P < 0.00001) erapy(NSCLC)	2 P = 0.94); I ^a = 0	к.				2.2.767 V/S. Rescholdfalestement Egyment Lad (2010) 7 59 1 4 592 30% 5.84 [12,10.41] 2016 4 4.2.379 V/S.59 4.157 4.2.5% 201 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010 4.31 4.5% 2010
Reck M, et al. 2016 Heilmann MD, et al. 2018 Mok TSK, vt al. 2019 Herbst RS, et al. 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ^e = 0.6 Test for overall effect. Z =	14 154 B 25 391 77 636 27 286 1467 143 00; Chi ² = 2.90, df = 3 8.05 (P < 0.00001)	2 15 0 57 9 61 4 26 159 15 P = 0.41); P = 0	0 4.7% 0 1.7% 5 10.5% 3 7.3% 8 24.2%	7.40 (1.65, 33.16) 79.39 (4.82, 1308.01) 9.27 (4.61, 18.68) 6.75 (2.33, 19.56) 8.99 [5.27, 15.35]	2016 2018B 2019 2020		Hetrogenety Tar 1 200, C pt = 0.00, T = 0.
1.4.4 PD-L1 VS. Chemot Herbst RS, et al. 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applii Test for overall effect. Z =	herapy(NSCLC) 27 286 286 27 :able 3.52 (P = 0.0004)	4 28 26 4	3 7.3% 8 7.3%	6.75 (2.33, 19.56) 6.75 [2.33, 19.56]	2020	•	2.23781 USE Predivation PD-1 CLLA 4 Oxfes Ratio Odds Ratio 2.23781 USE Predivational Control of the 2 state of the 2 st
1.4.5 PD-1 VS. Decetaxe Kato K,et al.2019 Huang J,et al.2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.0 Test for overall effect. Z =	4Paclitaxel(OSCC) 2 209 38 228 437 40 10; ChI*= 0.40, df = 1 4.47 (P < 0.0001)	0 20 3 22 42 P = 0.52); P = 0	3 1.5% 0 6.4% 8 7.9%	5.02 [0.24, 105.29] 14.47 [4.39, 47.52] 12.57 [4.14, 38.12]	2019		Tead (DP): Cq 2059 107.11 Molecome (T, T, T, M, C, T, Q, C, T, M, C, T,
14.6 PD-1/PD-L1VS. Ch Belimunt J, et al. 2017 Galsky MD, et al. 2020B Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.0 Taet for concernal effect 7 a	emotherapy(UC) 17 266 36 354 620 53 00; Chi ^e = 1.01, df = 1 4 14 (P. + 0.0001)	3 25 15 39 64 18 P = 0.32); P = 1	5 6.1% 0 11.3% 5 17.4 %	5.73 [1.66, 19.81] 2.83 [1.52, 5.26] 3.27 [1.87, 5.72]	2017 2020	+	Startic Literam Oak Rule
14.7 PD-1 VS. Paclitaxe Shitara K,et al 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not appli	a(GGOJC) 23 294 294 23 cable	1 27 27 1	5 3.0% 5 3.0 %	23.34 [3.13, 174.04] 23.34 [3.13, 174.04]	2018	-	3.12/19/L 1-Charamberger(CL) 759. df = 1/2 = 0.008). /= 68.9% Test for suborous differences; Ch ^a = 759. df = 1/2 = 0.008). /= 68.9% 12/19/L 1-12/19/L 10 24 226 51.65 [11.265.48] Standard/95/CL 24 226 51.65 [11.265.48] Towners 2 0 64.06 [Anite: Chine Towners 2 0 51.52 [276:192.11 [Anite: Anite: Ani
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.4.8 PD-1 VS. Chemoth Weber JS, et al. 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events	3.07 (P = 0.002) erapy(Melanoma) 15 268 268	0 10 10 0	2 1.7% 2 1.7%	12.53 (0.74, 211.45) 12.53 (0.74, 211.45)	2015	-	Local P = 42/100 Yes
Heterogeneity: Not applin Test for overall effect: Z = 1.4.9 PD-1 VS. Chemoth Ferris PI, et al 2016	able 1.75 (P = 0.08) erapy(HNSCC) 9 236	1 11	2.0%	4 36 (0 55 34 36)	2016		Decomplatation 71 402 71 412 71 412 71 412 71
Burtness B,et al.2019A Cohen EEW,et al.2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.0 Test for overall effect Z =	55 300 37 246 782 101 00; Chi ^a = 0.38, df = 2 5.88 (P < 0.00001)	18 28 9 23 63 28 P = 0.84); P = 0	7 12.0% 10.0% 24.9%	3.35 [1.92, 5.87] 4.43 [2.09, 9.39] 3.73 [2.40, 5.79]	2019 2019	•	3.3.570 +ChemelleregyVR.Dhe
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.3	5703 507 25; Chi ² = 31.57, df = 1	536 72 9 (P = 0.03); P	40%	7.15 [4.85, 10.55]	0.001 0.1	◆ 1 10 1000	Tead (25): C(1) 27(1) 27(2) Marging and the start (2, 1, 2, 2, 1) Trade (26): C(1) 10(1) 10(1) 10(1)

FIGURE 2 | Forest plots of the risk of all-grade hypothyroidism. (A) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1, chemotherapy drugs and tumor types in both groups. (B) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (C) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+Chemotherapy VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (D) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (E) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (E) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1 VS. CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on the PD-1 group. (F) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1 VS. CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on the PD-1 group.



FIGURE 3 | Forest plots of the risk of hypothyroidism for grades 3-5. (A) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (B) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (C) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (C) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+Chemotherapy VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups.

PD-L1 group (7, 8, 11, 16, 17, 30, 31). Through subgroup analysis, moderate heterogeneity ($I^2 = 47\%$, **Figure 2C**) was considered to be mainly caused by the NSCLC subgroup ($I^2 = 86\%$, **Figure 2C**) (17, 30). No obvious publication bias was found in the funnel plot (**Supplementary Figure 2C**).

No significant results was noted (OR=2.23, 95%CI:[0.46, 10.73], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=1.00(P = 0.32); Figure 3C), when the risk of hypothyroidism of grades 3-5 was assessed (7, 17, 30). The corresponding funnel plot was shown in the supplement (Supplementary Figure 3C) (7, 17, 30).

When PD-1/PD-L1 combined with CTLA-4 was compared with PD-1/PD-L1 (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4), the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades was found to be significantly lower (OR=0.51, 95%CI:[0.38, 0.70], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=4.30 (*P* <0.00001); **Figure 2D**) in the PD-1/PD-L1 group (6, 32, 40, 49). No heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$) was found. No obvious publication bias was found in the funnel plot (**Supplementary Figure 2D**). There were too few data to calculate the risk of hypothyroidism of grades 3-5 (49).

Compared with CTLA-4 (PD-1 VS. CTLA-4), the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades was found to be significantly higher (OR=6.66, 95%CI:[1.69, 26.25], $I^2 = 76\%$, Z=2.71(P = 0.007); **Figure 2E**) in the PD-1 group (36, 49). Through subgroup analysis, high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 76\%$, **Figure 2E**) might be related to the Nivolumab subgroup (**Figure 2E**) (49). The corresponding funnel plot was shown in the supplement

(Supplementary Figure 3E). No data of hypothyroidism of grades 3-5 was found.

When PD-1/PD-L1 combined with targeted therapy was compared with PD-1/PD-L1 (PD-1/PD-L1+Targeted VS. Targeted), the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades was found to be significantly increased (OR=3.05, 95%CI:[1.69, 5.51], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=3.71(*P* =0.0002); **Figure 2F**) (9, 10). No heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$) was found. No obvious publication bias was found in the funnel plot (**Supplementary Figure 2F**). No data of hypothyroidism of grades 3-5 was found.

Risk of Hyperthyroidism

Hyperthyroidism was identified in 36 clinical trials (5–18, 21, 23–31, 33–35, 37–40, 42, 43, 45–50), 31 of which were used for the final meta-analysis (5–12, 14–18, 24–31, 33–35, 37–40, 42, 43, 45–50).

Compared with chemotherapy (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy), the risk of hyperthyroidism of all grades was significantly higher (OR=4.79, 95%CI:[3.22, 7.13], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=7.73(P <0.00001); Figure 4A) in PD-1/PD-L1 group (11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 24-26, 34, 37-39, 42, 43). Subgroup analysis suggested that PD-1 appeared to be associated with a higher incidence risk of hyperthyroidism (OR=5.59, 95%CI:[3.46, 9.04], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=7.03(P < 0.00001); Supplementary Figure 8) (14, 15, 18, 25, 34, 37-39, 42, 43). However, no statistical significant difference was found between PD-1 and PD-L1 subgroup (P = 0.26, Supplementary Figure 8). No heterogeneity $(I^2 = 0\%)$ was found (Figure 4A). No obvious publication bias was found in the corresponding funnel plot (**Supplementary Figure 4A**). No significant results was noted (OR=2.83, 95%CI:[0.45, 18.00], I² = 0%, Z=1.10(P = 0.27); Figure 5A), when the risk of hyperthyroidism of grades 3-5 was assessed (14, 18, 39). The corresponding funnel plot was shown in the supplement (Supplementary Figure 5A) (14, 18, 39).

Compared with placebo (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo), the risk of hyperthyroidism of all grades was significantly higher (OR=4.76, 95%CI:[2.17, 10.41], $I^2 = 55\%$, Z=3.90(*P* <0.0001); **Figure 4B**) (5, 6, 27–29, 33, 35, 45). Through subgroup analysis, high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 55\%$) was considered to be mainly caused by PD-1 related NSCLC subgroup ($I^2 = 70\%$, **Figure 4B**) (27, 29). No obvious publication bias was found in the corresponding funnel plot (**Supplementary Figure 4B**). No significant results was noted (OR=3.00, 95%CI:[0.31, 28.89], $I^2 =$ 0%, Z=0.95 (*P* =0.34); **Figure 5B**), when the risk of hyperthyroidism of grades 3-5 was calculated (28, 29). The corresponding funnel plot was shown in the supplement (**Supplementary Figure 5B**) (28, 29).

When PD-1/PD-L1 combined with chemotherapy was compared with chemotherapy (PD-1/PD-L1+Chemotherapy VS. Chemotherapy), the risk of hyperthyroidism of all grades was found to be significantly higher (OR=4.38, 95%CI:[2.80, 6.85], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=6.48(*P* <0.00001); **Figure 4C**) in the PD-1/PD-L1 related group (7, 8, 11, 16, 17, 30, 31). No heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$) was found (**Figure 4C**). No obvious publication bias was found in the corresponding funnel plot (**Supplementary Figure 4C**). No significant results was noted (OR=3.06, 95%CI: [0.77, 12.10], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=1.60(*P* =0.11); **Figure 5C**), when the

risk of hyperthyroidism of grades 3-5 was assessed (7, 17, 30, 31). The corresponding funnel plot was shown in the supplement (**Supplementary Figure 5C**) (7, 17, 30, 31).

When PD-1/PD-L1 combined with CTLA-4 was compared with PD-1/PD-L1 (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4), the risk of hyperthyroidism of all grades was found to be significantly lower (OR=0.31, 95%CI:[0.19, 0.51], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=4.53 (P < 0.00001); Figure 4D) in the PD-1/PD-L1 mono-therapy group (6, 40, 49). No heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$) was found. No obvious publication bias was found in the funnel plot (Supplementary Figure 5D). Similar risk trend could also be seen, when the risk of hyperthyroidism of grades 3-5 was assessed (OR=0.11, 95%CI:[0.01, 0.86], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=2.11 (P = 0.04); Figure 5D) (6, 50). The corresponding funnel plot was shown in the supplement (Supplementary Figure 5D) (6, 50).

