DOI: 10.1002/cai2.116

#### **META-ANALYSIS**



# Cardiovascular toxicity with CTLA-4 inhibitors in cancer patients: A meta-analysis

Huiyi Liu<sup>1</sup> | Lu Fu<sup>1</sup> | Shuyu Jin<sup>1,2</sup> | Xingdong Ye<sup>1</sup> | Yanlin Chen<sup>1</sup> | Sijia Pu<sup>1,3</sup> | Yumei Xue<sup>1,4</sup>

 <sup>1</sup>Department of Cardiology, Guangdong Cardiovascular Institute, Guangdong Provincial People's Hospital, Guangdong Academy of Medical Sciences, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China
<sup>2</sup>The Second School of Clinical Medicine, Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China
<sup>3</sup>School of Medicine, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China
<sup>4</sup>Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of

Clinical Pharmacology, Research Center of Medical Sciences, Guangdong Provincial People's Hospital, Guangdong Academy of Medical Sciences, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

#### Correspondence

Yumei Xue, Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Clinical Pharmacology, Research Center of Medical Sciences, Guangdong Provincial People's Hospital, Guangdong Academy of Medical Sciences, Guangzhou 510180, Guangdong, China. Email: xymgdci@163.com

#### Funding information

National Natural Science Foundation of China, Grant/Award Number: 81870254; Science and Technology Programs of Guangdong Province, Grant/Award Number: 2019B020230004;

#### Abstract

**Background:** With the emergence of cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein-4 (CTLA-4) inhibitors, the outcomes of patients with malignant tumors have improved significantly. However, the incidence of cardiovascular adverse events has also increased, which can affect tumor treatment. In this study, we evaluated the incidence and severity of adverse cardiovascular events caused by CTLA-4 inhibitors by analyzing reported trials that involved CTLA-4 inhibitor therapy.

Methods: Randomized clinical trials published in English from January 1, 2013, to November 30, 2022, were searched using the Cochrane Library and PubMed databases. All included trials examined all grade and grades 3-5 cardiac and vascular adverse events. These involved comparisons of CTLA-4 inhibitors to placebo, CTLA-4 inhibitors plus chemotherapy to chemotherapy alone, CTLA-4 inhibitors combined with PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors to PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors alone, and CTLA-4 inhibitors plus target agent to PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors plus target agent. The odds ratio (OR) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated using the Mantel-Haenszel method. Results: Overall, 20 trials were included. CTLA-4 inhibitors significantly increased the incidence of all-grade cardiovascular toxicity (OR = 1.33, 95% CI: 1.00–1.75, p = 0.05). The incidence of all-grade cardiovascular toxicity increased in malignant tumor patients who received single-agent CTLA-4 inhibitors (OR = 1.73, 95% CI: 1.13–2.65, p = 0.01), as well as the incidence rate of grades 3–5 cardiovascular adverse events (OR = 2.00, 95% CI: 1.08-3.70, p = 0.03). Compared with the non-CTLA-4 inhibitor group, CTLA-4 inhibitors plus chemotherapy, PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors, or target agent did not significantly affect the incidence of

Abbreviations: BTC, biliary tract cancer; CHF, congestive heart failure; CIs, confidence intervals; CTCAE, common toxicity criteria; CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein-4; ESCC, esophageal squamous cell carcinoma; ES-SCLC, extensive-stage small-cell lung cancer; HNSCC, head and neck squamous cell carcinoma; HTN, hypertension; ICIs, immune checkpoint inhibitors; MeSH, Medical Subject Headings; MI, myocardial infarction; MSI, microsatellite instability; NSCLC, non-small-cell lung cancer; OR, odds ratio; PD-1/PD-L1, programmed cell death protein 1/programmed cell death ligand-1; RCC, renal cell carcinoma.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made. © 2024 The Authors. *Cancer Innovation* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of Tsinghua University Press. National Key Research and Development Project, Grant/Award Number: 2018YFC1312502; Guangdong Special Funds for Science and Technology Innovation Strategy, China (Stability support for scientific research institutions affiliated to Guangdong Province, GDCI 2021)

cardiac and vascular toxicity. The incidence of grades 3–5 cardiac failure, hypertension, pericardial effusion, myocarditis, and atrial fibrillation were much higher among patients exposed to CTLA-4 inhibitor, but the data were not statistically significant.

**Conclusion:** Our findings suggest that the incidence rate of all cardiovascular toxicity and severe cardiovascular toxicity increased in patients who were administered CTLA-4 inhibitors. In addition, the risk of serious cardiovascular toxic events was independent of the type of adverse event. From these results, physicians should assess the benefits and risks of CTLA-4 inhibitors when treating malignancies.

K E Y W O R D S

cardiovascular toxicity, CTLA-4 inhibitors, malignancies

#### **1** | INTRODUCTION

The discovery of tumor-associated antigens and their recognition by activated T cells [1] has revolutionized the treatment methods for many malignant tumors and significantly improved patient outcomes [2]. Cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein-4 (CTLA-4) is expressed in activated T cells and can inhibit the uncontrolled proliferation of T cells after binding to B7 [3, 4]. A CTLA-4 inhibitor, one type of immune checkpoint inhibitor (ICI), can bind to CTLA-4 and restore the T cell-mediated immune response against tumor cells. Two specific CTLA-4 inhibitors, ipilimumab, and tremelimumab, have been shown to be effective in patients with metastatic melanoma, nonsmall-cell lung cancer (NSCLC), relapsed malignant pleural mesothelioma, advanced pancreatic cancer [5-8], hepatocellular carcinoma [9], and malignant mesothelioma [10] when used as a monotherapy or in combination with other drugs. However, with the wide application of CTLA-4 inhibitors, increasing studies have suggested that they can cause a variety of immune-related toxicities by enhancing the systemic immune response. Cardiovascular toxicity is one of the most significant and severe complications [3]. Cardiovascular toxicities of CTLA-4 inhibitors include congestive heart failure, pericardial effusion, myocardial infarction, myocarditis, and hypertension [11]. As a result of these toxicities, cancer treatment may be delayed or stopped, and the subsequent outcomes may be worse. Therefore, it is essential to assess the incidence and severity of cardiovascular toxicity when using CTLA-4 inhibitors. In this meta-analysis, we evaluated the incidence of various cardiovascular toxicities associated with using CTLA-4 inhibitors alone or combined with other targeted agents to guide their administration to cancer patients better.

#### **2** | **PATIENTS AND METHODS**

## 2.1 | Search methods and study selection

We searched all human randomized control trials published in English between January 1, 2013, and November 30, 2022, in the Cochrane Library and PubMed databases. The Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and their entry terms were "ipilimumab," "tremelimumab," "CTLA-4 inhibitors," and "CTLA-4." Only studies with the sole difference between the experimental and control groups being the use of CTLA-4 inhibitors were included.

These studies included trials that compared singleagent CTLA-4 inhibitors to placebo, CTLA-4 inhibitors combined with chemotherapy to chemotherapy alone, CTLA-4 inhibitors combined with another ICI (PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors) to PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors alone, and CTLA-4 inhibitors combined with target agent to PD-1/ PD-L1 inhibitors combined with target agent. Only trials that mentioned cardiovascular side effects were included. The abstracts and duplicate trials were deleted. The titles and abstracts of identified publications were carefully screened by two researchers independently. Full-text evaluations were conducted for any publications that the researchers thought were potentially relevant.

#### 2.2 | Data collection

Data were collected on all grades and grades 3–5 cardiovascular toxicities, which included myocardial infarction, cardiac failure, pericardial effusion, cardiac arrest, myocarditis, hypertension, and atrial fibrillation.

