MELANOMA IMMUNOTHERAPY SF – RESEARCH PAPER

Taylor & Francis

OPEN ACCESS Check for updates

Immune checkpoint inhibitors in adjuvant setting after radical resection of melanoma: a meta-analysis of the pivotal trials

Melissa Bersanelli (1)^{a,b}, Fausto Petrelli^c, Sebastiano Buti (1)^b, and Ignazio Stanganelli^{a,d}

^aMedicine and Surgery Department, University of Parma, Parma, Italy; ^bMedical Oncology Unit, University Hospital of Parma, Parma, Italy; ^cOncology Unit, ASST Bergamo Ovest, Treviglio, Italy; ^dSkin Cancer Unit, Istituto Scientifico Romagnolo per lo Studio e la Cura dei Tumori (IRST) IRCCS, Meldola, Italy

ABSTRACT

Beyond the overall relapse-free survival (RFS) advantage demonstrated in randomized trials (RCT) of adjuvant anti-PD-1 immunotherapy in radically resected stage III–IV melanoma, key issues about subgroups of interest have been raised in recent years, with non-conclusive results when considering single studies. In the present meta analysis, we pooled all RCT data in this setting, analyzing, overall, 3043 patients. The RFS benefit of adjuvant immunotherapy over the comparator (placebo or anti-CTLA-4) was strongly confirmed in the pooled analysis, and it was statistically significant in most subgroups, excluding patients with stage IIIA and stage IV M1c melanoma. Nevertheless, the relative benefit was not statistically significantly different when considering their IIIB-IIIC and M1a-M1b counterparts. Future trials in this setting should consider subgroups of interest for tailoring the adjuvant strategy in terms of duration and drug combination in light of literature data.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 30 December 2020 Revised 13 February 2021 Accepted 7 March 2021

KEYWORDS

Melanoma; immune checkpoint inhibitors; anti-PD-1; immunotherapy; adjuvant; perioperative; ICI; nivolumab; pembrolizumab; ipilimumab

Introduction

A few years ago, the therapeutic path of patients undergoing resection of infiltrating melanoma was concluded with complete lymph node dissection (CLND) in cases with metastatic sentinel lymph node.^{1,2} Only a limited subgroup of patients were candidates to adjuvant therapy with high- or low-dose interferon- α , being the only available systemic intervention to prevent the distant relapse in this disease.^{3–6} In both cases, the outcome in terms of overall survival (OS) was not improved in the majority of studies, and the benefit in terms of relapse-free survival (RFS) was not consistent across several prospective trials, leading to the current negative recommendation of guidelines in the case of CLND and the frequent abandonment of the adjuvant strategy with interferon- α .⁷

In 2015, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved the anti-CTLA-4 ipilimumab as adjuvant therapy for stage III melanoma patients. The approval was granted based on the first pivotal trial in this setting, demonstrating the advantage of ipilimumab over placebo in obtaining longer RFS, higher rates of OS, and distant metastasis-free survival (DMFS) than placebo after surgery.⁸ Since then, two anti-PD-1 immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICI) have been tested versus placebo or ipilimumab itself, to reduce the risk of recurrence following radical resection of melanoma, in certain cases also including metastatic patients with stage IV disease, rendered disease-free with radical surgery.^{9–11} To date, the approved ICI drugs in this setting include nivolumab and pembrolizumab, becoming the new standard of therapy, even in the lack of adequate follow-up.

Moreover, definite OS results are still missing, suggesting the likely comparable survival gain for the anti-CTLA-4 and the anti-PD-1 strategy, but with a toxicity profile favoring the latter.^{9,12-14}

Beyond the clear overall advantage demonstrated in each trial, key issues about subgroups of interest have been raised in recent years, especially in sight of the radical update of the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) staging system for this disease, from the 7th version to the 8th, partially reclassifying the stages included in the adjuvant trials.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ One of the crucial issues is the inclusion of the current IIIA stages in the adjuvant immunotherapy indication; another is the inclusion of patients with microsatellite only (without nodal involvement); another one is the effectiveness of adjuvant ICI in patients with BRAF-mutated melanoma. In a single trial, the subgroup analyses could underestimate the advantages of experimental therapies due to the limited sample size of the subgroup of interest and the wide margins of uncertainty demonstrated by the confidence intervals.

In this review, we selected all randomized controlled clinical trials investigating the use of ICI immunotherapy in the adjuvant setting for patients with melanoma after surgical radicalization, performing a meta analysis with RFS as the primary endpoint, to offer more robust evidence on the adjuvant indication. Moreover, we performed subgroup meta analysis to improve the statistical power for subgroups of interest, to support with empowered evidence the use of adjuvant immunotherapy in special populations.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

CONTACT Melissa Bersanelli 🔯 melissa.bersanelli@unipr.it 🗈 Medical Oncology Unit, University Hospital of Parma, Via Gramsci 14, Parma 43126, Italy.

^{© 2021} The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

Methods

Search strategy and inclusion criteria

We followed PRISMA guidelines for this systematic review and meta-analysis. We searched PubMed for randomized controlled trials published in English language from each database's inception to November 21, 2020. Two investigators (FP and MB) independently searched the databases. The search terms were "adjuvant" AND "melanoma" AND "immune checkpoint inhibitor" OR "anti-PD-1". We also reviewed the references of the included article for any further potential publication. Eligible studies had to be: (1) randomized trials assessing ICI alone or in combination for the adjuvant treatment of patients with any stage melanoma and (2) had to have available or calculable hazard ratios (HRs) for relapse according to patients' clinical subgroups (where RFS was compared between treated vs not treated with immunotherapy in any subgroups). We excluded non-randomized trials, non-cutaneous melanoma, and trials having other drugs as experimental arms. Two investigators (FP and MB) independently reviewed the retrieved articles to select the relevant articles, and any disagreement was resolved with the consensus of a third investigator (SB). Three reviewers (MB, SB, and FP) independently extracted data from the studies, and all discrepancies were resolved by consensus with all investigators.

Data extraction and quality assessment

From each study, SB and FP extracted the first author and year of publication, study phase, type of malignancy, number of patients, age, sex, stages, ulceration/nodal status, median follow-up, study arms, HR for RFS according to patients' characteristics (when available). We included the most updated report of any trials when duplicate publications were identified.