When PD-1/PD-L1 combined with chemotherapy was compared with PD-1/PD-L1 (PD-1/PD-L1+Chemotherapy VS. PD-1/PD-L1), no statistical analysis results of hyperthyroidism of all grades was found (OR=1.52, 95%CI:[0.91, 2.51], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=1.61(*P* =0.011); **Figure 4E**) (11, 18). No heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$) was found. No obvious publication bias was found in the funnel plot (**Supplementary Figure 4E**). There were too few data to calculate the risk of hyperthyroidism of grades 3-5 (18).

Risk of Thyroiditis

Thyroiditis was reported in 17 clinical trials (6, 7, 14, 16, 23, 24, 27–29, 34, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 47–50), 16 of which were used for the final meta-analysis (6, 7, 14, 16, 24, 27–29, 34, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 47–50).

Compared with chemotherapy (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy), the risk of thyroiditis of all grades was significantly higher (OR=5.88, 95%CI:[1.89, 18.30], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=3.06(P =0.002); **Figure 6A**) in PD-1/PD-L1 group (14, 24, 34, 37-39, 42). Subgroup analysis suggested that PD-1 appeared to be associated with a higher incidence risk of thyroiditis in NSCLC subgroup (OR=7.47, 95%CI:[1.67, 33.37], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=2.63(P =0.008); **Figure 6A**) (14, 37, 39, 42). However, no statistical significant difference was found indifferent subgroups (P =0.93, **Figure 6A**). No heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$) was found (**Figure 6A**). No obvious publication bias was found in the corresponding funnel plot (**Supplementary Figure 6A**). No data of thyroiditis of grades 3-5 was found.

Compared with placebo (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo), the risk of thyroiditis of all grades was significantly higher (OR=5.91, 95%CI:[1.54, 22.68], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=2.59(P = 0.010); Figure 6B1) (27–29, 35). No heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$) was found. No obvious publication bias was found in the funnel plot (Supplementary Figure 6B1). No statistical significant analysis results was found, when the risk of thyroiditis of grades 3-5 was checked (OR=2.13, 95%CI:[0.22, 20.58], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=0.66(P = 0.051); Figure 6B2) (27, 29). The corresponding funnel plot was shown in the supplement (Supplementary Figure 6B2) (27, 29).

When PD-1/PD-L1 combined with CTLA-4 was compared with CTLA-4 (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4), the risk of thyroiditis of all grades was found to be significantly lower (OR=0.12, 95%CI:[0.02, 0.68], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=2.40(P =0.02);