The type and dose of ICI, tumor type, and number of study patients were noted. Common Toxicity Criteria (CTCAE) version 5.0 was used to classify the cardiovascular adverse events. A grade 1 or 2 cardiac disorder means that the patient is asymptomatic or has mild symptoms and does not require urgent intervention, respectively. A grade 3 adverse event means that the patient has severe symptoms or onset of symptoms that require urgent intervention. Grade 4 adverse events are usually life-threatening, while a grade 5 adverse event indicates death.

#### 2.3 | Statistical analysis

We assessed the quality of each included study and performed our analysis using RevMan v.5.4. The article quality was evaluated by detecting the following biases: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other bias. The bias risk was also summarized. The method of effect estimation was determined according to  $I^2$ . When  $I^2 < 50\%$ , we used the fixed-effect model. Otherwise, a random-effect model was used. A  $p \le 0.05$  (double-tailed) was considered statistically significant.

#### 3 | RESULTS

#### 3.1 | Eligible studies and characteristics

Overall, 4976 trials were obtained when searching the Cochrane Library and PubMed databases. After eliminating duplicate literature and carefully screening the titles, abstracts, and full text, 20 trials were included [7, 8, 12–29]. Figure 1 shows the search strategy and trial selection flow chart. We evaluated the quality of the included trials, and the results are shown in Figure 2. The details of the 20 trials are summarized in Table 1. We categorized the trials as (1) CTLA-4 inhibitors to placebo (five trials, 3553 patients), (2) CTLA-4 inhibitors combined with chemotherapy to chemotherapy alone (one trial, 1539 patients), (3) CTLA-4 inhibitors combined with PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors to PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors alone (11 trials, 3949



FIGURE 1 The flow diagram describing the systematic search.









FIGURE 2 Risk bias diagram and forest map.

patients), or (4) CTLA-4 inhibitors combined with target agent to PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors combined with target agent (three trials, 1314 patients). The most common tumor types in the trials were melanoma (five trials, 25%), NSCLC (three trials, 15%), small cell lung cancer (SCLC) (three trials, 15%), prostate cancer (two trials, 10%), malignant mesothelioma (two trials, 10%), urothelial carcinoma (one trial, 5%), gastroesophageal adenocarcinoma (one trial, 5%), pancreatic cancer (one trial, 5%), advanced or metastatic solid tumors (one trial, 5%), and BTC, ESCC, or HNSCC (one trial, 5%).

## 3.2 | Incidence of cardiovascular adverse events

The incidence of myocardial infarction, cardiac failure, pericardial effusion, cardiac arrest, myocarditis, hypertension, and atrial fibrillation in the different treatments is shown in Table 2. Among all studies, the incidence of all-grade cardiovascular toxicity was 1.33 (95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.00–1.75, p = 0.05) (Figure 3). Subgroup analysis showed that compared with placebo, single-agent CTLA-4 inhibitors significantly affected the

TABLE 1 Chara	tcteristics of the 20 trials in	icluded in analysis.					
Article	Cancer type	Treatment	Enrollment	All-grade cardiotoxicity	Grades 3–5 cardiotoxicity	All-grade hypertension	Grades 3–5 hypertension
<b>CTLA-4</b> inhibitor	vs. placebo						
Maio 2017	Malignant	Tremelimumab (10 mg/kg)	382	16	11	NA	NA
	mesothelioma	Placebo	189	7	5	NA	NA
Beer 2017	Prostate cancer	Ipilimumab (10 mg/kg)	399	7	7	NA	NA
		Placebo	199	0	0	NA	NA
Eggermont 2016	Melanoma	Ipilimumab (10 mg/kg)	475	1	1	NA	NA
		Placebo	476	0	0	NA	NA
Kwon 2014	Prostate cancer	Ipilimumab (10 mg/kg)	393	26	19	20	1
		Placebo	396	13	7	13	1
Ribas 2013	Melanoma	Ipilimumab (10 mg/kg)	325	1	1	NA	NA
		Placebo	319	0	0	NA	NA
<b>CTLA-4 inhibitor</b>	+ chemotherapy vs. che	motherapy					
Tarhini 2019	melanoma	Ipilimumab (3 mg/Kg)	516	1	1	NA	NA
		Ipilimumab (10 mg/Kg)	503	7	1	NA	NA
		HDI	520	0	0	NA	NA
<b>CTLA-4</b> inhibitor	++ PD-1/PD-1 inhibitor v	s. PD-1/PD-1 inhibitor					
Paz-Ares 2022	ES SCLC	Durvalumab (1500 mg) + tremelimumab (75 mg) + EP	266	4	4		
		Durvalumab (1500 mg) + EP	256	3	3		
Doki 2022	BTC, ESCC, HNSCC	Tremelimumab (1 mg/kg) + durvalumab (10 mg/kg)	124	NA	NA	1	0
		Durvalumab (10 mg/kg)	116	NA	NA	3	0
Goldman 2021	ES-SCLC	Durvalumab (1500 mg) + tremelimumab (75 mg) + platinum-etoposide	266	NA	NA	15	L
		Durvalumab (1500 mg) plus platinum- etoposide	265	1	1	16	8
Cascone 2021	Metastatic NSCLC	Nivolumab (3 mg/kg) + ipilimumab (1 mg/kg)	21	1	0	NA	NA
		Nivolumab (3 mg/kg)	23	1	0	NA	NA
							(Continues)

5 of 16

(Continued)
L
Ш
Г
B
◄
E

Article	Cancer type	Treatment	Enrollment	All-grade cardiotoxicity	Grades 3–5 cardiotoxicity	All-grade hypertension	Grades 3–5 hypertension
Boyer 2021	Metastatic NSCLC	Pembrolizumab (200 mg) + ipilimumab (1 mg/kg)	282	٢	9	۲	L
		Pembrolizumab (200 mg + placebo	281	8	7	4	4
Zimmer 2020	Melanoma	Nivolumab (1 mg/kg) + ipilimumab (3 mg/kg)	55	2	0	NA	NA
		Nivolumab (3 mg/kg)	56	1	0	NA	NA
Powles 2020	Urothelial carcinoma	Durvalumab (1500 mg) + tremelimumab (75 mg)	340	0	0	NA	NA
		Durvalumab (1500 mg)	345	4	3	NA	NA
Planchard 2020	Metastatic NSCLC	Durvalumab (20 mg/kg + tremelimumab (1 mg/kg)	173	NA	NA	ςΩ	2
		Durvalumab (10 mg/kg)	117	NA	NA	1	0
Scherpereel 2019	Malignant pleural mesothelioma	Nivolumab (3 mg/kg) + ipilimumab (1 mg/kg)	61	1	1	NA	NA
		Nivolumab (3 mg/kg)	63	1	1	NA	NA
Hodi 2018	Advanced melanoma	Nivolumab (1 mg/kg) + ipilimumab (3 mg/kg)	313	NA	NA	4	1
		Nivolumab (3 mg/kg)	313	NA	NA	5	2
Antonia 2016	SCLC	Nivolumab (3 mg/kg, 1 mg/kg) + ipilimumab (3 mg/kg, 1 mg/kg)	115	1	1	NA	NA
		Nivolumab (3 mg/kg)	98	1	1	NA	NA
<b>CTLA-4</b> inhibitor	+ target agent vs. PD-1/	'PD-1 inhibitor + target agent					
Shitara 2022	Gastro-esophageal adenocarcinoma	Nivolumab (1 mg/kg) + ipilimumab (3 mg/kg)	403	7	7	NA	NA
		Nivolumab (1 mg/kg) + chemotherapy	782	0	0	NA	NA
Reiss 2022	Pancreatic cancer	Niraparib (200 mg + ipilimumab (3 mg/kg)	45	NA	NA	9	4
		Niraparib (200 mg) + nivolumab (240 mg)	46	NA	NA	4	4

ntinued	
(Co	
L	
ĽΕ	
B	
◄	
E	

je Tre:		atment	Enrollment	All-grade cardiotoxicity	Grades 3–5 cardiotoxicity	All-grade hypertension	Grades 3–5 hypertension
or Mogamulizumab (1 tic solid tremelimumab (	gamulizumab (] remelimumab (	l mg/kg) + (10 mg/kg)	19	NA	NA	1	1
Mogamulizumab (1 m durvalumab (10 m	amulizumab (1 m durvalumab (10 m	g/kg) + g/kg)	19	NA	NA	0	0