Statistical analysis

The primary endpoint was the difference in patients' outcome to ICI between different subgroups measured in terms of HR for RFS reported for these subgroups. Depending on available data, we applied subgroup analysis by stage (IIIA, IIIB-C, or IV), nodal status (N0 or N+), age (0-64 vs 65+ years), sex, presence of ulceration, BRAF status, PD-L1 expression. We extracted the HRs for relapse in the intervention group and control group and their 95% CIs from each study, separately for the different subgroups. We calculated the pooled HRs of RFS using the random-effects models. We assessed the heterogeneity between the two estimates using an interaction test to give P for heterogeneity. We did the Q-test to assess betweenstudy heterogeneity and calculated the I2 statistic, which expresses the percentage of the total observed variability due to study heterogeneity. The null hypothesis was that the interaction between the covariates and immunotherapy efficacy is equal across subgroups and was tested with a χ^2 test. All reported P values are two-sided. The analyses were performed with Review Manager (RevMan) Version 5.3 (Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Center, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014).

Results

After selecting the pertinent publications, a total of n = 4 randomized studies were aggregated in the quantitative analysis according to the inclusion criteria (Figure 1). Overall, n = 3043 patients were analyzed. Among the included studies (Table 1), three were Phase III randomized trials, 12-14 and one was a Phase II randomized study.¹¹ One of the studies¹¹ was considered separately for nivolumab plus ipilimumab vs placebo and nivolumab vs placebo, respectively. Three had the placebo as the comparator in the control arm; only one¹³ had the anti-CTLA-4 ipilimumab as the control treatment.

Overall, the pooled analysis showed a significant RFS benefit for adjuvant ICI against the control arms, with a hazard ratio (HR) of 0.60 [95% confidence interval (CI) 0.48–0.75]; p < .0001 (Figure 2). The heterogeneity of the included studies was significant (P = .004, $I^2 = .74\%$).

According to subgroup meta analysis, a statistically significant RFS benefit from ICI adjuvant therapy was confirmed across subgroups (Figure 3) considering sex (male *vs* female), age (elderly *vs* younger, cutoff 65 years), BRAF mutational status (BRAF mutated *vs* wild-type), PD-L1 expression (negative *vs* positive, where available; different cutoff at 1% or 5%), ulceration (present *vs* absent). None of the tests evidenced a significant difference among these subgroups, demonstrating that the interaction between the covariates and immunotherapy efficacy was equal across subgroups of interest.

Two subgroups did not reach statistically significant RFS benefit from adjuvant ICI immunotherapy: those of patients with stage IIIA melanoma according to the AJCC 7th ed., ⁹ (HR 0.74 [95% CI 0.47–1.17], p = .20; Figure 3f) and with stage IV disease M1c (HR 0.58 [95% CI 0.23–1.51], p = .27; Figure 3g). Nevertheless, the test for subgroup difference was not statistically significant in both cases.

Discussion

This meta-analysis confirmed a significantly improved RFS in patients with radically resected stage IIIA or worse melanoma treated with ICI compared with placebo/comparator. The overall estimate (HR = 0.60) strengthens the encouraging results of the individual trials.^{8–14} Moreover, the significant efficacy of ICI was confirmed in sub-analysis with relevant effects among both women and men, young and elderly patients, in wild type and mutated BRAF types, in positive and negative PD-L1, for ulcerated and not ulcerated melanomas, in stage IIIB-C, and IV (M1a-b).

Regarding stage IIIA, it was available in two of the analyzed studies and with a relatively limited sample size: overall, 175 treated patients vs 163 controls were pooled in the present analysis. The HR point estimate showed a better RFS for ICI (0.74) but the confidence intervals overlapped the unit. Stage III is expected to have a central role in the clinical debate about translating experimental results on ICI efficacy in the real-world. In fact, all the four analyzed trials included patients according to the 7th version of the AJCC staging system. Unfortunately, the current (8th) AJCC version has a variable agreement with the previous



Figure 1. Flow diagram of the study selection process for the qualitative and quantitative analysis.

one.^{15,18} An extremely poor agreement has been documented in real-world populations for stage III (K = 8.1%), due to the shift of former IIIB into IIIA.¹⁸ The majority of studies' recurrent pitfall in this setting is the patient selection based on AJCC 7th edition; moreover, the 8th update was based on data gathered when checkpoint inhibitors were not used as adjuvant therapy in stage III melanoma. Of note, recent evidence demonstrated that AJCC-8 staging had a robust prognostic importance for RFS but no predictive importance toward adjuvant immunotherapy.¹⁹ Studies involving greater sample sizes are needed to fully understand the real efficacy of ICI in patients with stage IIIA melanoma.

Also, in patients with stage IV M1c melanoma, 56 treated cases and 37 controls were available across three trials, with an extremely limited sample: consequently, even in the pooled analysis, the results for this subgroup are not conclusive. On the other hand, at least one of the RCT included had negative results for this subgroup¹³ and, moreover, the lack of benefit in the meta analysis could be due to the early discontinuation of ICI treatment after 1 year, as provided by the majority of RCT, probably not enough for such high-risk patients.

The pooled analysis's usefulness to confirm significant RFS benefit, despite single-trial data not reaching statistically significant subgroup results, emerged for the subgroups of elderly and patients with PD-L1-negative tumors. Previously, at least two of the four trials considered reported non-statistically significant RFS benefit for adjuvant ICI in these subgroups of interest.^{11,12,14} Our results finally confirm statistically significant and clinically meaningful benefit (absolute decrease of relapse of 28% and 50%, respectively) for the elderly and patients with PD-L1negative melanoma.

Despite the unreliability of a comparative analysis regarding the safety of different adjuvant ICI regimens, indirect comparison of literature data about immune-related adverse events (irAEs) in these RCTs allows considering anti-PD-1 monotherapy as the best option in terms of tolerability (both over combinations and over single-agent anti-CTLA-4). On the other hand, the statistical strength of the results obtained in each of the analyzed subgroups with the combination of ipilimumab and nivolumab, in a single trial, with a huge improvement of RFS across all patients when compared to placebo, is undoubtedly attractive even in the face of greater toxicity.¹¹

Finally, considering the possibility of different adjuvant treatment choices for patients with BRAF-mutated melanoma, ²⁰ the present meta-analysis provides evidence that the expected magnitude of benefit from ICI adjuvant therapy is maintained in this population. The strength of each single-trial subgroup is overcome with 963 patients BRAF-

Table 1. Studies included in the present review and meta analysis.