.1.1 PD-1 VS, Chemotherapy(NSCLC)		3.1.1 PD-1PD-11-Chemotherapy(TKBC)
Borghaei H,et al. 2015 4 287 0 268 1.89	6 8.52 [0.46, 159.07] 2015	
Reck M,et al. 2016 12 154 2 150 6.99 Herbst RS et al. 2016A 12 339 3 309 9.79	6 6.25 [1.38, 28.44] 2016 6 3.74 [1.05 13.39] 2016	Mttender/EA,et al.2020 5 164 0 167 2.4% 11.55(0.83,210.81) 2020
lerbst RS,et al. 2016B 20 343 3 309 10.69	6 6.32 [1.86, 21.47] 2016B	Summoral (95% C) 1397 994 44.5% 4.09 (2.09, 8.01) Total events 61 10
tok TSK, et al. 2019 39 636 4 615 14.79 Jubiotal (95% CD) 1759 1651 43.89	6 9.98 [3.54, 28.10] 2019	 Heterogeneiht, Tau^a = 0.00, Ch² = 0.75, df = 2 (P = 0.69), P = 0.69, P = 0.5 Tauté for convol attent = 2 4 1.5 (P = 0.001.)
otal events 87 12		
leterogeneity: Tau# = 0.00; Chi# = 1.43; df = 4 (P = 0.84); P = 0% est for overall effect Z = 6.17 (P < 0.00001)		3.1.2.19-1.1*Chemotherapy Vs. Chemotherapy (Vs.
		Viest Hetal2019 23 473 1 232 4.9% 11.81[1.58],87.98] 2019 Subdata 1855: (1) 966 862 24.3% 4.74.14.44.55.90
.1.2 PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy(NSCLC) lida Tetal 2018 2 56 1 45 2 79	6 1631014 18571 2018	Tratevents 39 6
larlesi F,et al. 2018 5 393 0 365 1.99	6 10.35 [0.57, 187.81] 2018	Heterogenetity, rau = 0.25, Cm = 1, 37, dit = 1 (P = 0.24), P = 27% Testfor overall effect 2 = 2.56 (P = 0.01)
Herbst RS,et al. 2020 13 286 2 263 7.09 Aubtotal (95% CI) 735 673 11.69	6 6.21 [1.39, 27.80] 2020	313D0.11cDemotherany VS. Chemotherany
otal events 20 3		Paz-Ares Let al 2019 22 265 0 266 2.5% 40.25 [2.07, 816.26] 2019
<pre>ieterogeneity: Tau^a = 0.00; Chi^a = 1.16, df = 2 (P = 0.56); P = 0% est for overall effect: Z = 2.69 (P = 0.007)</pre>		Sumotal (95% C) 205 206 2.5% 49.25 [2.3% 49.25] Total events 22 0
		Heterogeneity: Not applicable Teerofic overall effect: 1 = 2 + 2 + 2 = 1 007
erris RL, et al. 2016 2 236 0 111 1.79	6 2.38 [0.11, 49.94] 2016	- 114 DOI 14/bitsberge/VS (Champhersmell?)
ohen EEW,et al.2019 5 246 1 234 3.49	6 4.83 [0.56, 41.69] 2019	- Galsky Di-chantoolee apy 52 Common apy 52 / 1 453 7 390 28.9% 4.02 (175, 9.23) 2020
ubtotal (95% CI) 782 632 13.9%	2.99 [1.03, 8.66]	Subtotal (95% CI) 453 390 28.8% 4.02 [1.75, 9.23] Total events 31 7
otal events 15 4		Heterogeneity: Not applicable Tant for annual effect. / a 2.9.0 A = 0.001
est for overall effect: Z = 2.02 (P = 0.04)		1951-00-099148 1984-1 Z = 3.26 (F = 0.001)
14 DD 13/S Chemotheramell(C)		Tetal (95% C) 2381 2276 100.0% 4.38 [2.80, 6.85]
ielimunt J,et al. 2017 10 266 1 255 3.79	6 9.92 [1.26, 78.08] 2017	
alsky MD, et al. 2020B 17 354 7 390 19.89	6 2.76 [1.13, 6.74] 2020	Test for overall elect. 2 = 0.06 (* 0.0000) Test for suborou difference: Ch* 2.34, dr = 3 (P = 0.40), P = 0% PD-1/PD-L1*Chemotherapy Chemotherapy
otal events 27 8	3.73[1.20, 11.00]	
leterogeneity: Tau# = 0.20; Chi# = 1.30, df = 1 (P = 0.25); P = 23%		PD-1/PD-L1 PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
estion overall effect. $Z = 2.37$ (P = 0.02)		Study or Subaroup Events Total Events Total Weight M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year M-H, Random, 95% Cl 4.1.1 Markeman IV-Subarburghabilitaryan Philiparanomia
1.1.5 PD-1 VS. Chemotherapy(GGOJC)		Hodi FS,etal 2018A 14 313 35 313 62.3% 0.37 [0.20, 0.71] 2018
aubtotal (95% CI) 294 276 3.89	6 11.70 [1.51, 90.61]	ZimmerLet12020A 5 56 20 55 22.3% 0.17[0.06,0.50] 2020
otal events 12 1		Total events 19 55
est for overall effect: Z = 2.36 (P = 0.02)		Heterogeneity: Tau# = 0.10; Ch# = 1.48, df = 1 (P = 0.22); P = 32% Taof for exemptile officer Z = 2.42.49 = 0.000(b)
16 PD-1VS Chemotheram(Melanoma)		163.101.016188 EB54.2 = 0.0000
Veber JS,et al.2015 5 268 1 102 3.49	6 1.92 [0.22, 16.64] 2015	4.1.2 Nivolumab VS. Nivolumab igilimumab (SCLC) Antonio S Lata J 2016 2 98 2 54 7.7% 0.25 (0.05.2.19) 2016
iubtotal (95% CI) 268 102 3.4%	% 1.92 [0.22, 16.64]	Antonia SJ,eta (2016) 2 98 3 54 7.7% 0.35 (0.06, 2.19) 2016
leterogeneity: Not applicable		Subtotal (95% CI) 196 108 15.4% 0.35 [0.10, 1.28]
est for overall effect: Z = 0.59 (P = 0.55)		1004 eVents Heterogenetik: Tau# = 0.00; Chi# = 0.00, df = 1 (P = 1.00); i# = 0%
otal (95% Cl) 4458 3979 100.09	6 4.79 [3.22, 7.13]	Test for overall effect Z = 1.58 (P = 0.11)
Total events 166 29		Total (95% Cl) 565 476 100.0% 0.31 [0.19, 0.51]
rest for overall effect: Z = 7.73 (P < 0.00001)	0.001 0.1 1 10 PD-1/PD-L1 Chemothe	1000 Total events 23 61
"est for subaroup differences: Chi#= 3.44. df= 5 (P = 0.63). I#= 0%		Testforeral #0 = 0.00, 01 = 1.30, 01 = 0.00, 1 = 0.00 Testfore overall effect 22 = 4.53 (P < 0.0001) Testfore overall effect 22 = 4.53 (P < 0.0001) Dutept 1 =
		Test for subarous differences: Chi ² = 0.08. df = 1 (P = 0.78). I ² = 0%
PD-1PD-L1 Placebo	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio	
PD-1.PD-L1 Placebo tudy or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weigh 1.1.PD-1 VS, Placebo(NSCLC)	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio ht M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year M-H, Random, 95% Cl	E PD-14PD-14*Chemotherapy PD-19PJ-11 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
PD-1.PD-1.1 Placebo tudy or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weigh 1.1.PD-1.VS. Placebo(NSCLC) az-Ares Letal.2018 10 169 1 167 9.3	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio ht M-H, Random, 95% CI Year M-H, Random, 95% CI \$\$ 10.44 (1.32, 825.00) 2018	E P0.1P0.11-Chemotherapy P0.1P0.11 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Staty or Subarcos Events Tatal Overts Tatal Weight M-H. Banden, 5% CI M-H. Banden, 5% CI
PD.1PD.L1 Placebo ub/or Subgroup Fevrits Total Verita Total Weind 1.1PD.1VS.Placebo(HSCLC) 24.4 Verita 11 17 9.3 Aves.pt al.2018 10 169 1 167 9.3 anchi.L.qui 2018 16 405 6 202 12.1 adetaid (95%) 0.5 7.4 349 27.4 349 25.7 35.9 25.7 35	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio ht M-H, Random, 95% CI Year M-H, Random, 95% CI % 10.44 [1.32, 82.50] 2018 % 1.34 [0.52, 3.49] 2019 % 3.06 [0.40, 23.35] Image: Close Clos	E PD-1PD-L1+-Chernotherapy Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Shark or Sharcop Events Total Zents Total Weight MH-Random, 55% CI MH-Random, 55% CI 8.11 PD-L1+Chernotherapy XR 20-L1 12 276 8 300 30.9% 1.68 () 87, 41/2
PD-1PD-L1 Placebe Downs Total Paris 11 PD-1VS. PlacebetRSCU_ 10 169 1 17 sx-sex_Leta_2018 10 169 1 167 3.2 abdrail, Leta_1019 16 65 6 202 18:1 abdrail (SV C) 574 369 26.5 14 events 26 abl events 26 7 7 7 7 7 7	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio M. M.R.Random, 55% Cl. Year M.H. Random, 55% Cl. Year % 10.4 (1.32, 82.50) 2016 % 3.04 (3.23, 3.40) 2016 % 3.06 (0.40, 23.35)	E 594/9 or 536/arrow P0.1053.11-30cm/strage P0.1070.11 Odds Ratio State of 536/arrow F00.1 Total Events Total Weidd MH, Bandon, 595. Cl MH, Bandon, 595. Cl MH, Bandon, 595. Cl MH, Bandon, 595. Cl State of 54. Cl State of 55. Cl State of
PD-1PD-11 Placebo Devins Total Devins Total Weisities 11PD-1VS-Racebod/RSCLD 0 109 1 67 8.3 Anore Let al 2016 1 67 6 26.2 1.3 Anore Let al 2016 1 67 6 26.2 1.4 Market Action Let al 2016 2 7 7 2 7 deteopenets Tull* 1.06 (= 0.23), df - 1.07 = 0.07, if = 7.0%, station or all effect C.1.08 (= 0.23) 7 7.9%, station or all effect C.1.08 (= 0.22)	MdAR Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio MdAR Ration. 92% CL. Your MH, Random. 92% CL. % 1.04 (13.2, 82.50) 2018 % 1.34 (13.2, 82.50) 2019 % 3.08 (0.46, 23.35) 2019	E PD.1PD.11-Chemothwrapy PD.1PD.11 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Shafy or Subarcon Kenta Teld Versiti 141 Odds Ratio 6.11 0PD.1 Teld Centa Teld Versiti 141.0 Net John 8.11 0PD.1 Teld 276 0.00 30.9% 1.89 (b7, 41.2) 141.0 Sadded and SPS CD 2.276 0.00 30.9% 1.66 (b67, 41.2) 141.0 Sadded and SPS CD 2.276 0.00 30.9% 1.66 (b67, 41.2) 141.0 Total events 1.2 0 30.9% 1.66 (b67, 41.2) 141.0
TOIL 100 L.1 Floreday Events Total Events Total 1.1 PD-1VS, PlaceboldRSLQ 0 160 1167 3.3 2xAves, Lett 2019 10 160 1167 3.3 abd/set, Lett 2019 10 160 0.6 2.02 101 abd/set, Lett 2019 16 40.6 2.02 101 4.04 2.02 101 abd/set, Lett 2019 16 40.6 2.02 101 4.04 2.02 2.05 abd/set, Lett 2014 16 16 6.02 2.01 7 3.09 2.8.5 abd/set/set/set/set/set/set/set/set/set/set	M AHL Rankon, 55% CI Year McAt Rankon, 55% CI 10 M-12, 202, 202, 202 2016 % 1.24 (6.52, 24.60) 2016 % 3.266 (0.40, 22.35) 3.366 (0.40, 22.35)	E PD-18/D.11-Opennet/barrage PD-18/D.11 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 8.11PD.11-Chemestherage Total Cents Total Cents 16.0 No.1 No.1 8.11PD.11-Chemestherage 20 8.00 30.9 16.0 No.1 Burbers & dr.41.20168 12 276 8.00 30.9 1.60 No.7, 4.12 Total events 12 276 8 30.9 3.69 1.60 No.7, 4.12 Total events 12 276 8 30.9 3.69 1.60 No.7, 4.12 Total events 12 276 8 30.9 3.69 1.60 No.7, 4.12 Total events 12 276 8 30.9 3.69 1.60 No.7, 4.12 Total events 10.9 9.0 3.00 1.50 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60 1.60
PD-1070-11 Placebe Dents Total Dents Total Weide 1.1070-156 Nicobe0HCC 100 160 1 167 23 1.1070-156 Nicobe0HCC 10 160 1 167 23 2x4res Leads12018 10 160 0 20 121 1 26 202 121 adead (95% C) 574 360 28.5 31 d=1.0° = 0.007, F = 70%, 10 100	Models Table Odde Table Mith Bandom, 955;Cl. Year Mith Bandom, 955;Cl. Start, Start	Statute of Shifter opt. IP1.105.11 Odda Ratio Odda Ratio Statute of Shifter opt. Secret Total Vestatic Mitt Readown, 92% CI Mitt Readown, 92% CI B.1109.11 Link Vestatic Total Vestatic Mitt Readown, 92% CI Mitt Readown, 92% CI Burthous Det All 2019 F0.1 276 0.00 30.9% 1.68 [0.67, 4.12] — Statute optic 276 0 30.9% 1.68 [0.67, 4.12] — — Total events 12 0 30.9% 1.68 [0.67, 4.12] — — Test or ownsile effect 2 = 119 0F = 0.200 Total Events 12 0 0.9% 1.69 [0.67, 4.12] —
$\label{eq:resolution} \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Mith Bankin, 55%, Cl. Year Date Rate Mith Bankin, 55%, Cl. Year Mith Bankin, 55%, Cl. Year Mith Bankin, 55%, Cl. Year Mith Bankin, 55%, Cl. Year % 1.24 (5.2, 24.0) % 5.19 (1.57, 1.74) % 5.19 (1.57, 1.74) % 5.19 (1.57, 1.74) % 5.22 (2.7, 5.69)	E PD 19PD.11-01emethwrapy PD 19PD.11 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 8.107.01.01emethwrapy VS. PD 1 1741 Odds Ratio M14.0amilien, 595.01 M14.0amilien, 595.01 9.8107.01.01emethwrapy VS. PD 1 276 9.00 30.95 1.95 (97,41.2) Sadded all Soft D 2.276 9.00 30.95 1.96 (167,41.2) Total events 1.2 276 9.00 30.95 1.66 (167,41.2) Total events 1.2 0 9.00 30.95 1.66 (167,41.2) 1.95 (17,11.2) Total events 1.2 0 9.00 30.95 1.66 (167,41.2) 1.95 (17,11.2) Total events 1.2 0 9.00 30.95 1.66 (167,41.2) 1.95 (17,11.2) Total events 1.2 0 1.95 (16,11.6) 1.95 (17,11.2) 1.95 (17,11.2) Total events 1.2 1.05 (15,11.6) (19,70.2,200) 1.95 (17,11.2) 1.95 (17,11.2) Outs MD ref 2.70.02 1.5 (16,11.6) (14,12.2) 1.5 (16,11.6) (17,2.200) 1.95 (16,11.2) 1.95 (16,11.2) Sadded all 9
P0-1F0-L1 Placebe Torm Torm Torm L10P0-VIS-Flacebul9KSCLC1 106 1 167 23 L40P0-VIS-Flacebul9KSCLC1 106 1 167 23 L40P0-VIS-Flacebul9KSCLC1 16 45 24 23 L40P0-VIS-Flacebul9KSCLC1 574 30 24 3 L40P0-VIS-Flacebul9KSCLC1 12 12 16 65 3 24 15 L21P0-L1VS-Flacebul9KSCLC1 574 3 23 1.55 5 1.55 <	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 16 M-R. Ratio M-R. Ratio 10 4/12.282.202 2016 % 1.24 (6.22.202) 2016 % 515 (1.57, 17.18) 2017 % 515 (1.57, 17.18) 2017 % 3.28 (1.43, 7.54)	E 59:190.11-3emotheragy P0.190.11-3emotheragy P0.190.11-3emotheragy Odds Ratio 8.1.190.11-Chemetheragy Total Central Total Notest Mitt Bandon, 595.01 Burbors 56 et al.2019 1.2 276 0.00 30.9% 1.66 [0.07, 4.12] Sadded and Soc 01 1 276 0.00 30.9% 1.66 [0.07, 4.12] Transformer and sect 2 = 1.09 (P = 0.10) 1 0 0 0.06% 1.66 [0.07, 4.12] Transformer and sect 2 = 1.09 (P = 0.10) 1 453 1.7 354 (0.01%, 1.46 [0.79, 2.60] Saddetal (p55 C) 31 453 1.7 354 (0.01%, 1.46 [0.79, 2.60] Total or one-total central or one-total
$\label{eq:resonance} \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Model Table Date Table Date Table Model Table MH Bandom . 59: CI MH Bandom . 59: CI % 1.24 (#12,22,22,02) 0218 % 1.24 (#12,22,22,02) 0218 % 1.24 (#12,22,22,02) 0218 % 5.19 (#157,17,18) 0217 % 5.19 (#57,17,18) 0217 % 2.25 (#7,6.68) 0216	E Dist of Subject on Subject and Subject on Subj
$\label{eq:constraints} \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	M MLR Bandlow Dedde Ratio M MLR Bandom, 595; CI Year MLR Bandom, 595; CI MLR Bandom, 595; CI Year MLR Bandom, 595; CI % 1.24 (B52; 24:02) 2016 F % 5.19 (I.57; 17:16) 2017 F % 5.19 (I.57; 17:16) 2017 F % 2.25 (D.77; 6.59) 2010 F	E PD:1PD.11-Opennet/wrapy PD:1PD.11 Odde Ratio Odde Ratio 8.11PD.11-Chemenderargy Total Zevers Total Weistrik M.H. Bandem, 92% CI M.H. Bandem, 92% CI 8.11PD.11-Chemenderargy 12 276 8 100 30.9% 16.89 (p.7.4.12) Burhovs B et Al.2019 12 276 8 000 30.9% 16.89 (p.7.4.12) Total weistrik 12 276 8 000 30.9% 16.89 (p.7.4.12) Total weistrik 10 10.7% 3 000 30.9% 16.89 (p.7.4.12) Total weistrik 10.7% (P.7.0) 12 76 8 000 30.9% 16.89 (p.7.4.12) Total weistrik 10.7% (P.7.0) 12 96 16.9% 16.9% 16.9% 16.9% R12PD-14Chemederargy VS.PD-1 00 34.5 17 354 69.1% 1.48 (p.7.9.2.68) Stadead (PDS CI 21 17 144 (p.9.2.5%) 17 144 (p.9.2.5%) Herocogenee(N tot gocicicicic) 21 17
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Models Table Odde Table Odde Table Mild Random, 25% CI Year Mild Random, 25% CI Year Mild Random, 25% CI Year % 1.24 (£2,22,24) (2016) + % 1.24 (£2,22,24) (2016) + % 5.16 (£5,17,16) 2017 % 5.16 (£5,17,16) 2017 % 5.26 (£7,6.59) 2010 % 3.28 (£4,7,754) •	E TP1: 1170.1.1-12-benefitier appr. P0: 1170.1.1 Odder Ratio Odder Ratio R.1.1 P0: 1.1-Chementher appr. Total Levents Total Levents Total Levents Total Levents Not.1 Buthows Status Status Total Levents Total Levents Total Levents Total Levents Not.1 Buthows Status Status 276 9 100 30.9% 15.89 [S0.7.4.1.2] Total revents 12 0 30.9% 15.89 [S0.7.4.1.2] Total revents Total revents 12 0 30.9% 15.89 [S0.7.4.1.2] Total revents Total revents 12 0 30.9% 15.89 [S0.7.4.1.2] Total revents Total revents 12 0 30.9% 15.89 [S0.7.4.1.2] Total revents Total revents 13 14.1 25 55 69.7% 1.49 [D.70, 2.80] Total revents 13 17 154 [S0.1%, 1.49 [D.79, 2.80] Total revents 17 Total revents 13 17 728 [S0.1 [S0.1, 2.51] Total reve