Abbreviations: EP, etoposide plus either cisplatin or carboplatin; HDI, high-dose interferon alfa.

different subgroups.
n four
Ξ.
toxicity
ascular
cardiov
of
incidence
The
TABLE 2

	CTLA-4 inhibitor (N = 1974, 55.56%)	Placebo (N = 1579, 44.44%)	CTLA-4 inhibitor (N = 1019, 66.21%)	Chemotherapy (N = 520, 33.79%)	CTLA-4 inhibitor + PD-1/ PD-1 inhibitor (N = 2016, 51.05%)	PD-1/PD-1 inhibitor (N = 1933, 48.95%)	CTLA-4 inhibitor + TA (N = 467, 35.54%)	PD-1/PD-1 inhibitor + TA (N = 847, 64.46%)
Myocardial infarction	7 (0.35)	3 (0.19)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cardiac failure	5 (0.25)	5 (0.25)	NA	NA	1 (0.05)	NA	2 (0.43)	NA
Pericardial effusion	15 (0.76)	6 (0.39)	NA	NA	4 (0.20)	9 (0.47)	NA	NA
Cardiac arrest	7 (0.35)	2 (0.13)	2 (0.20)	NA	1 (0.05)	3 (0.16)	NA	NA
Myocarditis	1 (0.05)	NA	1 (0.10)	NA	4 (0.20)	3 (0.16)	NA	NA
Hypertension	20 (1.01)	13 (0.82)	NA	NA	30 (1.50)	29 (1.50)	7 (1.50)	4 (0.47)
Atrial fibrillation	5 (0.25)	4 (0.25)	NA	NA	3 (0.15)	3 (0.16)	NA	NA

	CTLA-4 inh	nibitor	Non-CTLA-4 in	hibitor		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight (%)	M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl	M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Antonia 2016	1	115	1	98	1.2	0.85 [0.05, 13.78]	
Beer 2017	2	399	0	199	0.8	2.51 [0.12, 52.52]	
Boyer 2021	14	282	12	281	13.2	1.17 [0.53, 2.58]	- <b>-</b> -
Cascone 2021	1	21	1	23	1.1	1.10 [0.06, 18.77]	
Doki 2022	1	124	3	116	3.6	0.31 [0.03, 2.99]	
Eggermont 2016	1	475	0	476	0.6	3.01 [0.12, 74.14]	
Goldman 2021	15	266	17	265	18.6	0.87 [0.43, 1.78]	
Hodi 2018	4	313	5	313	5.7	0.80 [0.21, 3.00]	
Kwon 2014	46	393	26	396	26.5	1.89 [1.14, 3.12]	
Maio 2017	16	382	7	189	10.4	1.14 [0.46, 2.81]	_ <b>_</b>
Paz-Ares 2022	4	266	3	256	3.5	1.29 [0.29, 5.81]	
Planchard 2020	3	173	1	117	1.4	2.05 [0.21, 19.92]	
Powles 2020	0	340	4	345	5.2	0.11 [0.01, 2.08]	
Reiss 2022	6	45	4	46	4.0	1.62 [0.42, 6.16]	
Ribas 2013	1	325	0	319	0.6	2.95 [0.12, 72.78]	
Scherpereel 2019	1	61	1	63	1.1	1.03 [0.06, 16.90]	
Shitara 2022	2	403	0	782	0.4	9.74 [0.47, 203.46]	
Tarhini 2019	3	1019	0	520	0.8	3.58 [0.18, 69.52]	
Zamarin 2020	1	19	0	19	0.5	3.16 [0.12, 82.64]	
Zimmer 2020	2	55	1	56	1.1	2.08 [0.18, 23.57]	
Total (95% CI)		5476		4879	100.0	1.33 [1.00, 1.75]	•
Total events	124		86				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	1.84, df = 19	(p = 0.8)	(9); $I^2 = 0\%$			L	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.98 (p =	0.05)				0.001	0.1 1 10 1000
		,					CILA-4 INNIDITOR NON-CILA-4 INHIbitor

**FIGURE 3** Forest plots of the risk of all-grade cardiovascular toxicity calculated using the fixed effect model. CI, confidence interval; CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein-4.

incidence of all-grade cardiovascular toxicity (odds ratio [OR] = 1.73, 95% CI: 1.13-2.65, p = 0.01) (Figure 4). When compared with chemotherapy alone, the combination with a CTLA-4 inhibitor did not influence the incidence of all-grade cardiovascular adverse events (OR = 3.58, 95% CI: 0.18-69.52, p = 0.40). Compared with using a PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitor or target agent alone, a CTLA-4 inhibitor combined with a PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitor or target agent did not impact the incidence of all-grade cardiovascular toxicity (OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.61-1.38, p = 0.67; OR = 2.43, 95% CI: 0.81-7.36, p = 0.11, respectively) (Figure 4).

For grades 3–5 cardiovascular toxicity, the incidence among all studies did not increase (OR = 1.14, 95% CI: 0.76–1.70, p = 0.52) (Figure 5). Compared with placebo, the risk of severe cardiovascular toxicity when using a singleagent CTLA-4 inhibitor increased dramatically (OR = 2.00, 95% CI: 1.08–3.70, p = 0.03) (Figure 6). When a CTLA-4 inhibitor was combined with chemotherapy or PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitor or target agent, the risk of grades 3–5 cardiovascular toxicity did not increase (OR = 3.58, 95% CI: 0.18–69.52, p = 0.40; OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.55–1.51, p = 0.71; OR = 1.92, 95% CI: 0.62–5.97, p = 0.26, respectively) (Figure 6).

An analysis was also conducted to estimate the risks of myocardial infarction, cardiac failure, pericardial effusion, cardiac arrest, myocarditis, hypertension, and atrial fibrillation. CTLA-4 inhibitors did not statistically influence the incidence of these events compared with placebo, chemotherapy, another ICI, or target agent (Figure 7a,b). Subgroup analysis found that the risks of severe cardiac failure (OR = 1.85, 95% CI: 0.63–5.41, p = 0.26), hypertension (OR = 1.24, 95% CI: 0.67–2.27, p = 0.49), pericardial effusion (OR = 1.26, 95% CI: 0.50–3.18, p = 0.62), myocarditis (OR = 1.29, 95% CI: 0.36–4.66, p = 0.70), and atrial fibrillation (OR = 2.24, 95% CI: 0.69–7.28, p = 0.18) were much higher among patients exposed to CTLA-4 inhibitor. However, there were few patients involved, so these differences were not statistically significant.

#### 4 | DISCUSSION

This study found that the incidence of all-grade cardiovascular toxicity was significantly increased in the patients exposed to CTLA-4 inhibitors. In contrast, the risk of grades 3–5 cardiovascular toxicity did not increase. Subgroup analysis showed that the use of a single-agent CTLA-4 inhibitor significantly increased the incidence of all-grade cardiovascular toxicity and severe cardiovascular toxicity compared with placebo. For combination regimens, the incidence of cardiac and vascular adverse events among patients exposed to CTLA-4 inhibitors did not change. Additional analysis of individual cardiovascular adverse events suggested that CTLA-4 inhibitors may be associated with an increased risk of severe cardiovascular adverse events.