	CheckMate-238	EORTC-18071	KEYNOTE-054	IMMUNED	
Study	Ascierto 2020	Eggermont 2019	Eggermont 2020	Zimmer 2020	
Phase			III		
Arms	Nivolumab <i>vs</i> Ipilimumab	Ipilimumab vs Placebo	Pembrolizumab vs Placebo	Nivolumab + Ipilimumab vs Nivolumab vs Placebo	
Primary endpoint	Recurrence-free survival	Recurrence-free survival	Recurrence-free survival in the overall population and in PD-L1- positive tumors	Recurrence-free survival	
Treatment duration	1 year	3 years	1 year	1 year	
Total patients enrolled	906 (453 vs 453)	951 (475 vs 476)	1019 (514 vs 505)	167 (56 vs 59 vs 22)	
Median follow-up (months)	51.1 vs 50.9	63.6	36.6	28.4	
Included stages	IIIB-C, IV	III	III	IV	
AJCC version	VII	VII	VII	VII	
Sex					
- Male	258 vs 269	296 vs 293	324 vs 304	31 vs 31 vs 33	
- Female	195 vs 184	179 <i>v</i> s 183	190 vs 201	25 vs 18 vs 19	
Age	(cutoff 65 years)	(cutoff 65 years)	(cutoff 65 years)	(cutoff 65 years)	
- Younger	333 vs 339	394 vs 389	389 vs 379	45 vs 43 vs 35	
- Elderly	120 vs 114	81 <i>v</i> s 87	125 vs 126	11 vs 16 vs 17	
BRAF		not available			
- Mutation	187 vs 194		245 vs 262	27 vs 27 vs 21	
- Wild type	197 vs 212		233 vs 214	29 vs 32 vs 31	
- Not reported	69 vs 47		36 vs 29	0	
PD-L1	(cutoff 5%)	not available	(cutoff 1%)	(cutoff 5%)	
- Positive	153 vs 154		428 vs 425	28 vs 28 vs 25	
- Negative	300 vs 299		59 vs 57	28 vs 31 vs 27	
- Unknown	0		36 vs 29	0	
Ulceration				Not available	
- Present	145 vs 133	197 vs 203	208 vs 197		
- Absent	187 vs 199	257 vs 244	230 vs 251		
 Not reported 	38 vs 34		76 vs 57		
Stage					
- IIIA	0	98 vs 88	77 vs 75	0	
- IIIB-C	368 vs 366	377 vs 388	437 vs 430	0	
- IV	82 vs 87*	0	0	56 vs 59 vs 52	
M stage					
- M1a-b	62 vs 66	0	0	38 vs 41 vs 36	
- M1c	20 vs 21	0	0	18 vs 18 vs 16 ⁺	

*1 case not reported.

+Including history of brain metastases in 22 patients.





mutated melanoma included in our analysis (see Table 1), confirming the efficacy of the immunotherapeutic strategy in this setting and offering the opportunity of basing the adjuvant treatment choice on the toxicity profile according to the patient comorbidities

The limitations of the current study are represented by the following: significant heterogeneity among RCT included, with various comparator arms (placebo or anti-CTLA-4 active therapy) and different inclusion criteria (i.e., stage III only or stage IV included); relatively limited sample size for specific subgroups; outdated AJCC version used for the trial inclusion criteria; relatively small numerosity of RCT published in this setting for melanoma patients.

Conclusion

The benefit of ICI-based adjuvant immunotherapy for radically resected melanoma patients was confirmed in this pooled analysis of all randomized trials in this setting, with no significant differences across subgroups. The prolongation of therapy over 1 year could represent the possible evolution of the adjuvant approach in future trials for radically resected stage IV melanoma, and the selection of high-risk patients suitable to be candidates to anti-PD -1/anti-CTLA-4 combinations instead of a monotherapy. Eventually, an unsolved issue in the field of adjuvant immunotherapy in melanoma is represented by the lack of data about patients who did not undergo radical lymph