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Model Table Date Table Mit Bandom SS: CI Mit Bandom SS: CI Mit Bandom SS: CI Year Mit Bandom SS: CI Mit Bandom SS: CI 1.34 (H.20, 22, 20] 2018	E P0.190.11-Otenestherapy P0.190.11 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 8.1190.11-Otenestherapy Total Zents Total Zents Mill Bandem, 925.0 Mill Bandem, 925.0 8.1190.11-Otenestherapy 12 270 8 300 30.9 16.0 Total cents 12 270 8 300 30.9 16.0 16.1 Total cents 12 270 8 300 30.9 16.0 16.0 Total cents 12 270 8 300 30.9 16.0 16.0 16.0 Total cents 10.9 0.10 31 453 17 354 68.1% 1.46 (p.07, 2.66) Obtals MS(1, d.2020) 31 453 17 354 68.1% 1.46 (p.07, 2.66) Total cents 31 453 17 354 68.1% 1.46 (p.07, 2.66) Total cents 31 453 17 354 69.7% 1.46 (p.07, 2.66) Total cents 32 65 100.0
P0-1P0-L1 Placebe Control Total Porch Placebe 1.195-1VS-Placebe/98CC-0 100 160 1 167 23 Areas Let al 2018 10 160 1 167 23 Areas Let al 2018 10 166 0 20 151 Betration Let al 2018 16 45 20 151 166 450 202 151 Betration Let al 2018 10 169 167 23 167 70% 157 107 107 107 23 123 155 155 156 167 53 34 155 156 167 53 34 155 156 167 167 34 34 155 156 167 163 34 163 166 16 35 34 155 156 166 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 <td>Models Table Odde Date MAH Bandom, 955 Cl. Year MAH Bandom, 955 Cl. % 114 4[12, 22, 24, 0] % 124 8[22, 24, 0] % 519 [157, 17, 19] % 519 [157, 17, 19] % 225 8[7, 6, 69] % 226 [0, 12, 61, 50]</td> <td>E P0.109.11-Operative rays P0.109.11 Odde Ratio Odde Ratio Buth or Sharmon Fords Total Centris Total Centris Total Centris Total Centris No. 30.9% 1.68.987,41.2 Buthors Strict Stada 2019 1.2 270 8.00 30.9% 1.68.987,41.2 Buthors Strict 2.00 3.09% 1.68.987,41.2 1.69.987,41.2 1.69.987,41.2 Buthors Strict 2.00 3.09% 1.69.987,41.2 1.69.987,41.2 1.69.987,41.2 Total centra 2.00 3.09% 1.69.987,41.2 1.69.978,22.8 1.69.978,22.8 Total centra 2.01.079,-03.07 4.53 3.54.98.978,51.4 1.69.978,2.8 1.64.979,2.8 Total centra 3.01.179,0.12,0.1179,0.22.7 1.736 654.109.0% 1.52.8.91,2.51 1.64.979,2.8 Total centra 3.01.179,0.22,710,0.5 1.02 7.20 654.109.0% 1.52.8.91,2.51 1.01,1.1,0.1,1.</td>	Models Table Odde Date MAH Bandom, 955 Cl. Year MAH Bandom, 955 Cl. % 114 4[12, 22, 24, 0] % 124 8[22, 24, 0] % 519 [157, 17, 19] % 519 [157, 17, 19] % 225 8[7, 6, 69] % 226 [0, 12, 61, 50]	E P0.109.11-Operative rays P0.109.11 Odde Ratio Odde Ratio Buth or Sharmon Fords Total Centris Total Centris Total Centris Total Centris No. 30.9% 1.68.987,41.2 Buthors Strict Stada 2019 1.2 270 8.00 30.9% 1.68.987,41.2 Buthors Strict 2.00 3.09% 1.68.987,41.2 1.69.987,41.2 1.69.987,41.2 Buthors Strict 2.00 3.09% 1.69.987,41.2 1.69.987,41.2 1.69.987,41.2 Total centra 2.00 3.09% 1.69.987,41.2 1.69.978,22.8 1.69.978,22.8 Total centra 2.01.079,-03.07 4.53 3.54.98.978,51.4 1.69.978,2.8 1.64.979,2.8 Total centra 3.01.179,0.12,0.1179,0.22.7 1.736 654.109.0% 1.52.8.91,2.51 1.64.979,2.8 Total centra 3.01.179,0.22,710,0.5 1.02 7.20 654.109.0% 1.52.8.91,2.51 1.01,1.1,0.1,1.
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Model Table Oase Data Mill Bandom 254 CI Year Mill Bandom 254 CI Year Mill Bandom 254 CI Year Mill Bandom 254 CI Year % 1.24 (9.22,240) 2016 % 519 (157, 17.16) 2017 % 2.25 (9.71, 6.50) 2017 % 2.46 (0.12, 51.50) 2017	Bit of Schements PD: 1170.1112.htm://bit of Schements Odds: Ratio Odds: Ratio R.1170.112.htm://bit of Schements 1630 1630 0.01 No.1 R.1170.112.htm://bit of Schements 12 276 0.00 0.09 30.9% 1.68 (0.7, 1.2) Statute of Schements 12 276 0.00 30.9% 1.68 (0.7, 1.2) 1.67 (0.7, 1.2) Table orderit 12 0 0.00 30.9% 1.68 (0.7, 1.2) 1.67 (0.7, 1.2) Table orderit 12 0 0.00 30.9% 1.68 (0.7, 1.2) 1.67 (0.7, 2.68) Table orderit 12 0 0.00 30.9% 1.68 (0.7, 1.2) 1.67 (0.7, 2.68) Table orderit 1.01 (0.7, 1.2) 1.01 (0.7, 1.2) 0 1.7 1.64 (0.9%, 2.68) 1.67 (0.7, 2.68) Table orderit 0.01 (1.2) (0.7, 1.2) 7.29 651 (10.0.9% 1.52 (0.9, 1.25 (1) 1.61 (0.9, 1.2) Table orderit 0.01 (1.2) (0.7, 1.00) 7.29 651 (10.0.9% 1.52 (0.9, 1.25 (1) 1.61 (1.1) (1.0.1) Table orderit
$\label{eq:response} \hline \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Models Table Odde Date MAH Bandon, Son Clear MH Bandon, Son Clear % 10.44 (132, 02.240) % 13.48 (32, 3.40) % 51.91 (15.7, 17.16) % 51.91 (15.7, 17.16) % 2.28 (37.6.56) % 2.48 (0.12, 51.50)	E PD:18/D.11-Chemotheragy PD:18/D.11 Odde Ratio Odde Ratio Burbors Status Total Cents Total Cents Total Weidel M.1.1
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Model Date Date MH Bandom MH Bandom Str. 10 % 1.24 (B/2), 24/2 0210 MH Bandom Str. 10	Example constraining PD: 11PD.11-Chemotheragy PD: 11PD.11 Odder Ratio Odder Ratio Rx11 PD.11-Chemotheragy Control Total Control 100.0 0.000.0
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Model Date Date Mill Bandom 355; Cl Year Mill Bandom 355; Cl Mill Bandom 355; Cl Year Mill Bandom 355; Cl % 1.24 (B.22, 240) 2016 Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action % 5.19 (B.57, 17, 16) 2017 Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action % 5.19 (B.57, 17, 16) 2017 Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action % 2.25 (D.7, 5.69) 2010 Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action % 2.46 (D.12, 51.50) 2017 Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action % 2.46 (D.12, 51.50) 2017 Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action % 2.46 (D.12, 51.50) 2017 Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action Image: Signal Action % 9.41 (Action, 222.11) 2016 Image: Signal Action Image: Signal A	E P0.19D.11-Otensibler app. P0.19D.11 Odde Ratio Odde Ratio Subjer of Shift row Fords Total Vestal HL/Backen, 505.01 M.H. Randem, 505.01 Burbors & et al. 2010 12 276 8 300 30.96 16.88 (p.F. 1.12) Total vestal 12 276 8 300 30.96 16.88 (p.F. 1.12) Total vestal 12 276 8 300 30.96 16.88 (p.F. 1.12) Total vestal 12 276 8 300 30.96 16.88 (p.F. 1.12) Total vestal 10.79 0.80 30.96 16.88 (p.F. 1.12) 14.97 Total vestal 10.67 0.70 30 30.96 16.88 (p.F. 1.12) 14.97 Statud RD vid 2020A 21 17 14.98 (p.R. 1.48 (p.P. 2.28)) 14.98 (p.R. 1.48 (p.P. 2.28)) 14.98 (p.R. 1.48 (p.P. 2.26)) Total vestal 21 17 14.98 (p.R. 1.16 (p.P. 2.26)) 17.98 (p.R. 1.16 (p.P. 2.26)) 17.98 (p.R. 1.28 (p.R. 1.27)) 10.00 (p.R. 1.28 (p.R. 1.27)) Total vestal 42
P0-1P0-11 Placebe bit 05 bits - Division Total Courts Total Courts Total Courts Total Courts Total Courts Total Weight Acres Let al 2018 0 166 1 67 3 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 3 3 2 3 3 2 3 1 5 3 3 4 5 3 1 5 3 3 4 5 3 3 4 5 3 3 4 5 3 3 4 5<	Models Table Odde Date Mill Random, 25% Cl. Year Mill Random, 25% Cl. Year Mill Random, 25% Cl. Year % 1104 (112, 22, 22, 42) 0108	P0.1070.11 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Subtrop 5.0cm Fords Fords Fords Fords Fords Mith Bandom, 205.01 Mith Bandom, 205.01 Burlings 5.01 12 27.0 8.00 30.9% 1.68 (87, 41.2) Staddard 0.01 27.0 8.00 30.9% 1.68 (87, 41.2) Fords Tradit openers, Mith applicable 1 27.6 9.00 30.9% 1.68 (87, 41.2) Tradit openers, Mith applicable 1 27.0 8.00 30.9% 1.68 (87, 41.2) Tradit openers, Mith applicable 1 27.0 8.00 30.9% 1.68 (87, 41.2) Staddard 055.01 21 4.53 1.52 (8.91, 6.1) 1.64 (82.79, 2.68) Tradit openets, Mith applicable 1 1.7 1.64 (82.79, 2.68) 1.64 (82.79, 2.68) Tradit openets, Mith applicable 1 7.29 651 (10.9% 1.52 (8.91, 2.51) Tradit openets, Mith applicable 1 7.79 251 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Model Table Open Table Open Table Model Table MH Bandom 595 CI MH Bandom 595 CI % 1.24 (9.22, 24.01, 2016) MH Bandom 595 CI % 1.24 (9.22, 24.01, 2016) Image: Comparison of the table of t	E P0.19D.11-Observation rays P0.19D.11 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 81.19D.11-Observation rays Ford Ford Ford Ford Mill Banders, 25:0.1 Mill Banders, 25:0.1 81.19D.11-Observation rays Ford 70 8 300 30.96 1.64 (9.67, 41.2) Total events 12 276 8 300 30.96 1.64 (9.67, 41.2) Total events 12 276 8 300 30.96 1.64 (9.67, 41.2) Total events 10 0.90 30.96 1.64 (9.67, 41.2) 4.64 (9.67, 41.2) Obtal SMD 0.62 30.97 30 30.96 1.64 (9.79, 2.68) Total events 31 453 17 354 60.75 1.46 (9.79, 2.68) Total events 31 453 17 354 60.75 1.46 (9.79, 2.68) Total events 31 453 17 354 60.75 1.64 (9.79, 2.68) Total events 32 12 17 10 1.52 (9.7, 2.51)
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Models Table Odde Date MAH Random, 955 CI Year MAH Random, 955 CI Year MAH Random, 955 CI Year % 1.24 (#2,2,24.01, 2019) Image: Comparison of the comparison	P0.180.11 Control Total Contro Cont
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Model Date Description Model 355:CI Year MH Bandom 255:CI % 1.24 (0.2, 22.20) 2018 % 1.24 (0.2, 22.20) 2019 % 5.15 (1.57, 17.18) 2017 % 2.25 (0.7, 6.59) 2010 % 2.26 (0.12, 25.50) % 2.46 (0.12, 25.50) 2017 % 2.46 (0.12, 25.50) % 9.41 (400, 22.11) 2016 % 9.41 (400, 22.11) 2017 % 9.41 (400, 22.11) 2017	E P0.190.11 Odds Total Odds Total Odds Total 8.11P0.11 Control Total Control HLI Bandemu 109:01 8.11P0.11 Control 0 30.03 30.5% 16.69 [0.67, 41.2] Burbers IS et al. 2010/8 1.2 2.07 8 30.00 30.5% 16.69 [0.67, 41.2] Total events 1.2 2.08 0 30.9% 16.69 [0.67, 41.2] 0 Burbers IS et al. 2010/r 1.07 0.100 30.9% 16.69 [0.67, 41.2] 0 0 Total events 3.1 1.7 3.54 60.1% 1.489 [0.79, 2.68] 0 Total events 3.1 1.7 5.4 60.1% 1.489 [0.79, 2.68] 0 Total events 3.1 7.5 60.1% 1.489 [0.79, 2.68] 0 0 Total events 3.1 7.5 60.1% [0.69, 1.52 [0.51, 2.51] 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Odds Table Odds Table MAH Random, 259:27 Year MAH Random, 259:27 % 104.4(12, 22, 240) 2019 % 1.24.8(2, 2, 40) 2019 % 5.19(1, 57, 17.19) 2017 % 5.19(1, 57, 17.19) 2017 % 2.26.8(7, 6.56) 2017 % 2.46.8(12, 51.50) 2017 % 2.46.8(12, 51.50) 2017 % 2.46.8(12, 51.50) 2017 % 3.44.1(400, 22.211) 2016 % 8.4.1(400, 22.211) 2020 % 8.4.1(400, 22.11) 2020 % 4.5.9(2, 77, 761.24) 2020 % 4.5.9(2, 77, 761.24) 2020	Bits PD:18/D.11-Chemotheragy PD:18/D.11 Odds Table H.H. Bandman, DP:Cl Burbles G at ALDING Total Control Total Control 100 30.9% 16.80 (0.97, 4.1.2) Burbles G at ALDING 12 276 6 300 30.9% 16.80 (0.97, 4.1.2) Burbles G at ALDING 10 0 30.9% 16.80 (0.97, 4.1.2) 100 Total control 10 0 0 30.9% 16.80 (0.97, 4.1.2) 100 Total control 10 0 0 30.9% 16.80 (0.97, 4.1.2) 100 Total control 10 0 0 30.9% 16.80 (0.97, 4.1.2) 100 Data MD (1.40 (2.90.2) 3 453 17 354 60.1% 1.48 (0.79, 2.68) Total control 31 12 17 354 60.1% 1.48 (0.97, 2.68) Total control 31 12 20 100 10 10 Total control 43 2 100.0% 1.53 (0.97, 2.51) 100 1
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Model Date Description Mill Random 25:21 Year Mill Random 25:21 % 1.14 R0:22.40 2016 Image: Second Sec	P1:19D.11:-Denomber any: P0:19D.11: Odds Rulio Odds Rulio Rulio of Subarrow Total Contri Full. Weidel. Milk. Bandom. 595: C1 M.H. Bandom. 595: C1 Rulio of Subarrow 12 270 6 300 30.95; 1.68 (0.57, 11.2) Burlines Gird al 2019 12 270 6 300 30.95; 1.68 (0.57, 11.2) Tester coper. 12 0 0 30.95; 1.68 (0.57, 11.2) 0 Tester coper. 12 0 0 30.95; 1.68 (0.57, 11.2) 0 Balad of Si C1 12 0 0 30.95; 1.68 (0.57, 11.2) 0 Tester coper. 141 (2.50) 11 254: (0.57, 11.6) 0
District Part of the second Energy Formation Total Devices Total Media bit of District 0 160 1 167 3.3 bit of District 1 1 0 0.0 1.0 1.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 1.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 0.0	Odds Table Odds Table MAH Basten, S25 Orac MH Basten, S25 Orac % 10.44 (132, 62.240) % 13.8 (62.3.40) % 51.9 (1.57, 17.16) % 51.9 (1.57, 17.16) % 51.9 (1.57, 17.16) % 2.26 (0.12, 51.50) % 2.46 (0.12, 51.50) % 9.41 (1.00, 0.22 11) % 9.41 (1.00, 0.22 11) % 9.44 (1.00, 22 11) % 9.44 (1.00, 22 11) % 45.92 (2.77, 761.24) % 45.92 (2.77, 761.24)	E P0.19D.11-Chemotheragy P0.19D.11 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Suffer of Shares Ford Fo
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Model Date Description M. H. Bandom, 355: Cl. Year M.H. Bandom, 355: Cl. Year M.H. Bandom, 355: Cl. Year % 1.24 (62); 24:01 (2016)	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $
TD: HDT: L1 Pacetors Entrains Lotat Function Anote (L4) 2018 100 166 1 K Anote (L4) 2018 100 166 1 6 302 121 Anote (L4) 2018 10 166 5 302 121 Anote (L4) 2018 10 166 5 302 121 Marco (L4) 2019 574 5 302 121 100 100 100 11 100 100 145 100	Model Date Description Model Mill Bandom 250: Cl. Year Mill Bandom 250: Cl. Year Mill Bandom 250: Cl. Year % 1.24 (0.2, 22, 20) 0.16 S. 1.24 (0.2, 24, 02) % 5.16 (1.57, 17.18) 2017 S. S. % 5.16 (1.57, 17.18) 2017 S. S. % 2.25 (0.7, 6.59) 2010 S. S. % 2.46 (0.12, 25.150) 2017 S. S. % 2.46 (0.12, 25.150) 2017 S. S. % 2.46 (0.12, 25.150) 2017 S. S. % 4.81 (20, 22.211) 2016 S. S. % 4.84 (20, 22.211) 2010 S. S. % 4.83 (2.27, 7.81.24) 2020 S. S. % 4.58 (2.17, 7.81.24) 2020 S. S. % 4.76 (2.47, 16.41) S. S. S.	E P0.190.11-0-tensionary P0.190.11 Odds Ratio Automatical Subtrop 10.100 Control Ford
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Odds Table Odds Table MAH Bandon, 255:20 Year MAH Bandon, 255:20 % 1:24 (92); 24:20 2019 % 1:24 (92); 24:20 2019 % 5:19(1:57, 17:19) 2017 % 2:25 (97); 6:59 2017 % 2:26 (97); 6:59 2019 % 2:26 (97); 6:59 2017 % 2:46 (912; 6:1:60) 2017 % 2:46 (912; 6:1:60) 2017 % 2:46 (912; 6:1:60) 2020 % 3:32 (4:19; 74:61) 2020 % 4:76 (2:17; 761:24) 2020 % 4:76 (2:17; 761:24) 2020	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Model Date Description Mill Random 2010 Mill Random 2010 Mill Random 2010 % 1.24 (0.2) 240 2010 % 516 (1.2, 52.20) 2010 % 516 (1.5, 17, 16) 2017 % 516 (1.5, 17, 16) 2017 % 2.25 (0.7, 6.50) 2010 % 516 (1.5, 15.00) 2017 % 2.46 (0.12, 51.50) 2017 % 9.41 (4.00, 22.11) 2016 % 9.41 (4.00, 22.11) 2010 % 9.41 (4.00, 22.11) 2010 % 9.41 (4.00, 22.11) 2010 % 9.41 (4.00, 22.11) 2010 % 9.41 (4.00, 22.11) 2010 % 4.76 (2.47, 7.81.41) 0 % 4.76 (2.47, 7.81.41) 0	E P0.19D.11: Observation range: P0.19D.11 Odds Batic Butter Distances Test Content Hill Reinform 0.95: C Hill Reinform 0.95: C Butter Distances 12 270 8 300 30.95: Mill Big B37, 41.22 Butter Distances 12 270 8 300 30.95: Mill Big B37, 41.22 40.95: C Butter Distances 12 270 8 300 30.95: Mill Big B37, 41.22 40.95: C Butter Distances 12 270 8 300 30.95: Mill Big B37, 41.22 40.95: C Butter Distances 12 12 13 433 17 364 66.15: Mill B187, 45.21 40.95: C Butter Distance 30 32 453 17 364 66.15: Mill B187, 15.81 40.95: C