	CTLA-4 inh	ibitor	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subaroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight (	%) M-H. Fixed. 95% C	M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
2.1.1 CTLA-4 inhibitor	VS Placebo						
Beer 2017	2	399	0	199	2.0	2.51 [0.12, 52,52]	
Eggermont 2016	1	475	0	476	1.5	3.01 [0.12, 74.14]	
Kwon 2014	46	393	26	396	68.3	1.89 [1.14, 3.12]	<b>₩</b>
Maio 2017	16	382	7	189	26.8	1.14 [0.46, 2.81]	
Ribas 2013	1	325	0	319	1.5	2.95 [0.12, 72.78]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1974		1579	100.0	1.73 [1.13, 2.65]	•
Total events	66		33				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	.22, df = 4 ( p	= 0.87)	<sup>2</sup> = 0%				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.52 (P=)	0.01)					
2.1.2 CTLA-4 inhibitor	+chemother	apy VS	Chemoth	nerapy			_
Tarhini 2019	3	1019	0	520	100.0	3.58 [0.18, 69.52]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1019		520	100.0	3.58 [0.18, 69.52]	
Total events	3		0				
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable						
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.84 (p = 0)	0.40)					
2.1.3 CTLA-4 inhibitor	+PD-1/PD-L1	inhibit	or VS PD	)-1/PD-	L1 inhibit	or	
Antonia 2016	1	115	1	98	2.2	0.85 [0.05, 13.78]	
Boyer 2021	14	282	12	281	23.8	1.17 [0.53, 2.58]	
Cascone 2021	1	21	1	23	1.9	1.10 [0.06, 18.77]	
Doki 2022	1	124	3	116	6.4	0.31 [0.03, 2.99]	
Goldman 2021	15	266	17	265	33.4	0.87 [0.43, 1.78]	
Hodi 2018	4	313	5	313	10.3	0.80 [0.21, 3.00]	
Paz-Ares 2022	4	266	3	256	6.3	1.29 [0.29, 5.81]	
Planchard 2020	3	173	1	117	2.4	2.05 [0.21, 19.92]	
Powles 2020	0	340	4	345	9.3	0.11 [0.01, 2.08]	
Scherpereel 2019	1	61	1	63	2.0	1.03 [0.06, 16.90]	
Zimmer 2020	2	55	1	56	2.0	2.08 [0.18, 23.57]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		2016		1933	100.0	0.91 [0.61, 1.38]	<b>T</b>
Total events	46		49				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 4	.45, df = 10 (	p = 0.92	2); l² = 0%	•			
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.43 (p = 0)	0.67)					
			in hihita.	TD			
2.1.4 CTLA-4 Infibitor	+10 V3 FD-	1/FU-L1	Infilbito	TID	04.4	4 60 10 40 6 461	
Reiss ZUZZ	0	40	4	40	81.1	1.62 [0.42, 6.16]	
Shitara 2022	2	403	0	/82	8.0	9.74 [0.47, 203.46]	
Zamarin 2020 Subtotol /05% CIV	1	19	U	19	10.9	3.10 [0.12, 82.04]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	•	407		04/	100.0	2.43 [0.01, 7.30]	-
Hotorogonoity: Chi2 - 1	9 10 df = 2 ( n	- 0 55)	4				
Test for everall effects	1 - 1 = 2(p)	- 0.55)	, I <sup>-</sup> – Ų%				
Lest IOL Overall ellect	L = 1.00 (p = 0)	0.11)					
						ŀ	
						í	0.001 0.1 1 10 1000
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Chi² =	6 25 d	f=3(n=	0.10)	$ ^2 = 52.0\%$		CTLA-4 inhibitor Control
		J.E.J. U		J. 101.			

**FIGURE 4** Forest plots of the risk of all-grade cardiovascular toxicity in the subgroups calculated using the fixed effect model. CI, confidence interval; CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein-4.

As described above, we found that a single-agent CTLA-4 inhibitor observably increased the incidence of cardiovascular toxicity. Ipilimumab was the first ICI used to treat metastatic melanoma [30]. It was reported that all-grade adverse events could occur in 60% of patients treated with ipilimumab, while all severe adverse events could occur in 10%–30% of these individuals [31]. Tremelimumab is another CTLA-4 inhibitor, which has been in clinical use for a shorter time than ipilimumab. The risk of

cardiovascular adverse events was reportedly 4.19% when single-agent tremelimumab was used to treat malignant mesothelioma [21]. When tremelimumab was combined with durvalumab, the incidence was 5.64% [18]. Recently, Rubio-Infante et al. [32] reported that the incidence of cardiac adverse events with a CTLA-4 inhibitor was 3.6% among 3764 treated patients. Xavier et al. [33] also reported that the incidence of all-grade cardiovascular toxicity with CTLA-4 inhibitors was 8.33% and 5.48% for

	CTLA-4 Inf	libitor	Non-CTLA-4 In	hibitor		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight (%)	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Antonia 2016	1	115	1	98	2.4	0.85 [0.05, 13.78]	
Beer 2017	2	399	0	199	1.5	2.51 [0.12, 52.52]	
Boyer 2021	13	282	11	281	23.1	1.19 [0.52, 2.69]	
Eggermont 2016	1	475	0	476	1.1	3.01 [0.12, 74.14]	
Goldman 2021	7	266	9	265	19.3	0.77 [0.28, 2.10]	
Hodi 2018	1	313	2	313	4.4	0.50 [0.04, 5.52]	
Kwon 2014	0	39	1	97	1.9	0.81 [0.03, 20.42]	
Maio 2017	11	382	5	189	14.3	1.09 [0.37, 3.19]	
Paz-Ares 2022	4	266	3	256	6.6	1.29 [0.29, 5.81]	
Planchard 2020	2	173	0	117	1.3	3.43 [0.16, 72.00]	
Powles 2020	0	340	4	345	9.8	0.11 [0.01, 2.08]	
Reiss 2022	4	45	4	46	7.9	1.02 [0.24, 4.37]	
Ribas 2013	1	325	0	329	1.1	3.05 [0.12, 75.05]	
Scherpereel 2019	1	61	1	63	2.1	1.03 [0.06, 16.90]	
Shitara 2022	2	403	0	782	0.7	9.74 [0.47, 203.46]	
Tarhini 2019	3	1019	0	520	1.5	3.58 [0.18, 69.52]	
Zamarin 2020	1	19	0	19	1.0	3.16 [0.12, 82.64]	
Total (95% CI)		4922		4395	100.0	1.14 [0.76, 1.70]	•
Total events	54		41				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 7	.96, df = 16	(p=0.95	5); l² = 0%			0.001	01 1 10 1000
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.64 (p=	0.52)				0.001	CTLA_4 inhibitor Non-CTLA_4 inhibitor

**FIGURE 5** Forest plots of the risk of grades 3–5 cardiotoxicity calculated using the fixed effect model. CI, confidence interval; CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein-4.

severe cardiovascular adverse events, much higher than the 1% reported in most trials. Among the cardiovascular adverse events caused by CTLA-4 inhibitors, severe events accounted for the majority, which is consistent with our conclusions in this study. When comparing the results of the Rubio-Infante et al. [32] and Xavier et al. [33] studies, CTLA-4 inhibitors were also found to increase the incidence of vascular adverse events.