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	V, Random, 95% CI	Year		IV, Random, 95% CI
1.2.1 male Eggermont 2019	-0.2744	0.1379	18.1%	0.76 (0.58, 1.00)	2019		+
Zimmer NIVO + IPI 2020 Zimmer NIVO + 2020	-0.3011 -1.1712 -0.2614	0.1156 0.3704 0.2855	19.6% 7.2% 10.1%	0.74 [0.59, 0.93] 0.31 [0.15, 0.64] 0.77 [0.44, 1.35]	2020 2020 2020		
Eggermont 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^e = 0.03; Test for overall effect: Z = 2	0 Chi ^a = 5.44, df = 3 (.91 (P = 0.004)	0 (P = 0.14)	55.0% (I*= 45%	Not estimable 0.69 [0.54, 0.89]	2020		•
1.2.2 female Eggermont 2019	-0.2744	0.1744	15.8%	0.76 [0.54, 1.07]	2019		-
Ascierto 2020 Zimmer NIVO + IPI 2020	-0.3711	0.1443	17.7%	0.89 [0.52, 0.92] 0.14 [0.05, 0.39]	2020	_	
Eggermont 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.16;	-0.9943 0 Chi ^a = 11.84, df = 3	0.3676 0 (P = 0.00	7.3% 45.0% 38); I² = 75°	0.37 (0.18, 0.76) Not estimable 0.50 [0.31, 0.81]	2020		•
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.06;	, chi ² = 18.07, df = 7	(P = 0.01	100.0% I); I ^z = 61%	0.62 [0.49, 0.78]		0.05	•
Test for overall effect: Z = 4 Test for subgroup difference	.07 (P < 0.0001) :es: Chi ^a = 1.32, df =	1 (P = 0.	25), I² = 24	.2%			Favours adj ICI Favours [control]
Study or Subgroup 1.3.1 elderly	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Year		Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
Eggermont 2019 Eggermont 2020	-0.2231	0.2501	12.9%	0.80 [0.49, 1.31] Not estimable	2019		-+
Zimmer NIVO + IPI 2020 Zimmer NIVO 2020	-0.3285 -1.3471 -0.2485	0.1759 0.6695 0.4089	3.3% 7.3%	0.72 [0.51, 1.02] 0.26 [0.07, 0.97] 0.78 [0.35, 1.74]	2020 2020 2020	-	
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^x = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 2	Chi# = 2.53, df = 3 (48 (P = 0.01)	(P = 0.47)	40.4% c I* = 0%	0.72 [0.55, 0.93]			•
1.3.2 younger Eggermont 2019 Zimmer NIVO + IPI 2020	-0.2744 -1.5606	0.165 0.3299	17.5% 9.6%	0.76 [0.55, 1.05] 0.21 [0.11, 0.40]	2019 2020		
Zimmer NIVO 2020 Eggermont 2020 Assists 2020	-0.734	0.275	11.8%	0.48 [0.28, 0.82] Not estimable	2020 2020 2020		
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.14; Test for overall effect: Z = 2	-0.3285 ; Chi# = 14.70, df = 3 .91 (P = 0.004)	0.1103 (P = 0.00	59.6% 59.6% 32); I ^a = 80*	0.72 [0.58, 0.89] 0.53 [0.34, 0.81] %	2020		•
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^e = 0.07; Test for overall effect: 7 = 3	Chi*= 17.65, df= 7 80 (P = 0.0001)	(P = 0.01	100.0% 1); l*= 60%	0.61 [0.47, 0.79]		0.05	
Test for subgroup difference	es: Chi ² = 1.43, df =	1 (P = 0.	23), I ^a = 30	.1%			Favours adj ICI Favours [control]
Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 BRAFmut Eggermont 2019	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Not petimonia	Year		N, Random, 95% Cl
Zimmer NIVO + IPI 2020 Zimmer NIVO 2020	0 -2.6593 -0.9416	0.6392 0.3669	3.6% 8.4%	0.07 [0.02, 0.25] 0.39 [0.19, 0.80]	2019 2020 2020	_	
Eggermont 2020 Ascierto 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau [#] = 0.26; Test for overall affect 7	-0.6539 -0.2357 Chi*= 17.19, df= 3	0.1736 0.1404 (P = 0.00	16.5% 18.3% 46.8% 006); I*= 83	0.52 [0.37, 0.73] 0.79 [0.60, 1.04] 0.42 [0.23, 0.77]	2020		+ ◆
1.4.2 BRAFwt Eggermont 2019		0		Not estimable	2019		
Zimmer NIVO + IPI 2020 Zimmer NIVO 2020	-0.821 -0.3425	0.3537	8.7%	0.44 [0.22, 0.88] 0.71 [0.39, 1.29]	2020		
Ascierto 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau [#] = 0.00;	-0.4463 -0.3711 Chi# = 1.50, df = 3 (0.1912 0.1346 (P = 0.68)	18.6% 53.2%	0.69 [0.44, 0.93] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.65 [0.54, 0.80]	2020		•
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tours = 0.00	.∠r (P < 0.0001) Chi [#] = 18 99 dr- 7	(P = 0.00	100.0%	0.56 [0.43, 0.73]		+	•
Test for overall effect: Z = 4 Test for subgroup difference	.30 (P < 0.0001) es: Chi ² = 1.86, df =	. = 0.00 1 (P = 0.	,, i = 03' 17), I² = 46	.2%		0.02	0.1 1 10 Favours adj ICI Favours [control]
Study or Subgroup 1.5.1 PDL1+	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight P	Hazard Ratio V, Random, 95% CI	Year		Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
Eggermont 2019 Eggermont 2020 Ascierto 2020	-0.5621	0.1438	19.6%	Not estimable 0.57 [0.43, 0.76] 0.67 ID 47 0.00	2019 2020 2020		
Zimmer NIVO + IPI 2020 Zimmer NIVO 2020	-0.4005 -1.4271 -0.5621	0.1809 0.4467 0.3448	6.2% 8.9%	0.07 [0.47, 0.96] 0.24 [0.10, 0.58] 0.57 [0.29, 1.12]	2020 2020 2020	-	
subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^e = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 4.	Chi#= 4.54, df= 3 (1 08 (P < 0.0001)	P = 0.21);	51.8% I*= 34%	0.56 [0.42, 0.74]			•
1.5.2 PUL1-							1
Zimmer NIVO + IPI 2020	-1.5606	0.3785	7.8%	Not estimable 0.21 [0.10, 0.44]	2019 2020	_	