FIGURE 4 | Forest plots of the risk of all-grade hyperthyroidism. (A) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (B) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (C) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+Chemotherapy VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/ PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (D) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (E) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+chemotherapy VS. PD-1/PD-L1): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 in both groups.

Figure 6C1) in CTLA-4 group (41, 49). No heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$) was found. No obvious publication bias was found in the funnel plot (**Supplementary Figure 6C1**). Similar risk trend could also be found, when the risk of thyroiditis of grades 3-5 was evaluated (OR=0.47, 95%CI:[0.05, 4.58], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=0.65 (P = 0.52); **Figure 6C2**) (41, 49). Np heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$, **Figure 6C2**) was found. The corresponding funnel plot was shown in the supplement (**Supplementary Figure 6C2**) (41, 49).

When PD-1/PD-L1 combined with chemotherapy was compared with chemotherapy (PD-1/PD-L1+Chemotherapy VS. Chemotherapy), no statistical analysis results of thyroiditis of all grades was found (OR=2.73, 95%CI:[0.86, 8.69], $I^2 = 0\%$, Z=1.70(P=0.09); **Figure 6D**) (7, 16). No heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$) was found. No obvious publication bias was found in the funnel plot (**Supplementary Figure 6D**). No data of thyroiditis of grades 3-5 was found.



DISCUSSION

Programmed cell death protein 1 (PD-1) and its ligand (PD-L1) inhibitors were developed to overcome the immune escape mechanisms of cancer progression and manipulate the immune system to recognize and attack cancer cells (1). A large number of PD-1/PD-L1 related immune-related toxicities, including thyroid dysfunction, had been reported (1, 4–50), which might be related to this immune regulation mechanism. Clinical manifestations of thyroid dysfunction ranged from life threatening to no signs or symptoms (64–66). Therefore, systematic assessment of the risk of thyroid dysfunction had an important guiding significance for clinical work (1).

Consistent with previous reports (1), hypothyroidism was much more common with PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors than others (**Table 1**) (4–50). Through comprehensive analysis, we found that the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades in the PD-1/PD-L1 mono-therapy group was significantly higher compared to the chemotherapy arm (Figure 2A) (4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 24-26, 32, 34, 37–39, 42–44). Similar results could also be noted, when the control group was placebo or CTLA-4 (Figures 2B, E) (5, 6, 27-29, 33, 35, 36, 46, 49). When PD-1/PD-L1 was combined with other treatments for cancer patients, the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades was also significantly increased (Figures 2C, D, F) (6-11, 16, 17, 30-32, 40, 49). Subgroup analysis suggested that PD-1 appeared to be associated with a higher incidence risk of hypothyroidism compared to PD-L1 (Supplementary Figure 7) (4, 14, 15, 18, 19, 25, 32, 34, 37–39, 42-44). But this difference between PD-1 and PD-L1 subgroup was not statistical significant (Supplementary Figure 7) (4, 14, 15, 18, 19, 25, 32, 34, 37-39, 42-44). Due to the lack of clinical trials on PD-1 and PD-L1 head-to-head comparisons, we could not clarify the difference in the risk of hypothyroidism between the two. For the existence of heterogeneity (Figures 2A-C, E), we conducted a sufficient stratified subgroup analysis and inferred the source of the heterogeneity. Furthermore, no obvious publication bias was found among all the enrolled clinical trials