Patients using higher doses (10 mg/kg) of ipilimumab have been reported to have a higher risk of adverse events than those using lower doses (3 mg/kg) [34]. Tumor responses have also been associated with drug dose. With this, additional questions arise: whether adverse events indicate better tumor outcomes when patients use ICIs [35]. According to work by Downey et al. [36], among the patients with metastatic melanoma who received ipilimumab, those who developed immune-related adverse events were associated with better antitumor outcomes. Attia et al. [37] showed that patients with severe autoimmune toxicity experienced better clinical responses compared with those with no autoimmune toxicity. These studies showed that the responses of tumors treated with an anti-CTLA-4 antibody correlated with immune-related adverse events. Fortunately, most adverse events were grade 1 or 2, with almost all being reversible with administration of high-dose steroids [37].

However, the mechanism by which ICIs can induce cardiovascular toxicity remains unclear. Because of the association between drug dose and immune-related adverse events, we hypothesized that disruption of peripheral immune system tolerance may be the underlying mechanism. One case was reported that involved abatacept, a CTLA-4 agonist that has been approved for use in patients with rheumatic diseases, leading to the resolution of myocarditis that was induced by an ICI [38]. CTLA-4 inhibitors may cause cardiovascular adverse events through two mechanisms. First, tumor cells and cardiomyocytes share some muscle-specific antigens, which can trigger cross-reactivity with T cells [39, 40]. Skeletal muscle cells may also share the same muscle-specific antigens, as the first symptom of most patients with immune myocarditis is ptosis. Additionally, immune cell infiltration can be observed in the skeletal muscle of the eyelid. In the affected hearts of PD-1 (-/-) BALB/c mice, complement C3 and immunoglobulin G, specific antibodies to cardiac troponin I, were diffused on the surface of cardiomyocytes [41]. Second, CTLA-4 plays a vital role in normal immune function. Therefore, ICI-mediated inhibition may cause cardiac cells to be more susceptible to injury [42]. Once CTLA-4 on the T cell surface competitively binds to B7, activated T cell proliferation is limited. Thus, the injured area can be protected, reducing unnecessary damage [2]. When CTLA-4 inhibitors interact with CTLA-4, T cell proliferation is not limited, causing excessive production of inflammatory factors in the injured area and immune damage.

Since 2015, the combination of CTLA-4 inhibitors and PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors has shown excellent efficacy in advanced melanoma [43], renal cell carcinoma [44], microsatellite instability-high malignancy [45], SCLC [12], and NSCLC. However, the risk of toxicity was also



	CTLA-4 inhi	bitor	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight (%)	M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
4.1.1 CTLA-4 inhibitor	VS Placebo						
Beer 2017	2	399	0	199	4.2	2.51 [0.12, 52.52]	
Eggermont 2016	1	475	0	476	3.2	3.01 [0.12, 74.14]	
Kwon 2014	20	393	8	396	48.1	2.60 [1.13, 5.98]	
Maio 2017	11	382	5	189	41.3	1.09 [0.37, 3.19]	
Ribas 2013	1	325	0	319	3.2	2.95 [0.12, 72.78]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1974		1579	100.0	2.00 [1.08, 3.70]	-
Total events	35		13				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	.75, df = 4 (p	= 0.78)	<sup>2</sup> = 0%				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.20 (p = 0)	0.03)					
	tahamathar	We Ve	Chamath				
4.1.2 GTLA-4 Infibitor	-chemothera	1010	chemou	FOO	100.0	2 59 10 49 60 501	
Subtotal (95% CI)	3	1019	U	520	100.0	3.56 [0.16, 69.52]	
Total events	2	1013	•	320	100.0	3.50 [0.10, 08.52]	
Hotorogeneity Net and	Jiaahla		U				
Test for overall offect:	7 = 0.94 (n = 0)	140)					
	L = 0.04 (p = 0)	.40)					
4.1.3 CTLA-4 inhibitor	+PD-1/PD-L1	inhibit	or VS PD	-1/PD-I	L1 inhibitor		
Antonia 2016	1	115	1	98	3.4	0.85 [0.05, 13.78]	
Boyer 2021	13	282	11	281	33.5	1.19 [0.52, 2.69]	
Goldman 2021	7	266	9	265	28.0	0.77 [0.28, 2.10]	
Hodi 2018	1	313	2	313	6.4	0.50 [0.04, 5.52]	
Paz-Ares 2022	4	266	3	256	9.6	1.29 [0.29, 5.81]	
Planchard 2020	2	173	0	117	1.9	3.43 [0.16, 72.00]	
Powles 2020	0	340	4	345	14.2	0.11 [0.01, 2.08]	
Scherpereel 2019	1	61	1	63	3.1	1.03 [0.06, 16.90]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1816		1738	100.0	0.91 [0.55, 1.51]	<b>•</b>
Total events	29		31				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3	6.67, df = 7 ( p	= 0.82)	<sup>2</sup> = 0%				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.37 ( p = 0	).71)					
4.1.4 CTLA-4 inhibitor	+TD VS PD-1	/PD-L1	inhibitor	+TD			
Reiss 2022	4	45	4	46	81.8	1.02 [0.24, 4.37]	
Shitara 2022	2	403	0	782	7.7	9.74 [0.47, 203.46]	<del></del>
Zamarin 2020	1	19	0	19	10.5	3.16 [0.12, 82.64]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		467		847	100.0	1.92 [0.62, 5.97]	
Total events	7		4				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	.91, df = 2 (p	= 0.39)	² = 0%				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 1.12 ( p = 0	).26)					
						L	
						0.001	0.1 1 10 1000
<b>.</b>							CTLA-4 inhibitor Control
lest for subaroup diffe	rences: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	4.68. d	t=3(p=	0.201.	*= 35.9%		

**FIGURE 6** Forest plots of the risk of grades 3–5 cardiotoxicity in the subgroups calculated using the fixed effect model. CI, confidence interval; CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein-4.

higher when the two ICIs were used together [46]. A recent meta-analysis showed that currently used PD-1, PD-L1, and CTLA-4 inhibitors exhibited similar incidence rates of cardiac and vascular toxicity, with 7.59% (95% CI: 5.31%–10.22%), 7.69% (95% CI: 3.88%–12.60%), and 8.33% (95% CI: 3.40%–15.08%), respectively. However, the incidence of combination therapy is higher (12.45%, 95% CI: 4.99%–22.56%) [33]. Another meta-analysis also showed that compared with single-agent ICI, dual immunotherapy demonstrated a higher incidence of cardiovascular adverse events (3.1% and 5.8%,

respectively), which suggested that the type of ICI was relevant [32]. Because of this, closer observation is warranted in patients who are receiving dual immunotherapy. In this study, we also compared the risk of a CTLA-4 inhibitor combined with a PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitor to that with a PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitor alone. However, the incidence of cardiovascular toxicity was not increased with this combination, which was consistent with other trials [47, 48]. There are several possible reasons why our results showed that combination therapy did not result in higher cardiovascular toxicity compared with monotherapy. First,