Zimmer NIVO + IPI 2020 Zimmer NIVO 2020 Eggermont 2020 Ascierto 2020 Subtotal (95% CI)	0 -1.5606 -0.5978 -0.6162 -0.3011	0 0.3785 0.3093 0.3537 0.1156	7.8% 10.2% 8.6% 21.5% 48.2%	Not estimable 0.21 [0.10, 0.44] 0.55 [0.30, 1.01] 0.54 [0.27, 1.08] 0.74 [0.59, 0.93] 0.50 [0.30, 0.83]	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	_	→ →
Eggenholic 2019 Zimmer NIVO 1 IPI 2020 Zimmer NIVO 2020 Eggermont 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.18; Test for overall effect Z = 2.	0 -1.5606 -0.5978 -0.6162 -0.3011 Chi# = 10.72, df = 3 70 (P = 0.007)	0 0.3785 0.3093 0.3537 0.1156 (P = 0.01	7.8% 10.2% 8.6% 21.5% 48.2%); P = 72%	Not estimable 0.21 [0.10, 0.44] 0.55 [0.30, 1.01] 0.54 [0.27, 1.08] 0.74 [0.59, 0.93] 0.50 [0.30, 0.83]	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020	-	
Eggermola 2019 Zimmer NIVO 2020 Eggermola 2020 Ascieto 2020 Subtotal (65% C) Heterogeneity: Tau'e 0.16; Test for overall effect: Z = 2. Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau'e 0.06; Test for overall effect: Z = 4. Test for overall effect: Z = 4.	0 -1.5606 -0.5978 -0.6162 -0.3011 : Chi# = 10.72, df = 3 .70 (P = 0.007) : Chi# = 15.85, df = 7 .88 (P < 0.0001) es: Chi# = 0.14, df =	0 0.3785 0.3093 0.3537 0.1156 (P = 0.01 (P = 0.03 1 (P = 0.3	7.8% 10.2% 8.6% 21.5% 48.2%); P = 72% 100.0% 0; P = 56% 70), P = 0%	Not estimable 0.21 [0.10, 0.44] 0.55 [0.30, 1.01] 0.54 [0.27, 1.08] 0.74 [0.59, 0.93] 0.50 [0.30, 0.83] 0.50 [0.30, 0.83]	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020		0 ¹ /2 0.6 1 2 6 10 Favours adj ICI Favours (control)
Egyamon 2013 Zimmer NAVO 2020 Zimmer NAVO 2020 Asciento 2020 Subtotal (35-V 2020 Subtotal (35-V 2020 Haterogrambr, Tau* = 0.16; Test for overail effect Z = 1. Total (95% CI) Haterogrambr, Tau* = 0.06; Test for overail effect Z = 4. Test for subarous difference Study or Subarous	0 -1.5606 -0.5978 -0.6162 -0.3011 Chi [#] = 10.72, df = 3 70 (P = 0.007) Chi [#] = 15.85, df = 7 88 (P < 0.0001) Chi [#] = 15.85, df = 7 88 (P < 0.0001)	0 0.3785 0.3093 0.3537 0.1156 (P = 0.01 (P = 0.03 1 (P = 0.3 cc	7.8% 10.2% 8.6% 21.5% 21.5% 100.0%); I*= 72% 100.0%); I*= 56% 70), I*= 0%	Not estimable 0.21 (0.10, 0.44) 0.55 (0.30, 1.01) 0.54 (0.27, 1.08) 0.74 (0.59, 0.93) 0.50 (0.30, 0.83) 0.54 (0.42, 0.69) Hazard Ratio V, Random 0.65 (2)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	0.2 0.5 1.2 5 10 Favours ad ICI Favours (control) Nazard Ratio
Egymmer NAV + 9P 2020 Zimmer NAV + 9P 2020 Zimmer NAV + 9020 Sabtoal (85% CI) Heterogeneitr, Tauf = 0.18; Test for overall effect Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneitr, Tauf = 0.08; Test for overall effect Z = 4 Test for overall effect Z = 4 Test for subgroup 1.6.1 subgroup 1.6.1 subgroup 1.6.1 subgroup	0 -1.5806 -0.5878 -0.61578 -0.6154 -0.3011 Chi [#] = 10.72, df = 3 70 (P = 0.007) Chi [#] = 15.85, df = 7 88 (P < 0.00001) es: Chi [#] = 0.14, df = <u>log[Hazard Ratio]</u> -0.4308	0 0.3785 0.3093 0.3537 0.1156 (P = 0.01 (P = 0.03 1 (P = 0.3 1 (P = 0.3 5E 0.1547	7.8% 10.2% 8.6% 21.5% 48.2% 100.0% 0; P = 72% 100.0% 0; P = 56% 70), P = 0% Weight 1 24.3%	Not estimable 0.21 (0.10, 0.44) 0.55 (0.30, 101) 0.54 (0.27, 1.06) 0.74 (0.59, 0.93) 0.50 (0.30, 0.83) 0.54 (0.42, 0.69) Hazard Ratio V, Random, 95% CI	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	hazard Ratio P. Kandom, 595 CI
Zimmer NNO + IPI 2020 Eggermont 2020 Eggermont 2020 Subtotal (65% CI) Heterogeneity Tau* = 0.16, Test for overall effect Z = 4. Test for overall effect Z = 4. Test for subgroup 1.6.1 ulcertation Eggermont 2019 Eggermont 2019 Eggermont 2019	0 -1.5806 -0.5878 -0.6162 -0.3011 Chi# = 10.72, df = 3 70 (P = 0.007) Chi# = 15.85, df = 7 80 (P = 0.0001) es: Chi# = 0.14, df = log[Hazard Ratio] -0.4308 0 -0.2357	0 0.3785 0.3093 0.3537 0.1156 (P = 0.01 (P = 0.03 1 (P = 0.3 5E 0.1547 0 0.1577	7.8% 10.2% 8.8% 21.5% 48.2% 1); P= 72% 100.0% (); P= 56% 70), P= 0% Weight 1 24.3% 23.4%	Not estimable 0.21 (0.10, 0.44) 0.55 (0.30, 1.01) 0.45 (0.30, 1.01) 0.47 (0.55, 0.93) 0.50 (0.30, 0.83) 0.54 (0.42, 0.69) Hazard Ratio V, Random, 95% CI 0.65 (0.40, 0.88) Not estimable 0.79 (0.56, 1.08)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	heard failo
Zammer NVO 2020 Eggermont 2020 Ascietto 2020 Heterograndt Tati' o 10 Heterograndt Tati' o 10 Study or Subgroup Tast for valationus different Study or Subgroup Ascietto 2020 Heterograndt 2020 Ascietto 2020	0 -1.5806 -0.5978 -0.6197 -0.6107 -0.6107 -0.72 df = 0.0007 -0.107 -0.	0 0.3785 0.3093 0.3537 0.1156 (P = 0.01 (P = 0.03 1 (P = 0.3 1 (P = 0.3 5 5 0.1547 0.1577 0 0.1577 0 0.1577	7.8% 10.2% 8.6% 21.5% 48.2% 100.0% 0; P= 56% 70); P= 56% 70); P= 0% Weight 1 24.3% 23.4% 47.7%	Not estimable 0.21 (0.10, 0.44) 0.55 (0.30, 1.01) 0.45 (0.30, 1.02) 0.47 (0.56, 0.93) 0.50 (0.30, 0.63) 0.54 (0.42, 0.69) Hazard Ratio V, Random, 95% CI 0.65 (0.42, 0.69) Not estimable 0.79 (0.58, 1.08) Not estimable 0.72 (0.58, 0.89)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	42 45 5 4 10 Paous salic) Facus (control M. Rando (5% c)