A i i i i i i i i i i									
<pre>http://www.internationality.com/internationali</pre>	Α	PD-1/PD-	L1 Chemothe	rapy Total Moight I	Odds Ratio	Voar	Odds Ratio	B1	PD-1PD-L1 Placebo Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Exactly Total Exactly Total Wained M U Dandom 95% C1 Yang M U Dandom 95% C1
Current of the state of the		Study of subgroup Events 10.1 PD-1 VS. Chernothere appVISSC Borghaei H, et al.2015 Borghaei H, et al.2016 4 Herrbst RS, et al.2016 2 Mok TSK, et al.2019 10 Subtotal (95% CI) 17 Total events 17	Inclain Events 287 0 154 0 339 0 636 0 1416 0	268 12.6% 150 15.0% 309 13.9% 615 16.0% 1342 57.5%	2.81 [0.11, 69.31] 9.00 [0.48, 168.63] 4.59 [0.22, 95.88] 20.63 [1.21, 352.84] 7.47 [1.67, 33.37]	2015		+ - +	Statistic USL Centrals Lotatic Dentisis Lotatic Mini Control Mini Contro
<pre>style="target_carg</pre>		Test for overall effect 2 = 2.63 (P = (Test for overall effect 2 = 2.63 (P = (1.9.2 PD-11 VS. Chemother apy(NSi Barlesi F, et al. 2018 3 Subtotal (95% Ct) Total events 3 Heterogeneity. Not applicable	CLC) 393 0 393 0	365 14.6% 365 14.6%	6.55 [0.34, 127.28] 6.55 [0.34, 127.28]	2018	-	<u>.</u>	24.2 PD 1VS. Placebol(600.4C) kapy Ycel at 007 (50.00) Substati (9% C) 330 0 161 17.6% 1.47 [0.06, 36.30] 2017 Total works 0 0 161 17.6% 1.47 [0.06, 36.30] Test for overall effect: 2 0 24 (P = 0.11) Test for overall effect: 2 0 24 (P = 0.11) Test for overall effect: 2 0 24 (P = 0.11)
$C_{\text{the stars method if edge 2}} = 0 \\ \frac{1146}{10000} \frac{1000}{10000} \frac{1100}{10000} \frac{11000}{10000} \frac{11000}{10000} \frac{11000}{10000} \frac{110000}{10000} \frac{110000}{10000} \frac{110000}{10000} \frac{110000}{10000} \frac{110000}{10000} \frac{110000}{100000} \frac{110000}{100000} \frac{110000}{100000} \frac{110000}{100000} \frac{110000}{100000} \frac{110000}{100000} \frac{110000}{100000} \frac{1100000}{100000} \frac{1100000}{100000} \frac{1100000}{100000} \frac{1100000}{100000} \frac{1100000}{100000} \frac{1100000}{1000000} \frac{1100000}{1000000} \frac{1100000}{1000000} \frac{11000000}{1000000} \frac{1100000}{1000000} \frac{1100000}{1000000000000} \frac{11000000}{1000000000000000000000000000$		1.9.4 PD-1 VS. Chemotherapy(HNS Ferris RL,et al.2016 2 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events 2 Electronomity that applicable	CC) 236 0 236 0	111 13.9% 111 13.9%	2.38 [0.11, 49.94] 2.38 [0.11, 49.94]	2016 -			EggemmorkAMM et al 2018 1 509 1 502 44 2% 18.28 (2.15, 12.2.07) 2018 Subhotal (95%) 559 502 44.2% 16.26 (2.15, 12.2.07) Total events 1 1 1 Teatrogenetic Volt applicable Test for overall effect. Z = 2.70 (P = 0.307)
$ \frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$		Testforoverall effect 2 = 0.56 (P = (1.9.5 PD-1 VS. Chemotherapy(UC) Bellmunt J, et al. 2017 2 Subtotal (95% C) Total events 2 Heterogeneity. Not applicable Testforoverall effect Z = 1.01 (P = (0.58) 266 0 266 0 0.31)	255 13.9% 255 13.9%	4.83 [0.23, 101.09] 4.83 [0.23, 101.09]	2017		Ê B2	Point Office Point Office<
C1A-4 CILA+P0 1P0-L1 CILA+P0 1P0-L1 Out States Out Out States Out Out States Out Out Out States Out	C1	Total (95% CI) Total events 24 Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.00; Chi* = 1 Test for overall effect Z = 3.06 (P = 0 Test for subaroup differences: Chi*	2311 0 .51, df = 6 (P = 0.9 0.002) = 0.46. df = 3 (P =	2073 100.0% 16); I [#] = 0% 0.93). I [#] = 0%	5.88 [1.89, 18.30]	0.01 0.1 PD	10 10 D-1/PD-L1 Chemotherapy	T0	Grandhi Lef al 2018 1 40.5 0 20.2 50.0% 1.50 [0.06, 37.03] 2018 Paz-Kres Lef al 2018 1 27.9 0 280 50.00, 57.03] 2018 Total (95%; C) 683 482 100.0% 2.33 [0.22, 20.56] 0.001 0.1 10 1000 Total works 2 0 69.5% 0.001 0.1 10 1000 Test for overall effect Z = 0.66 (P = 0.51) P = 0.5% Double Comparison Po-LIPD-L1 Placebo
I = 0 $I = 0 $ I	CI	CTLA-4 <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Events Totz Hodi FS,et al.2016 0 4 Hodi FS,et al.2018B 1 31 Total (007) 60	CTLA-4+PD-1# al Events 6 2 1 13	PD-L1 <u>Total Weight</u> 94 30.8% 313 69.2%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.40 [0.02, 8.46] 0.07 [0.01, 0.57]	Year	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	C2	CTLA-4 CTLA-4-PD-1PD-11 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subarces Events Total Weinzhi ML Random, 50% CI Weinzhi ML Random, 50% CI Hodi FS at a 2016 0 45 1 94 40.5% 0.57 (10.3) (8.77) 2016
Construction of the second second	_	Total events 1 Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.00; Chi ^a = 0.1 Test for overall effect: Z = 2.40 (P = 0.	15 82, df = 1 (P = 0.37 .02)); ² = 0%	0.12 [0.02, 0.00]	0.001	0.1 1 10 100 CTLA-4 CTLA-4+PD-1/PD-L1	T _{I0}	Hold FS, et al. 2018B 0 311 1 313 50.2% 0.33 (0.01, 8.24) 2018B Tetal (8% Ct) 357 407 100.0% 0.47 (0.05, 4.58) Tetal (8% Ct) 357 407 100.0% 0.47 (0.05, 4.58) Heteropender Tau' = 0.0; Ch' = 0.76; P' = 0% 0.001 0.1 1 0 0.001 0.1 1 10 1000
IGURE 6 Forest plots of the risk of thyroiditis. (A) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy): ubgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (B1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis for grade 3-5 calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): Subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (B2) The risk of thyroiditis for grade 3-5 calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD	D	PD-1/PD-L1*Che Study or Subgroup Events Paz-Ares L,et al.2019 4 Schmid P,et al.2020 13	emotherapy Chen Total Even 265 781	notherapy <u>its Total Weight</u> 0 266 15.79 3 389 84.39	Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% Cl 9.17 [0.49, 171.21] 2.18 [0.62, 7.69]	Year 2019 2020	Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% Cl	_	стря стрянсти
IGURE 6 Forest plots of the risk of thyroiditis. (A) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy): ubgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (B1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE nodel (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (B2) The risk of thyroiditis for grade 3-5 calculate y the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo). (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD 1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (C2) The risk of thyroiditis for grades 3-5 calculated by the random		Total (95% Cl) Total events 17 Heterogeneity: Tau [*] = 0.00; Chi ^a = 0.80, dl Test for overall effect: Z = 1.70 (P = 0.09)	1046 f= 1 (P = 0.37); P = 0	655 100.0% 3 %	2.73 [0.86, 8.69]	0.001 PD-1/PD-L1+Cher	0.1 10 100 motherapy Chemotherapy	00	
ubgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (B1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE nodel (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (B2) The risk of thyroiditis for grade 3-5 calculate y the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo). (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD 1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (C2) The risk of thyroiditis for grades 3-5 calculated by the random	FIGU	RE 6 Forest plot	ts of the	risk of th	vroiditis. (A) The risk o	of all-grade thyro	iditis calc	culated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy):
Hodel (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (B2) The risk of thyroidits for grade 3-5 calculated y the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo). (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD 1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (C2) The risk of thyroiditis for grades 3-5 calculated by the random 1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (C2) The risk of thyroiditis for grades 3-5 calculated by the random	subgr	oup analysis was	conducte	ed based	on PD-1/F	'D-L1 and	tumor types in b	oth grou	ps. (B1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE)
y the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo). (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD 1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (C2) The risk of thyroiditis for grades 3-5 calculated by the random	mode	ו (PD-1/PD-L1 VS.	. Placebo): subgro	oup analysi	s was cond	ducted based on	tumor ty	ypes in the control group. (B2) The risk of thyroiditis for grade 3-5 calculated
1+CILA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (C2) The risk of thyroiditis for grades 3-5 calculated by the random	oy the	e random effect (RI	E) model	(PD-1/P	U-L1 VS. F	lacebo). (C	 The risk of all 	I-grade th	hyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD-
	_1+C	ILA-4): subgroup	analysis	was con	ducted bas	ed on tum	or types in the c	ontrol gro	oup. (C2) The risk of thyroiditis for grades 3-5 calculated by the random

(**Supplementary Figure 2**). Therefore, the conclusion that PD-1/PD-L1 increased the risk of hypothyroidism of all grades was considered to be much more reliable. No significant results was noted, when the risk of hypothyroidism of grades 3-5 was calculated (**Figure 3** and **Supplementary Figure 3**).

Drug-induced thyroid dysfunction is one of the common causes of hyperthyroidism (67). Whether PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors were used alone or in combination with other drugs, it indicated that PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors increased the risk of hyperthyroidism of all grades (Figures 4A-D). When PD-1/PD-L1 combined with chemotherapy was compared with PD-1/PD-L1, no statistical analysis results of hyperthyroidism of all grades was found (Figure 4E) (11, 18). Through the above analysis, we clarified the role of PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors in increasing the risk of hyperthyroidism of all grades (Figure 4 and Supplementary Figure 4) (5-12, 14-18, 24-31, 33-35, 37-40, 42, 43, 45-50). Through subgroup analysis, high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 55\%$) was considered to be mainly caused by PD-1 related NSCLC subgroup (I² = 70%, Figure 4B) (27, 29). No obvious publication bias was found among all the enrolled clinical trials (Supplementary Figure 4). Though similar incidence trend could also be seen in the assessment of hypothyroidism of grades 3-5 (Figure 5),

statistical significant result was only found in (**Figure 5D**). Since only two clinical trials were included (**Figure 5D**), the analysis results need to be further verified.

In the clinical trials included in the study, the incidence rate of thyroiditis was lower than those of hyperthyroidism and hypothyroidism (**Table 1**). Similar to the previous analysis results, PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors played the same role in increasing the risk of thyroiditis (**Figure 6**). No obvious heterogeneity and publication bias was found among all enrolled clinical trials (**Figure 6** and **Supplementary Figure 6**) (6, 7, 14, 16, 24, 27–29, 34, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 47–50).

Thyroid dysfunction had also been reported in other 5 PD-1/PD-L1 investigated clinical trials (13, 20–23). For the heterogeneity among these 5 clinical trials, it was impossible for us to conduct a meta-analysis. However, we found that sunitinib might play a similar role to PD-1/PD-L1 on increasing the risk of thyroid dysfunction (21–23).

By reviewing and analyzing PD-1/PD-L1 related literature (4–50), we found that PD-1/PD-L1 increased the risk of thyroid dysfunction. It reminds us that we need to monitor and evaluate the thyroid function status in time for patients receiving PD-1/PD-L1 treatment to prevent the occurrence of adverse events (1–3, 64–67).

VS. Chemotherapy).