12 of 16	CA	NC
	INN	<b>DVA</b>

(a)	CTLA-4 Inl	hibitor	Non-CTLA-4	Inhibitor		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight (%)	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
5.1.1 Cardiac failure							
Kwon 2014	4	393	4	396	64.7	1.01 [0.25, 4.06]	
Maio 2017	1	382	1	189	21.9	0.49 [0.03, 7.93]	
Scherpereel 2019	1	61	0	63	7.9	3.15 [0.13, 78.80]	
Shitara 2022	2	403	0	782	5.5	9.74 [0.47, 203.46]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1239		1430	100.0	1.55 [0.56, 4.28]	
Total events	8		5			a. a.	
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2	2.61, df = 3 ()	p = 0.46)	$ ^2 = 0\%$				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.84 (p =	0.40)					
5.1.2 Hypertension							
Boyer 2021	7	282	4	281	8.8	1.76 [0.51, 6.09]	
Doki 2022	1	124	3	116	6.9	0.31 [0.03, 2.99]	
Goldman 2021	15	266	16	265	34.1	0.93 [0.45, 1.92]	-
Hodi 2018	4	313	5	313	11.1	0.80 [0.21, 3.00]	
Kwon 2014	20	393	13	396	27.7	1.58 [0.77. 3.22]	+=-
Planchard 2020	3	173	1	117	2.6	2.05 [0.21, 19.92]	
Reiss 2022	6	45	4	46	7.7	1.62 [0.42, 6, 16]	
Zamarin 2020	1	19	D	19	1.0	3.16 [0.12, 82,64]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1615	•	1553	100.0	1.23 [0.83, 1.83]	•
Total events	57		46			• • •	
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3	3.88. df = 7 ()	p = 0.79	$I^2 = 0\%$				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.03 (p =	0.30)					
		/					
5.1.3 Pericardial effus	slon						
Antonia 2016	0	115	1	98	8.8	0.28 [0.01, 6.99]	
Bover 2021	4	282	7	281	37.9	0.56 [0.16, 1.95]	
Kwon 2014	3	393	0	396	2.7	7.11 [0.37, 138.05]	
Maio 2017	12	382	6	189	42.6	0.99 [0.37, 2.68]	
Scherpereel 2019	0	61	1	63	8.0	0.34 [0.01, 8,48]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-	1233		1027	100.0	0.88 [0.45, 1.71]	<b>•</b>
Total events	19		15				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3	3.28. df = 4 (	p = 0.51)	$ ^2 = 0\%$				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.38 ( p=	0.70)					
5.1.4 Myocarditis							
Antonia 2016	1	115	0	98	10.3	2.58 [0.10, 64.07]	
Boyer 2021	3	282	1	281	19.2	3.01 [0.31, 29.12]	
Eggermont 2016	1	475	O	476	9.6	3.01 [0.12, 74.14]	
Powles 2020	0	340	2	345	48.0	0.20 [0.01, 4.22]	
Tarhini 2019	1	1019	0	520	12.8	1.53 [0.06, 37.70]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		2231		1720	100.0	1.43 [0.46, 4.42]	
Total events	6		3				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2	2.35, df = 4 (	p = 0.67)	$ ^2 = 0\%$				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.62 (P=	0.54)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
5.1.5 Atrial fibrillation	I IIII						
Kwon 2014	5	393	4	396	46.7	1.26 [0.34, 4.74]	<b>_</b>
Paz-Ares 2022	3	266	2	256	23.9	1.45 [0.24, 8.74]	
Powles 2020	0	340	2	345	29.4	0.20 [0.01, 4.22]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		999		997	100.0	1.00 [0.38, 2.59]	<b>•</b>
Total events	8		8			1999 1993 B. 1999 L. L. (* 1993 B. J. 1966) - (* 1995)	
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = "	1.35, df = 2 (	p= 0.51)	; l² = 0%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.01 (p =	0.99)					
						0.004	01 1 10 1000
						0.001	CTLA_4 inhibitor Non-CTLA_4 inhibitor
Test for subaroup diffe	rences: Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 1.29. d	f = 4 ( p = 0.86)	.   <sup>2</sup> = 0%			

**FIGURE 7** Forest plots of the risk of (a) all-grade and (b) grades 3–5 cardiovascular toxicities calculated using the fixed effect model. CI, confidence interval; CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein-4.

patients in both groups may have received therapies other than ICIs as part of their treatment regimens. Second, because of the inclusion and exclusion criteria, we did not include all the trials that compared the combination of two ICIs to ICI monotherapy. Third, patients receiving PD-1 inhibitors may have a higher risk of toxic cardiovascular events than those taking CTLA-4 inhibitors. Rubio-Infante et al. [32] performed a pharmacovigilance database analysis

CANCER INNOVATION		

b)	CTLA-4 in	hibitor	Non-CTLA-4 in	hibitor		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight (%)	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
6.1.1 Cardiac failure							
Kwon 2014	4	393	3	396	57.9	1.35 [0.30, 6.06]	<b>_</b>
Maio 2017	1	382	1	189	26.1	0.49 [0.03, 7.93]	
Scherpereel 2019	1	61	0	63	9.4	3.15 [0.13, 78.80]	
Shitara 2022	2	403	0	782	6.6	9.74 [0.47, 203,46]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-	1239	-	1430	100.0	1.85 [0.63, 5.41]	
Total events	8		4				
Heterogeneity: Chi2 = 2	29 df = 3(	p = 0.51	$l^2 = 0\%$				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.12 (p =	= 0.26)					
6.1.2 Hypertension							
Boyer 2021	7	282	4	281	20.7	1.76 [0.51, 6.09]	
Goldman 2021	7	266	8	265	41.4	0.87 [0.31, 2.43]	
Hodi 2018	1	313	2	313	10.6	0.50 [0.04, 5.52]	
Kwon 2014	1	393	0	396	2.6	3.03 [0.12, 74.62]	
Planchard 2020	2	173	0	117	3.1	3.43 [0.16, 72.00]	
Reiss 2022	4	45	4	46	19.1	1.02 [0.24, 4.37]	
Zamarin 2020	1	19	0	19	2.5	3.16 [0.12, 82.64]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1491		1437	100.0	1.24 [0.67, 2.27]	<b>•</b>
Total events	23		18				
Heterogeneity: Chi2 = 2	2.43, df = 6 (	p = 0.88)	l² = 0%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.69 (P =	= 0.49)					
6.1.3 Pericardial effus	lon						
Antonia 2016	1	115	0	98	6.5	2.58 [0.10, 64.07]	
Boyer 2021	2	282	0	281	6.0	5.02 [0.24, 104.99]	
Kwon 2014	1	393	0	396	6.0	3.03 [0.12, 74.62]	
Maio 2017	7	382	4	189	63.7	0.86 [0.25, 2.99]	
Scherpereel 2019	0	61	1	63	17.8	0.34 [0.01, 8.48]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-	1233		1027	100.0	1.26 [0.50, 3.18]	
Total events	11		5				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2	2.27. df = 4 (	p = 0.69)	l <sup>2</sup> = 0%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.49 (P=	= 0.62)					
6.1.4 Myocarditis							
Antonia 2016	1	115	0	98	12.8	2.58 [0.10, 64.07]	
Boyer 2021	2	282	0	281	11.9	5.02 [0.24, 104.99]	
Powles 2020	0	340	2	345	59.5	0.20 [0.01, 4.22]	
Tarhini 2019	1	1019	0	520	15.9	1.53 [0.06, 37.70]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1756		1244	100.0	1.29 [0.36, 4.66]	-
Total events	4		2				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2	2.39, df = 3 (	p=0.50)	l <sup>2</sup> = 0%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.39 (p =	= 0.70)	(				
6.1.5 Atrial fibrillation							
Kwon 2014	5	393	0	396	12.3	11.23 [0.62, 203.71]	<u> </u>
Paz-Ares 2022	3	266	2	256	50.5	1.45 [0.24, 8.74]	
Powles 2020	0	340	1	345	37.2	0.34 [0.01, 8.31]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		999		997	100.0	2.24 [0.69, 7.28]	-
Total events	8		3				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2	2.75, df = 2 (	p = 0.25)	<sup>2</sup> = 27%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.34 (p=	= 0.18)					
						0.001	0.1 1 10 10

Test for subaroup differences: Chi<sup>2</sup> = 1.09. df = 4 (p = 0.90). I<sup>2</sup> = 0%

FIGURE 7 (Continued)

of the VigiAccess database, finding that at least 69.4% of cardiac disorders were associated with nivolumab and pembrolizumab treatment and 20% with ipilimumab and tremelimumab treatment. This would also result in no difference in the incidence of cardiovascular toxicity with the combination of the two ICI types compared with using a PD-1 inhibitor alone.