Zammer KWO 2020 Eggermond 2020 Agentem 2020 Agentem 2020 Haterogranuth, Trul ~ 0.0 Haterogranuth, Trul ~ 0.0 Haterogranuth, Trul ~ 0.0 Haterogranuth, Trul ~ 0.0 Test for overall effect 2.4 - 4 Test for subarous all ference Association 2016 Eggermond 2016 Eggermond 2016 Association 2016 Haterogranuth, Trul ~ 0.0 Test for overall effect 2.4 Association 2016 Haterogranuth, Trul ~ 0.0 Haterogranuth, Trul ~ 0.0 Haterogranuth, Trul ~ 0.0	0 -1.5806 -0.5878 -0.5878 -0.5878 -0.5878 -0.5878 -0.3071 -0.472 df -3 70 (P = 0.007) -0.472 df -3 70 (P = 0.0001) es: ChP = 0.14, df = 10g[Hazard Ratio] -0.4308 0 -0.2357 0 Chi ^a = 0.78, df = 1 (0.3 (P = 0.002)	0 0.3785 0.3637 0.1156 (P = 0.01 (P = 0.03 1 (P = 0.3 1 (P = 0.3 5E 0.1547 0 0.1547 0 0.1547 0 0.1547	7.8% 10.2% 8.8% 21.5% 48.2% 100.0%); P= 72% 100.0% 0; P= 56% 70), P= 0% 24.3% 23.4% 47.7% c; P= 0%	Not estimable 0.21 (0.10, 0.44) 0.55 (0.30, 1.01) 0.75 (0.27, 1.05) 0.75 (0.28, 0.05) 0.50 (0.30, 0.83) 0.54 (0.42, 0.69) Hazard Ratio VV, Random, 9% C1 0.55 (0.40, 0.89) VV, Random, 9% C1 0.55 (0.40, 0.89) VV estimable Not estimable 0.72 (0.58, 0.89)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	122 05 2 05 Расон зајСС Расон (сонто) Издано доус с) Издано доус с)
Zmmer MV 2020 Experiment VX 2020 Experiment X2020 Experiment X2020 Experiment X2020 Experiment X2020 Experiment X2020 Heterogramet, Taruf = 0.06, Heterogramet, Taruf = 0.06, Anne MV 2020 Statistical Anne Anne Anne Experiment X2020 Heterogramet, Taruf = 0.00, Tarufic orexel affect 2 = 3 La Konstanti Anne Anne Experiment X2020 Heterogramet, Taruf = 0.00, Tarufic orexel affect 2 = 3 La Konstanti Anne X2020	0 -1.6600 -0.5578 -0.0171 -0.0171 -0.0171 -0.0171 -0.072 -0.077 -0.0077 -0.0077 -0.0408 00 -0.2357 -0.0408 -0.0408 0 -0.0408 0 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.0408 -0.011 -0.012 -0.011 -0.012 -0.011 -0.012 -0.011 -0.012	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	7.8% 10.2% 8.6% 21.5% 48.2% 48.2% 100.0% 0; P=72% 100.0% 0; P=56% 70), P=0% Weight 1 24.3% 47.7% c; P=0% 24.3% 28.0%	Nod estimatic 0.51 (0.10, 0.01, 0.01) 0.51 (0.10, 0.01, 0.01) 0.74 (0.50, 0.03) 0.74 (0.50, 0.03) 0.54 (0.27, 0.63) 0.54 (0.27, 0.63) 0.54 (0.27, 0.65) Not estimatic 0.72 (0.56, 0.49) 0.65 (0.40, 0.05)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	Paous sej CD Faous (control 0 Nicard Ratio N, Ration 99: C)
Zmmer IV-0.202 Eggermond 2020 Eggermond 2020 Statistical (28% C) Hieterogranity, Tayl ² C) 0.4 Hieterogranity, Tayl ² C) 0	0 1.660 0.5975 0.3975 0.3975 0.3975 100° - 0.007 0.07° - 0.007 0.07° - 0.007 0.07° - 0.007 0.02777 0.02777 0.0277	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	7.3% 10.2% 8.6% 21.5% 48.2% 48.2% 48.2% 49.2% 100.0% 7.7 = 56% 24.3% 47.7% (P = 0% 24.3% 23.4% 47.7% 52.3%	Not estimate 0.51 (2) 10.0 (2) (2) 0.51 (2) 10.0 (2) (2) 0.51 (2) 10.0 (2) (2) 0.51 (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	 0.1	рания вари станования у станования и станования в станования в станования с стано С станования с станов С станования с станов
Zmmer HVO 2020 Experiment VA 2020 Experiment VA 2020 Experiment VA 2020 Experiment VA 2020 Experiment Zava Statuta (1984) Constraints (1984) Constraints (1984) Heterogenetic Tava Experiment VA 2020 Experiment VA 2020 Experiment VA 2020 Experiment VA 2020 Heterogenetic Tava Experiment VA 2020 Ammer VA 2020 Ammer VA 2020 Heterogenetic Tava Experiment VA 2020 Ammer VA 2020	- 0.00 - 0.0162 - 0.0172 - 0.0172 - 0.020 - 0.020	0 0 0 03785 0 3093 0 3037 (P = 0.01 (P = 0.03 (P = 0.03 0.1549 0 0.1549 0 0.1	7.3% 10.2% 8.8% 10.2% 21.5% 48.2% 40.2% 40.2% 40.2% 40.0% 40.0% 40.2% 40.0% 40.0% 40.2% 40.0% 40	Not estimate 0.55 (0.30, 1.01) 0.74 (0.10, 0.45) 0.74 (0.10, 0.45) 0.74 (0.25, 0.45) 0.74 (0.25, 0.45) 0.55 (0.30, 0.45) 0.55 (0.30, 0.45) 0.55 (0.40, 0.45) 0.78 (0.45, 0.45) 0.78 (0.45, 0.45) 0.78 (0.55, 1.08) Not estimate 0.79 (0.55, 1.08) 0.85 (0.44, 0.85) 0.85 (0.44, 0.85) 0.85 (0.44, 0.85) 0.85 (0.44, 0.85) 0.85 (0.44, 0.85) 0.78 (0.52, 1.14) Not estimate 0.85 (0.44, 0.85) 0.85 (0.44, 0.85) 0.78 (0.52, 1.54) 0.78 (0.52, 1.54)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	12 0.0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Zmmer IV/0 2020 Experiment V/0 2020 Experiment V/0 2020 Experiment V/0 2020 Experiment Zuro 2020 Experiment Zuro 2020 Hieteropeneht Turu ⁴ = 0.06, Statistic oversite difference Text for subarous difference Experiment Zuro 2020 Experiment Zuro 2020 Experiment Zuro 2020 Experiment Zuro 2020 Statistical 2020 Experiment Zuro 2020 Statistical 2020 Text for consult affect 2 = 3 La 20 ducental affect 2 = 3 Carriert 2020 Zimmer Millor 2020 Statistical 2021 Experiment 2020 Zimmer Millor 2020 Statistical 2021 Zimmer Millor 2020 Zimmer Millor	. 1 50 0.0572 0.0572 0.0572 0.0572 0.0572 0.076 0.0772 0.077 0.077 0.077 0.00001 . Cht ^a = 10.72 0.00001 . Cht ^a = 10.92 0.00001 . Cht ^a = 0.00001 . Cht ^a = 0.00001	0 0 0 0 3785 0 3	7.3% 10.2% 8.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8	Net estimate 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 0.01) 0.55 (0.00, 0.00) 0.55 (0.00, 0.00) 0.55 (0.00, 0.00) Hazard Ratio V, Ration (1.05 (0.00) Not estimate Not estimate	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	Parouts sal ICI Facuus (control)