Strengths and Limitations

Strengths: This meta-analysis was conducted according to the PRISMA guidelines. The literature searching process was put into practice in accordance with the PICOS principle. The quality of all enrolled clinical trials was high. Stratification and subgroup analyses were conducted as much as possible. Therefore, the conclusion was much more reliable.

Limitations: First, some clinical trials related to PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors cannot be included for meta-analysis due to obvious heterogeneity. Second, the low number of studies that reported the data of thyroid dysfunction made it difficult to get a definite conclusion.

CONCLUSION

Whether used alone or in combination with other anti-tumor drugs, PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors increased the risk of thyroid dysfunction, especially for hypothyroidism. Furthermore, PD-1/PD-L1 was better than chemotherapy and CTLA-4 in increasing the risk of thyroid dysfunction.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/**Supplementary Material**. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding authors.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The corresponding authors (YPS and GS) had the right to deal with all the data and were responsible for the decision to submit this manuscript for publication. YT, RL, YL, ML, YXS, YZ, AG and QW had the full data of the manuscript. YT, RL, YL, ML, and YXS were responsible for checking and evaluating the quality of the data and enrolled studies. YT was appointed for writing the draft of this manuscript. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

FUNDING

This study was funded by the Academic Promotion Program of Shandong First Medical University (2019QL025; YPS), Natural Science Foundation of Shandong Province (ZR2019MH042; YPS), Jinan Science and Technology Program (201805064; YPS), the National Science and Technology Major Project of the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (2020ZX09201025; GS), Postdoctoral Innovation Project of Jinan (YT), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81170087; GS), the Provincial Natural Science Foundation of Shandong (ZR2018MH003; GS), the Clinical Medical Science and Technology Innovation Program of Jinan (201805004; GS).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fonc.2021. 667650/full#supplementary-material

Supplementary Figure 1 | A summary table of review authors' judgements for each risk of bias item for each study.

Supplementary Figure 2 | Funnel plots of the risk of all-grade hypothyroidism. (A) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/ PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1, chemotherapy drugs and tumor types in both groups. (B) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (C) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+Chemotherapy VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (D) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (E) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1 VS. CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on the PD-1 group. (F) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1 VS. CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on the PD-1 group. (F) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+Targeted VS. Targeted).

Supplementary Figure 3 | Funnel plots of the risk of hypothyroidism for grades 3-5. (A) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (B) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (C) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (C) The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+ Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups.

Supplementary Figure 4 | Funnel plots of the risk of all-grade hyperthyroidism. (A) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/ PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (B) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (C) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 + Chemotherapy VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (D) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+ L1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on to rtypes in the control group. (E) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+chemotherapy VS. PD-1/PD-L1): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 in both groups.

Supplementary Figure 5 | Funnel plots of the risk of hyperthyroidism for grades 3-5. (A) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/ PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy). (B) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo). (C) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+Chemotherapy VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (D) The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4).

Supplementary Figure 6 | Funnel plots of the risk of thyroiditis. (A) The risk of allgrade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 and tumor types in both groups. (B1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. (B2) The risk of thyroiditis for grade 3-5 calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Placebo). (C1) The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4): subgroup analysis was conducted based on tumor types in the control group. **(C2)** The risk of thyroiditis for grades 3-5 calculated by the random effect (RE) model (CTLA-4 VS. PD-1/PD-L1+CTLA-4). **(D)** The risk of all-grade thyroiditis calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1+Chemotherapy VS. Chemotherapy).

Supplementary Figure 7 | Forest plots of the risk of all-grade hypothyroidism. The risk of hypothyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1

REFERENCES

- Kennedy LB, Salama AKS. A Review of Cancer Immunotherapy Toxicity. CA Cancer J Clin (2020) 70(2):86–104. doi: 10.3322/caac.21596
- Thompson JA. New NCCN Guidelines: Recognition and Management of Immunotherapy-Related Toxicity. J Natl Compr Canc Netw (2018) 16(suppl 5):594–6. doi: 10.6004/jnccn.2018.0047
- Postow MA, Sidlow R, Hellmann MD. Immune-Related Adverse Events Associated With Immune Checkpoint Blockade. N Engl J Med (2018) 378:158–68. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra1703481
- 4. Huang J, Xu J, Chen Y, Zhuang W, Zhang Y, Chen Z, et al. Camrelizumab Versus Investigator's Choice of Chemotherapy as Second-Line Therapy for Advanced or Metastatic Oesophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma (ESCORT): A Multicentre, Randomised, Open-Label, Phase 3 Study [Published Online Ahead of Print, 2020 May 13]. Lancet Oncol (2020), S1470–2045(20)30110-8.
- Powles T, Park SH, Voog E, Caserta C, Valderrama BP, Gurney H, et al. Avelumab Maintenance Therapy for Advanced or Metastatic Urothelial Carcinoma. N Engl J Med (2020) 383(13):1218–30. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa2002788
- Zimmer L, Livingstone E, Hassel JC, Fluck M, Eigentler T, Loquai C, et al. Adjuvant Nivolumab Plus Ipilimumab or Nivolumab Monotherapy Versus Placebo in Patients With Resected Stage IV Melanoma With No Evidence of Disease (IMMUNED): A Randomised, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Phase 2 Trial. *Lancet* (2020) 395(10236):1558–68. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736 (20)30417-7
- Schmid P, Cortes J, Pusztai L, McArthur H, Kümmel S, Bergh J, et al. KEYNOTE-522 Investigators. Pembrolizumab for Early Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. N Engl J Med (2020) 382(9):810–21. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa1910549
- Mittendorf EA, Zhang H, Barrios CH, Saji S, Jung KH, Hegg R, et al. Neoadjuvant Atezolizumab in Combination With Sequential Nab-Paclitaxel and Anthracycline-Based Chemotherapy Versus Placebo and Chemotherapy in Patients With Early-Stage Triple-Negative Breast Cancer (IMpassion031): A Randomised, Double-Blind, Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet* (2020) 396(10257):1090– 100. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31953-X
- Emens LA, Esteva FJ, Beresford M, Saura C, De Laurentiis M, Kim SB, et al. Trastuzumab Emtansine Plus Atezolizumab Versus Trastuzumab Emtansine Plus Placebo in Previously Treated, HER2-Positive Advanced Breast Cancer (KATE2): A Phase 2, Multicentre, Randomised, Double-Blind Trial. *Lancet* Oncol (2020) 21(10):1283–95. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30465-4
- Gutzmer R, Stroyakovskiy D, Gogas H, Robert C, Lewis K, Protsenko S, et al. Atezolizumab, Vemurafenib, and Cobimetinib as First-Line Treatment for Unresectable Advanced BRAFV600 Mutation-Positive Melanoma (IMspire150): Primary Analysis of the Randomised, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet* (2020) 395(10240):1835–44. doi: 10.1016/ S0140-6736(20)30934-X
- Galsky MD, Arija JÁA, Bamias A, Davis ID, De Santis M, Kikuchi E, et al. Atezolizumab With or Without Chemotherapy in Metastatic Urothelial Cancer (IMvigor130): A Multicentre, Randomised, Placebo-Controlled Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet* (2020) 395(10236):1547–57. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736 (20)30230-0
- Herbst RS, Giaccone G, de Marinis F, Reinmuth N, Vergnenegre A, Barrios CH, et al. Atezolizumab for First-Line Treatment of PD-L1-Selected Patients With NSCLC. N Engl J Med (2020) 383(14):1328–39. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa1917346
- Reck M, Wehler T, Orlandi F, Nogami N, Barone C, Moro-Sibilot D, et al. Safety and Patient-Reported Outcomes of Atezolizumab Plus Chemotherapy With or Without Bevacizumab Versus Bevacizumab Plus Chemotherapy in

VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 in both groups.

Supplementary Figure 8 | Forest plots of the risk of all-grade hyperthyroidism. The risk of hyperthyroidism calculated by the random effect (RE) model (PD-1/PD-L1 VS. Chemotherapy): subgroup analysis was conducted based on PD-1/PD-L1 in both groups.

Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. J Clin Oncol (2020) 38(22):2530-42. doi: 10.1200/JCO.19.03158

- Mok TSK, Wu YL, Kudaba I, Kowalski DM, Cho BC, Turna HZ, et al. Pembrolizumab Versus Chemotherapy for Previously Untreated, PD-L1-Expressing, Locally Advanced or Metastatic Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer (KEYNOTE-042): A Randomised, Open-Label, Controlled, Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet* (2019) 393(10183):1819–30. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32409-7
- Cohen EEW, Soulières D, Le Tourneau C, Dinis J, Licitra L, Ahn MJ, et al. Pembrolizumab Versus Methotrexate, Docetaxel, or Cetuximab for Recurrent or Metastatic Head-and-Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma (KEYNOTE-040): A Randomised, Open-Label, Phase 3 Study [Published Correction Appears in Lancet. 2019 Jan 12;393(10167):132]. *Lancet* (2019) 393(10167):156–67.
- Paz-Ares L, Dvorkin M, Chen Y, Reinmuth N, Hotta K, Trukhin D, et al. Durvalumab Plus Platinum-Etoposide Versus Platinum-Etoposide in First-Line Treatment of Extensive-Stage Small-Cell Lung Cancer (CASPIAN): A Randomised, Controlled, Open-Label, Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet* (2019) 394 (10212):1929–39. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32222-6
- West H, McCleod M, Hussein M, Morabito A, Rittmeyer A, Conter HJ, et al. Atezolizumab in Combination With Carboplatin Plus Nab-Paclitaxel Chemotherapy Compared With Chemotherapy Alone as First-Line Treatment for Metastatic Non-Squamous Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer (IMpower130): A Multicentre, Randomised, Open-Label, Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet Oncol* (2019) 20(7):924–37. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(19)30167-6
- Burtness B, Harrington KJ, Greil R, Soulières D, Tahara M, de Castro GJr, et al. Pembrolizumab Alone or With Chemotherapy Versus Cetuximab With Chemotherapy for Recurrent or Metastatic Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Head and Neck (KEYNOTE-048): A Randomised, Open-Label, Phase 3 Study. *Lancet* (2019) 394(10212):1915–28. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32591-7
- Kato K, Cho BC, Takahashi M, Okada M, Lin CY, Chin K, et al. Nivolumab Versus Chemotherapy in Patients With Advanced Oesophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma Refractory or Intolerant to Previous Chemotherapy (ATTRACTION-3): A Multicentre, Randomised, Open-Label, Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet Oncol* (2019) 20(11):1506–17. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(19)30626-6
- Sullivan RJ, Hamid O, Gonzalez R, Infante JR, Patel MR, Hodi FS, et al. Atezolizumab Plus Cobimetinib and Vemurafenib in BRAF-Mutated Melanoma Patients. *Nat Med* (2019) 25(6):929–35. doi: 10.1038/s41591-019-0474-7
- Rini BI, Powles T, Atkins MB, Escudier B, McDermott DF, Suarez C, et al. Atezolizumab Plus Bevacizumab Versus Sunitinib in Patients With Previously Untreated Metastatic Renal Cell Carcinoma (IMmotion151): A Multicentre, Open-Label, Phase 3, Randomised Controlled Trial. *Lancet* (2019) 393 (10189):2404–15. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30723-8
- Motzer RJ, Penkov K, Haanen J, Rini B, Albiges L, Campbell MT, et al. Avelumab Plus Axitinib Versus Sunitinib for Advanced Renal-Cell Carcinoma. N Engl J Med (2019) 380(12):1103–15. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1816047
- 23. Motzer RJ, Rini BI, McDermott DF, Arén Frontera O, Hammers HJ, Carducci MA, et al. Nivolumab Plus Ipilimumab Versus Sunitinib in First-Line Treatment for Advanced Renal Cell Carcinoma: Extended Follow-Up of Efficacy and Safety Results From a Randomised, Controlled, Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet Oncol* (2019) 20(10):1370–85. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(19)30413-9
- Barlesi F, Vansteenkiste J, Spigel D, Ishii H, Garassino M, de Marinis F, et al. Avelumab Versus Docetaxel in Patients With Platinum-Treated Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer (JAVELIN Lung 200): An Open-Label, Randomised, Phase 3 Study. *Lancet Oncol* (2018) 19(11):1468–79. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(18)30673-9
- 25. Shitara K, Özgüroğlu M, Bang YJ, Di Bartolomeo M, Mandalà M, Ryu MH, et al. Pembrolizumab Versus Paclitaxel for Previously Treated, Advanced Gastric or Gastro-Oesophageal Junction Cancer (KEYNOTE-061): A