This study has some limitations. The included trials covered a wide range of cancer types and treatment regimens that also varied in the control group, which could potentially create heterogeneity. Additionally, certain subgroup analyses had few included studies. In the future, larger clinical studies need to be included to clarify the cardiotoxicity of CTLA-4 inhibitors.

#### 5 | CONCLUSION

In summary, we found that CTLA-4 inhibitors could significantly increase the incidence of cardiovascular toxicity in patients. Monitoring toxic cardiovascular events during ICI treatment is not currently routinely recommended by guidelines. From the results of our analysis, we recommend performing a routine evaluation of cardiac structure and function during ICI use. How to reduce the cardiotoxicity associated with CTLA-4 inhibitors is an urgent problem that should be addressed.

#### AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Huiyi Liu: Writing—original draft (equal). Lu Fu: Methodology (equal). Shuyu Jin: Methodology (equal). Xingdong Ye: Acquisition of data. Yanlin Chen: Formal analysis (equal). Sijia Pu: Funding acquisition (equal). Yumei Xue: Writing—review & editing.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

#### CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

#### DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data used to support the findings of this study are included in the article.

#### ETHICS STATEMENT

Not applicable.

#### **INFORMED CONSENT**

Not applicable.

#### ORCID

Huiyi Liu D http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5806-1023

#### REFERENCES

- van der Bruggen P, Traversari C, Chomez P, Lurquin C, De Plaen E, Van den Eynde B, et al. A gene encoding an antigen recognized by cytolytic T lymphocytes on a human melanoma. Science. 1991;254(5038):1643–7. https://doi.org/10.1126/science. 1840703
- O'Day SJ, Hamid O, Urba WJ. Targeting cytotoxic T-lymphocyte antigen-4 (CTLA-4): a novel strategy for the treatment of melanoma and other malignancies. Cancer. 2007;110(12): 2614–27. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.23086
- Hu JR, Florido R, Lipson EJ, Naidoo J, Ardehali R, Tocchetti CG, et al. Cardiovascular toxicities associated with immune checkpoint inhibitors. Cardiovasc Res. 2019;115(5):854868. https://doi.org/10. 1093/cvr/cvz026; Erratum in: Cardiovasc Res. 2019;115(5):868
- 4. Peggs KS, Quezada SA, Korman AJ, Allison JP. Principles and use of anti-CTLA4 antibody in human cancer immunotherapy.

Curr Opin Immunol. 2006;18(2):206–13. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.coi.2006.01.011

- Wolchok JD, Weber JS, Maio M, Neyns B, Harmankaya K, Chin K, et al. Four-year survival rates for patients with metastatic melanoma who received ipilimumab in phase II clinical trials. Ann Oncol. 2013;24(8):2174–80. https://doi.org/ 10.1093/annonc/mdt161
- Yang CFJ, McSherry F, Mayne NR, Wang X, Berry MF, Tong B, et al. Surgical outcomes after neoadjuvant chemotherapy and ipilimumab for non-small cell lung cancer. Ann Thorac Surg. 2018;105(3):924–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.athoracsur.2017.09.030
- Scherpereel A, Mazieres J, Greillier L, Lantuejoul S, Dô P, Bylicki O, et al. Nivolumab or nivolumab plus ipilimumab in patients with relapsed malignant pleural mesothelioma (IFCT-1501 MAPS2): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, noncomparative, phase 2 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2019;20(2):239–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(18)30765-4
- Reiss KA, Mick R, Teitelbaum U, O'Hara M, Schneider C, Massa R, et al. Niraparib plus nivolumab or niraparib plus ipilimumab in patients with platinum-sensitive advanced pancreatic cancer: a randomised, phase 1b/2 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2022;23(8):1009–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(22) 00369-2
- Sangro B, Gomez-Martin C, de la Mata M, Iñarrairaegui M, Garralda E, Barrera P, et al. A clinical trial of CTLA-4 blockade with tremelimumab in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma and chronic hepatitis C. J Hepatol. 2013;59(1):81–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2013.02.022
- Calabrò L, Morra A, Giannarelli D, Amato G, D'Incecco A, Covre A, et al. Tremelimumab combined with durvalumab in patients with mesothelioma (NIBIT-MESO-1): an open-label, non-randomised, phase 2 study. Lancet Respir Med. 2018;6(6): 451–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2213-2600(18)30151-6
- Yeh ETH, Tong AT, Lenihan DJ, Yusuf SW, Swafford J, Champion C, et al. Cardiovascular complications of cancer therapy: diagnosis, pathogenesis, and management. Circulation. 2004;109(25):3122–31. https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR. 0000133187.74800.B9
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(16)30098-5; Erratum in: Lancet Oncol. 2016;17(7):e270.; Erratum in: Lancet Oncol. 2019;20(2):e70.
- Beer TM, Kwon ED, Drake CG, Fizazi K, Logothetis C, Gravis G, et al. Randomized, double-blind, phase III trial of ipilimumab versus placebo in asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic patients with metastatic chemotherapy-naive castration-resistant prostate cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2017;35(1): 40–7. https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.2016.69.1584
- Boyer M, Şendur MAN, Rodríguez-Abreu D, Park K, Lee DH, Çiçin I, et al. Pembrolizumab plus ipilimumab or placebo for metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer with PD-L1 tumor proportion score ≥50%: randomized, double-blind phase III KEYNOTE-598 study. J Clin Oncol. 2021;39(21):2327–38. https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.20.03579
- 15. Cascone T, William WN, Weissferdt A, Leung CH, Lin HY, Pataer A, et al. Neoadjuvant nivolumab or nivolumab plus

ipilimumab in operable non-small cell lung cancer: the phase 2 randomized NEOSTAR trial. Nature Med. 2021;27(3):504–14. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-01224-2

- Doki Y, Ueno M, Hsu CH, Oh DY, Park K, Yamamoto N, et al. Tolerability and efficacy of durvalumab, either as monotherapy or in combination with tremelimumab, in patients from Asia with advanced biliary tract, esophageal, or head-andneck cancer. Cancer Med. 2022;11(13):2550–60. https://doi. org/10.1002/cam4.4593
- Eggermont AMM, Chiarion-Sileni V, Grob JJ, Dummer R, Wolchok JD, Schmidt H, et al. Prolonged survival in stage III melanoma with ipilimumab adjuvant therapy. N Engl J Med. 2016;375(19):1845–55. https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa1611299
- Goldman JW, Dvorkin M, Chen Y, Reinmuth N, Hotta K, Trukhin D, et al. Durvalumab, with or without tremelimumab, plus platinum-etoposide versus platinum-etoposide alone in first-line treatment of extensive-stage small-cell lung cancer (CASPIAN): updated results from a randomised, controlled, open-label, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2021;22(1): 51–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(20)30539-8
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(18)30700-9
- 20. Kwon ED, Drake CG, Scher HI, Fizazi K, Bossi A, van den Eertwegh AJM, et al. Ipilimumab versus placebo after radiotherapy in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer that had progressed after docetaxel chemotherapy (CA184-043): a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2014;15(7):700–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(14)70189-5
- Maio M, Scherpereel A, Calabrò L, Aerts J, Perez SC, Bearz A, et al. Tremelimumab as second-line or third-line treatment in relapsed malignant mesothelioma (DETERMINE): a multicentre, international, randomised, double-blind, placebocontrolled phase 2b trial. Lancet Oncol. 2017;18(9):1261–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(17)30446-1
- 22. Paz-Ares L, Chen Y, Reinmuth N, Hotta K, Trukhin D, Statsenko G, et al. Durvalumab, with or without tremelimumab, plus platinum-etoposide in first-line treatment of extensive-stage small-cell lung cancer: 3-year overall survival update from CASPIAN. ESMO Open. 2022;7(2):100408. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esmoop.2022.100408
- Planchard D, Reinmuth N, Orlov S, Fischer JR, Sugawara S, Mandziuk S, et al. ARCTIC: durvalumab with or without tremelimumab as third-line or later treatment of metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer. Ann Oncol. 2020;31(5):609–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2020.02.006
- 24. Powles T, van der Heijden MS, Castellano D, Galsky MD, Loriot Y, Petrylak DP, et al. Durvalumab alone and durvalumab plus tremelimumab versus chemotherapy in previously untreated patients with unresectable, locally advanced or metastatic urothelial carcinoma (DANUBE): a randomised, open-label, multicentre, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2020;21(12): 1574–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(20)30541-6
- 25. Ribas A, Kefford R, Marshall MA, Punt CJA, Haanen JB, Marmol M, et al. Phase III randomized clinical trial comparing