Zmmer HVO 2020 Eggermont 2020 Eggermont 2020 Statebast (2020) Hieterogramht, Tauf - 0.01 Hieterogramht, Tauf - 0.01 Hieterogramht	-1.00 -0.0000 -0.000 -0.000 -0.000 -0.000 -0.000 -0.000 -0.000 -0.000	0 0.3785 0.3093 0.3937 0.1156 (P = 0.01 1 $(P = 0.333)1$ $(P = 0.333)1$ $(P = 0.33)0.154700.154700.154700.15490.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.15590.155$	7.9%, 10.3%, 8.8%, 21.5%, 48.2%, 11.6%, 11.7%, 11.7%, 11.7%, 12.4.3%, 23.4%, 47.7%, 24.3%, 23.4%, 47.7%, 24.3%, 23.4%, 47.7%, 100.0%,	Not 4 selectuate 0.55 [0.0, 1.01] 0.55 [0.0, 1.01] 0.45 [0.24, 0.05] 0.45 [0.24, 0.05] 0.56 [0.24, 0.05] 0.56 [0.24, 0.05] 0.56 [0.24, 0.05] Nazard Ratio V, Random, 1954 C1 0.57 [0.56, 0.25] 0.56 [0.24, 0.05] Not settimable 0.72 [0.56, 0.26] 0.57 [0.56, 0.26] 0.54 [0.52, 1.14] Not settimable 0.72 [0.56, 0.26] 0.72 [0.56, 0.26]	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	Hazard Rato Frances & B(C) Frances (control)
Zmmer HVO 2020 Eggermont 2020 Eggermont 2020 Statistical (2020) Hieterogramity, Tau" = 0.01 Hieterogramity, Tau Hieterogramity, Tau = 0.01 Hieterogramity, Tau = 0.01 Hietero	- 1 00 - 0.592 - 0.592 - 0.592 - 0.592 - 0.592 - 0.592 - 0.592 - 0.592 - 0.592 - 0.4306 - 0.430	0 0.3785 0.3093 0.3937 0.1156 (P = 0.01 1 (P = 0.11) (P = 0.03) 1 (P = 0.03) 0.1547 0.000 0.01547	7.9% 10.3% 8.6% 21.5% 8.6% 21.5% 48.2% 100.0% 17.7% 7.9 = 0% Weight 1 24.3% 23.4% 47.7% (* = 0% 52.3% (* = 0% 52.3% (* = 0% 10.2%	Not estimate 0.519 10.0.041 0.559 10.00.041 0.559 10.00.041 0.559 10.00.041 0.569 10.00.000 0.569 10.00.042 0.569 10.00.042 0.569 10.00.042 0.569 10.00.059 Not estimate Not e	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020		Hazard Ratio Paoura sejici Favora (control) Hiszard Ratio Michael Structure Favora sejici Favora (control) Hiszard Ratio Michael Structure Favora sejici Favora (control) Hiszard Ratio Michael Structure Michael St
Zmmer MVO 2020 Experiment VAO 2020 Experiment VAO 2020 Experiment VAO 2020 Experiment VAO 2020 Experiment Zao 2020 Heterograneth, Tauf 200 Heterograneth, Tauf 200 Zimmer MVO 200 Heterograneth, Tauf 200 Zimmer MVO	-1.50 -0.572	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	7.9% 10.3% 8.6% 21.5% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 24.3% 47.7% 24.3% 23.4% 47.7% 24.3% 23.4% 47.7% 24.3% 23.4% 47.7% 10.0% 24.3% 28.0% 52.3% 10.2% 4.6% 10.2% 4.6%	Not estimate 0.55 (0.30, 1.01) 0.55 (0.30, 1.01) 0.55 (0.30, 1.01) 0.55 (0.30, 1.01) 0.55 (0.30, 1.01) 0.55 (0.30, 0.85) 0.55 (0.30, 0.85) 0.55 (0.30, 0.85) 0.55 (0.30, 0.85) 0.55 (0.40, 0.05) Not estimate 0.57 (0.55, 0.49) 0.57 (0.55, 0.49) 0.57 (0.55, 0.49) 0.57 (0.55, 0.49) 0.57 (0.55, 0.49) 0.57 (0.55, 0.49) 0.57 (0.55, 0.49) 0.72 (0.55, 0.49) 0.72 (0.55, 0.49) 0.72 (0.52, 0.39) 0.72 (0.52, 0.39)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0 ¹	Parours adjICI Favours (control)
Zammer HVO 2020 Egyermod 2020 Egyermod 2020 Stabilized (BSA: 0) Heterogeneth, Tau ²⁺ 0 (H) Heterogeneth, Tau ²⁺ 0 (H) Egyermod 2019 Egyermod 2019 Egyermod 2020 Zammer HVO - 1P) 2020 Zammer HVO - 2020 Zamm		0 0.3765 0.3085 0.3081 (P = 0.01 (P = 0.01 (P = 0.03) 1 (P = 0.38) 0.1547 0 0.1549 0.0 0.1549 0.1549 0	7.8% 10.2% 8.6% 8.6% 10.6% 10.0% 14.8% 100.0	Not estimate 0.57 (2010) 10.04 (2010) 0.57 (2010) 10.04 (2010) 0.56 (2010) 10.01 (2010) 0.56 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 0.56 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 0.56 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 0.57 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 10.05 (2010) Not estimate 0.57 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 0.77 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 0.77 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 0.77 (2010) 10.05 (2010) 10.	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0	Process sell CI Facous journed Process sell CI Facous journed
Zammer Mol 2020 Experiment Mol 2020 Experiment Alor 2020 Experiment Alor 2020 Experiment Zamo		$0 \\ 0 \\ 0.3785 \\ 0.3093 \\ 0.3537 \\ 0.1156 \\ (P = 0.01 \\ 1 \\ (P = 0.33) \\ 1 \\ (P = 0.33) \\ 1 \\ (P = 0.33) \\ 0 \\ 0.1547 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	7.8% 10.2% 8.8% 21.5% 110.2% 110.2% 140.2% 140.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 14.8% 14.8%	Not estimate 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 0.00) 0.50 (0.00, 0.00) 0.50 (0.00, 0.00) 0.50 (0.00, 0.00) Not estimate 0.57 (0.56, 0.00) 0.57 (0.54, 0.00) 0.57 (0.54, 1.01) Not estimate Not estimate 0.57 (0.54, 1.01) 0.57 (0.54, 1.01)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0,1	Process sql CC Facous journel Nation VP CC Process sql CC Facous journel Nation VP CC Process sql CC Facous journel Process sql CC Facous journel Pro