Randomised, Open-Label, Controlled, Phase 3 Trial. Lancet (2018) 392 (10142):123-33. doi: 10.1093/annonc/mdy208.004

- 26. Hida T, Kaji R, Satouchi M, Ikeda N, Horiike A, Nokihara H, et al. Atezolizumab in Japanese Patients With Previously Treated Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer: A Subgroup Analysis of the Phase 3 OAK Study. *Clin Lung Cancer* (2018) 19(4):e405–15. doi: 10.1016/j.cllc.2018.01.004
- Gandhi L, Rodríguez-Abreu D, Gadgeel S, Esteban E, Felip E, De Angelis F, et al. Pembrolizumab Plus Chemotherapy in Metastatic Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med (2018) 378(22):2078–92. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1801005
- Eggermont AMM, Blank CU, Mandala M, Long GV, Atkinson V, Dalle S, et al. Adjuvant Pembrolizumab Versus Placebo in Resected Stage III Melanoma. N Engl J Med (2018) 378(19):1789–801. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa1802357
- Paz-Ares L, Luft A, Vicente D, Tafreshi A, Gümüş M, Mazières J, et al. Pembrolizumab Plus Chemotherapy for Squamous Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med (2018) 379(21):2040–51. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1810865
- Socinski MA, Jotte RM, Cappuzzo F, Orlandi F, Stroyakovskiy D, Nogami N, et al. Atezolizumab for First-Line Treatment of Metastatic Nonsquamous NSCLC. N Engl J Med (2018) 378(24):2288–301. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1716948
- Schmid P, Adams S, Rugo HS, Schneeweiss A, Barrios CH, Iwata H, et al. Atezolizumab and Nab-Paclitaxel in Advanced Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. N Engl J Med (2018) 379(22):2108–21. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1809615
- Hellmann MD, Ciuleanu TE, Pluzanski A, Lee JS, Otterson GA, Audigier-Valette C, et al. Nivolumab Plus Ipilimumab in Lung Cancer With a High Tumor Mutational Burden. N Engl J Med (2018) 378(22):2093–104. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1801946
- Horn L, Mansfield AS, Szczęsna A, Havel L, Krzakowski M, Hochmair MJ, et al. First-Line Atezolizumab Plus Chemotherapy in Extensive-Stage Small-Cell Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med (2018) 379(23):2220–9. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa1809064
- Bellmunt J, de Wit R, Vaughn DJ, Fradet Y, Lee JL, Fong L, et al. KEYNOTE-045 Investigators.Pembrolizumab as Second-Line Therapy for Advanced Urothelial Carcinoma. N Engl J Med (2017) 376(11):1015–26. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa1613683
- 35. Kang YK, Boku N, Satoh T, Ryu MH, Chao Y, Kato K, et al. Nivolumab in Patients With Advanced Gastric or Gastro-Oesophageal Junction Cancer Refractory to, or Intolerant of, at Least Two Previous Chemotherapy Regimens (ONO-4538-12, ATTRACTION-2): A Randomised, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet* (2017) 390(10111):2461– 71. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31827-5
- 36. Schachter J, Ribas A, Long GV, Arance A, Grob JJ, Mortier L, et al. Pembrolizumab Versus Ipilimumab for Advanced Melanoma: Final Overall Survival Results of a Multicentre, Randomised, Open-Label Phase 3 Study (KEYNOTE-006). *Lancet* (2017) 390(10105):1853–62. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31601-X
- Reck M, Rodríguez-Abreu D, Robinson AG, Hui R, Csőszi T, Fülöp A, et al. Pembrolizumab Versus Chemotherapy for PD-L1-Positive Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med (2016) 375(19):1823–33. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa1606774
- Ferris RL, Blumenschein GJr, Fayette J, Guigay J, Colevas AD, Licitra L, et al. Nivolumab for Recurrent Squamous-Cell Carcinoma of the Head and Neck. N Engl J Med (2016) 375(19):1856–67. doi: 10.1056/NEJM0a1602252
- Herbst RS, Baas P, Kim DW, Felip E, Pérez-Gracia JL, Han JY, et al. Pembrolizumab Versus Docetaxel for Previously Treated, PD-L1-Positive, Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer (KEYNOTE-010): A Randomised Controlled Trial. *Lancet* (2016) 387(10027):1540–50. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736 (15)01281-7
- Antonia SJ, López-Martin JA, Bendell J, Ott PA, Taylor M, Eder JP, et al. Nivolumab Alone and Nivolumab Plus Ipilimumab in Recurrent Small-Cell Lung Cancer (CheckMate 032): A Multicentre, Open-Label, Phase 1/2 Trial. Lancet Oncol (2016) 17(7):883–95. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(16)30098-5
- Hodi FS, Chesney J, Pavlick AC, Robert C, Grossmann KF, McDermott DF, et al. Combined Nivolumab and Ipilimumab Versus Ipilimumab Alone in Patients With Advanced Melanoma: 2-Year Overall Survival Outcomes in a Multicentre, Randomised, Controlled, Phase 2 Trial. *Lancet Oncol* (2016) 17 (11):1558–68. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(16)30366-7
- 42. Borghaei H, Paz-Ares L, Horn L, Spigel DR, Steins M, Ready NE, et al. Nivolumab Versus Docetaxel in Advanced Nonsquamous Non-Small-Cell

Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med (2015) 373(17):1627-39. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa1507643

- 43. Weber JS, D'Angelo SP, Minor D, Hodi FS, Gutzmer R, Neyns B, et al. Nivolumab Versus Chemotherapy in Patients With Advanced Melanoma Who Progressed After Anti-CTLA-4 Treatment (CheckMate 037): A Randomised, Controlled, Open-Label, Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet Oncol* (2015) 16 (4):375–84. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(15)70076-8
- 44. Brahmer J, Reckamp KL, Baas P, Crinò L, Eberhardt WE, Poddubskaya E, et al. Nivolumab Versus Docetaxel in Advanced Squamous-Cell Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med (2015) 373(2):123–35. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa1504627
- Antonia SJ, Villegas A, Daniel D, Vicente D, Murakami S, Hui R, et al. Durvalumab After Chemoradiotherapy in Stage III Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med (2017) 377(20):1919–29.
- 46. Antonia SJ, Villegas A, Daniel D, Vicente D, Murakami S, Hui R, et al. Overall Survival With Durvalumab After Chemoradiotherapy in Stage III NSCLC. N Engl J Med (2018) 379(24):2342–50. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1809697
- Larkin J, Chiarion-Sileni V, Gonzalez R, Grob JJ, Cowey CL, Lao CD, et al. Combined Nivolumab and Ipilimumab or Monotherapy in Untreated Melanoma. N Engl J Med (2015) 373(1):23–34. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1504030
- Wolchok JD, Chiarion-Sileni V, Gonzalez R, Rutkowski P, Grob JJ, Cowey CL, et al. Overall Survival With Combined Nivolumab and Ipilimumab in Advanced Melanoma. N Engl J Med (2017) 377(14):1345–56. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMoa1709684
- Hodi FS, Chiarion-Sileni V, Gonzalez R, Grob JJ, Rutkowski P, Cowey CL, et al. Nivolumab Plus Ipilimumab or Nivolumab Alone Versus Ipilimumab Alone in Advanced Melanoma (CheckMate 067): 4-Year Outcomes of a Multicentre, Randomised, Phase 3 Trial. *Lancet Oncol* (2018) 19(11):1480–92. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(18)30700-9
- Larkin J, Chiarion-Sileni V, Gonzalez R, Grob JJ, Rutkowski P, Lao CD, et al. Five-Year Survival With Combined Nivolumab and Ipilimumab in Advanced Melanoma. N Engl J Med (2019) 381(16):1535–46. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1910836
- von Itzstein MS, Lu R, Ali S, Xie D, Cai J, Xie Y, et al. Thyroid Dysfunction and Immune Checkpoint Inhibitor Outcomes. J Clin Oncol (2020) 38(15). doi: 10.1200/jco.2020.38.15_suppl.e15103
- Kim HI, Kim M, Lee SH, Park SY, Kim YN, Kim H, et al. Development of Thyroid Dysfunction Is Associated With Clinical Response to PD-1 Blockade Treatment in Patients With Advanced Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. Oncoimmunology (2017) 7 (1):e1375642. doi: 10.1080/2162402X.2017.1375642
- Jiang Y, Yang L, Han Y, Zhang Y, Kong F-M. Patterns of Thyroid Dysfunctions During Treatment With Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors (ICI) in 59 Solid Cancer Patients. J Clin Oncol (2020) 38(15). doi: 10.1200/ jco.2020.38.15_suppl.e18567
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. PRISMA Group Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. Ann Intern Med (2009) 151:264–69. W64. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-151-4-200908180-00135
- 55. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. Cochrane Bias Methods Group; Cochrane Statistical Methods Group. The Cochrane Collaboration's Tool for Assessing Risk of Bias in Randomised Trials. *BMJ* (2011) 343:d5928. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d5928
- Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating Characteristics of a Rank Correlation Test for Publication Bias. *Biometrics* (1994) 50(4):1088–101. doi: 10.2307/2533446
- Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in Meta-Analysis Detected by a Simple, Graphical Test. *BMJ* (1997) 315(7109):629–34. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629
- Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for Assessing the Quality If Nonrandomized Studies in Meta-Analyses (2009). Available at: http://www.ohri.ca/programs/ clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp (Accessed July 6, 2012).
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring Inconsistency in Meta-Analyses. BMJ (2003) 327:557–60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
- DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-Analysis in Clinical Trials. Control Clin Trials (1986) 7:177–88. doi: 10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2
- Liu H, Xu D, Wang W, Sun F, Zhang S, Yang X, et al. Systematic Assessment of Risk of Fever in Solid Tumor Patients Treated With PD-1/PD-L1 Inhibitors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Oncol* (2020) 10:570080. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.570080

- 62. Tian Y, Zhang Z, Yang X, Li D, Zhang L, Li Z, et al. The Risk Ratio of Immune-Related Colitis, Hepatitis, and Pancreatitis in Patients With Solid Tumors Caused by PD-1/PD-L1 Inhibitors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front Oncol (2020) 10:261. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.00261
- 63. Si Z, Zhang S, Yang X, Ding N, Xiang M, Zhu Q, et al. The Association Between the Incidence Risk of Peripheral Neuropathy and PD-1/PD-L1 Inhibitors in the Treatment for Solid Tumor Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Oncol* (2019) 9:866. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2019.00866
- Chaker L, Bianco AC, Jonklaas J, Peeters RP. Hypothyroidism. Lancet (2017) 390(10101):1550–62. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30703-1
- McDermott MT. Hyperthyroidism. Ann Intern Med (2020) 172(7):ITC49–64. doi: 10.7326/AITC202004070
- Hamburger JI. The Various Presentations of Thyroiditis. *Diagn Considerations* Ann Intern Med (1986) 104(2):219–24. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-104-2-219

 De Leo S, Lee SY, Braverman LE. Hyperthyroidism. Lancet (2016) 388 (10047):906–18. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00278-6

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2021 Tian, Li, Liu, Li, Song, Zheng, Gao, Wen, Su and Sun. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.