tremelimumab with standard-of-care chemotherapy in patients with advanced melanoma. J Clin Oncol. 2013;31(5):616–22. https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.2012.44.6112

- Shitara K, Ajani JA, Moehler M, Garrido M, Gallardo C, Shen L, et al. Nivolumab plus chemotherapy or ipilimumab in gastro-oesophageal cancer. Nature. 2022;603(7903):942–8. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04508-4
- Tarhini AA, Lee SJ, Hodi FS, Rao UNM, Cohen GI, Hamid O, et al. Phase III study of adjuvant ipilimumab (3 or 10 mg/kg) versus high-dose interferon Alfa-2b for resected high-risk melanoma: north American intergroup E1609. J Clin Oncol. 2020;38(6):567–75. https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.19.01381
- Zamarin D, Hamid O, Nayak-Kapoor A, Sahebjam S, Sznol M, Collaku A, et al. Mogamulizumab in combination with durvalumab or tremelimumab in patients with advanced solid tumors: a phase I study. Clin Cancer Res. 2020;26(17):4531– 41. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.ccr-20-0328
- 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. The Lancet. 2020;395(10236):1558–68. https:// doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30417-7
- Lipson EJ, Drake CG. Ipilimumab: an anti-CTLA-4 antibody for metastatic melanoma. Clin Cancer Res. 2011;17(22):6958–62. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.ccr-11-1595
- Martins F, Sofiya L, Sykiotis GP, Lamine F, Maillard M, Fraga M, et al. Adverse effects of immune-checkpoint inhibitors: epidemiology, management and surveillance. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2019;16(9):563–80. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41571-019-0218-0
- Rubio-Infante N, Ramírez-Flores YA, Castillo EC, Lozano O, García-Rivas G, Torre-Amione G. Cardiotoxicity associated with immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy: a meta-analysis. Eur J Heart Fail. 2021;23(10):1739–47. https://doi.org/10.1002/ ejhf.2289
- Xavier CB, Lopes CDH, Harada G, Peres EDB, Katz A, Jardim DL. Cardiovascular toxicity following immune checkpoint inhibitors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Transl Oncol. 2022;19:101383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranon.2022. 101383
- Bertrand A, Kostine M, Barnetche T, Truchetet ME, Schaeverbeke T. Immune related adverse events associated with anti-CTLA-4 antibodies: systematic review and metaanalysis. BMC Med. 2015;13:211. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12916-015-0455-8
- Maker AV, Yang JC, Sherry RM, Topalian SL, Kammula US, Royal RE, et al. Intrapatient dose escalation of anti-CTLA-4 antibody in patients with metastatic melanoma. J Immunother. 2006;29(4):455–63. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.cji.0000208259. 73167.58
- 36. Downey SG, Klapper JA, Smith FO, Yang JC, Sherry RM, Royal RE, et al. Prognostic factors related to clinical response in patients with metastatic melanoma treated by CTLassociated antigen-4 blockade. Clin Cancer Res. 2007;13(22 Pt 1):6681–8. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.ccr-07-0187
- 37. Attia P, Phan GQ, Maker AV, Robinson MR, Quezado MM, Yang JC, et al. Autoimmunity correlates with tumor regression in patients with metastatic melanoma treated with anti-cytotoxic

### f 16 CANC

T-lymphocyte antigen-4. J Clin Oncol. 2005;23(25):6043-53. https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.2005.06.205

- Salem JE, Allenbach Y, Vozy A, Brechot N, Johnson DB, Moslehi JJ, et al. Abatacept for severe immune checkpoint inhibitor-associated myocarditis. N Engl J Med. 2019;380(24): 2377–9. https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmc1901677
- Arangalage D, Degrauwe N, Michielin O, Monney P, Özdemir BC. Pathophysiology, diagnosis and management of cardiac toxicity induced by immune checkpoint inhibitors and BRAF and MEK inhibitors. Cancer Treat Rev. 2021;100:102282. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctrv.2021.102282
- Varricchi G, Galdiero MR, Tocchetti CG. Cardiac toxicity of immune checkpoint inhibitors: cardio-oncology meets immunology. Circulation. 2017;136(21):1989–92. https://doi.org/10. 1161/circulationaha.117.029626
- Okazaki T, Tanaka Y, Nishio R, Mitsuiye T, Mizoguchi A, Wang J, et al. Autoantibodies against cardiac troponin I are responsible for dilated cardiomyopathy in PD-1-deficient mice. Nature Med. 2003;9(12):1477–83. https://doi.org/10.1038/nm955
- Patel RP, Parikh R, Gunturu KS, Tariq RZ, Dani SS, Ganatra S, et al. Cardiotoxicity of immune checkpoint inhibitors. Curr Oncol Rep. 2021;23(7):79. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11912-021-01070-6
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa1504030
- Motzer RJ, Tannir NM, McDermott DF, Arén Frontera O, Melichar B, Choueiri TK, et al. Nivolumab plus ipilimumab versus sunitinib in advanced renal-cell carcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(14):1277–90. https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa1712126

- 45. Overman MJ, McDermott R, Leach JL, Lonardi S, Lenz HJ, Morse MA, et al. Nivolumab in patients with metastatic DNA mismatch repair-deficient or microsatellite instability-high colorectal cancer (CheckMate 142): an open-label, multicentre, phase 2 study. Lancet Oncol. 2017;18(9):1182–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(17)30422-9; Erratum in: Lancet Oncol. 2017;18(9):e510.
- 46. Xu C, Chen YP, Du XJ, Liu JQ, Huang CL, Chen L, et al. Comparative safety of immune checkpoint inhibitors in cancer: systematic review and network meta-analysis. BMJ. 2018;363:k4226. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.k4226
- Liu S, Gao W, Ning Y, Zou X, Zhang W, Zeng L, et al. Cardiovascular toxicity with PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors in cancer patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Front Immunol. 2022;13:908173. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2022.908173
- Rahouma M, Karim NA, Baudo M, Yahia M, Kamel M, Eldessouki I, et al. Cardiotoxicity with immune system targeting drugs: a meta-analysis of anti-PD/PD-L1 immunotherapy randomized clinical trials. Immunotherapy. 2019;11(8):725–35. https://doi.org/10.2217/imt-2018-0118

**How to cite this article:** Liu H, Fu L, Jin S, Ye X, Chen Y, Pu S, et al. Cardiovascular toxicity with CTLA-4 inhibitors in cancer patients: a metaanalysis. Cancer Innov. 2024;3:e116. https://doi.org/10.1002/cai2.116