Zamer HV 0202 Egyermol 2020 Satola (BPS, C) Heteropenet, Tau* = 0.0, Egyermol 2020 Egyermol 2020 Satola (BPS, C) Heteropenet, Tau* = 0.0, Egyermol 2020 Satola (BPS, C) Heteropenet, Tau* = 0.0, Egyermol 2020 Satola (BPS, C) Heteropenet, Tau* = 0.0, Egyermol 2020 Satola (BPS, C) Heteropenet, Tau* = 0.0, Taut 0 const left; Z = 2 Taut 0 const left; Z = 3 Taut 0 const left; Z = 1 Taut 0 const left; Z = 1 Taut 0 const left; Z = 1 Taut 0 const left; Z = 2 Taut 0 const left; Z = 1 Taut 0 const left; Z = 2 Taut 0 const left; Z = 1 Taut 0 const left; Z = 1 Taut 0 const left; Z = 2 Taut 0 const left; Z = 1 Taut 0 const left; Z = 1 Taut 0 const left; Z = 2 Taut 0 const left; Z = 1 Taut 0 const le	- 1 90 - 0.572 - 0.4300 - 0.500 - 0.500 - 0.500 - 0.500 - 0.500 - 0.500 - 0.2277 - 0.500 - 0.500 - 0.500 - 0.500 - 0.2277 - 0.500 -	0 0.03785 0.03085 0.03037 0.1156 ($P = 0.01$ 1 ($P = 0.03$ 1 ($P = 0.03$ 1 ($P = 0.03$) 0.1547 0.1547 0.0.00 0.0.1547 0.0.00 0.0.1547 0.0.00 0.0.1547 0.0.00 0.0.1547 0.0.1547 0.0.00 0.0.1547 0.0.1547 0.0.00 0.0.1547 0.0	7,8% 10,2% 8,8% 21,5% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,0% 10,2% 4,8% 10,0% 10,2% 4,8% 10,2% 4,8% 10,2% 4,8% 10,2% 4,8% 10,2% 4,8% 10,2% 4,8% 10,2% 4,8% 10,2% 4,8% 10,2% 10,2% 4,8% 10,2%10,2% 10,2%	Not estimate 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 0.01) 0.55 (0.00, 0.00) 0.55 (0.00, 0.00)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	Hazard Rato N, Ratedone, Soci Cit Favours acticit Favours (control) M, Ratedone, Soci Cit Favours acticit Rato N, Ratedone, Soci Cit Favours acticit Rato N, Ratedone, Soci Cit Historic Rato Historic Rato
Zammer No. 2020 Eggermond 2020 Egger	- 1.59 - 0.592 - 0.4300 - 0.2307 - 0.2300 - 0.230	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0.785 \\ 0.3085 \\ 0.3037 \\ 0.1556 \\ (P = 0.01 \\ 1 \\ (P = 0.03 \\ 1 \\ (P = 0.03 \\ 1 \\ (P = 0.38) \\ 0.1547 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0.1547 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0.1547 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0.1547 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	7,9%, 10,2%, 8,6%, 6%, 10,2%, 8,6%, 6%, 10,2%, 10,0%, 10,0%, 10,0%, 10,0%, 10,0%, 10,0%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,2%, 10,0%, 1	Not estimate 0.52 (19) 10, 0.42 (0.42) 0.55 (10, 0.01) 0.55 (1	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0.1	Paout adico racon journal Vitando por control Vitando por control Vit
Zammer Mol 2020 Experiment Mol 2020 Experiment Mol 2020 Experiment Xiao	- 1.5 0 - 0.5 0 - 0	$0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\$	7,8%, 10,2%,	Not estimate 0.55 (20, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 1	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0	Paoura saji Ci Favora (control)
Zammer Mol 2020 Experiment Mol 2020 Experiment Xiao		0.0785 0.0395 0.03976 0.03976 0.03976 0.03976 0.03976 0.03976 0.03976 0.03976 0.01577 0.000 0.01577 0.000 0.01515 0.00515 0.01515 0.00515 0.01515 0.00515 0.05	7.8% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.2% 10.0% (); f = 56% 24.3% 23.4% 24.3% 24.3% 24.3% 24.3% 22.4% 24.3% 22.4% 22.4% 22.4% 22.3% 4.7% 52.3% ('F = 0% 10.2% 24.3% 52.3% 4.8% ('F = 0% 10.2% 27.8%	Not estimate 0.52 (19) 10, 0.44 0.55 (20, 0.10) 0.55 (20, 0.10	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0	Hazard Ratio
Zmmer HVO 2020 Experiment HVO 2020 Experiment HVO 2020 Experiment Araffer Araffer Textor oversite Head Araffer Textor oversite Head Araffer Textor oversite Head Araffer Experiment Textor Araffer Experiment Textor Araffer Experiment 2020 Experiment Textor Araffer Experiment Araffer Experiment Araffer Exp	- 1.5 0 - 0.5 0 - 0	0 - 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 +	7.9% 10.2% 10.2% 12.5% 48.2% 10.0% (); F = 75% 40.0% (); F = 75% 40.0% (); F = 75% 40.0% (); F = 75% 40.0% 47.7% 424.3% 427.7% 424.3% 52.3% 40.0% () F = 75% 40.0% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F = 75% () F =	Not estimate 0.571 (0) 10.04 (0) 451 (0) 40 0.551 (0) 10.04 (0) 451 (0	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0 ¹ 0	Paoura saji Ci Favora (control)
Zammer Mol 2019 Zammer Mol 2020 Eggermond 2010 Sobelatal (BSA) C0 Heterogeneth, Tau ² C0 Tautor correal effect 2 - 2 Tautor correal effect 2 - 2 Tautor correal effect 2 - 2 Heterogeneth, Tau ² C0 Heterogeneth, Tau ² C0 Heterogeneth, Tau ² C0 Tautor correal effect 2 - 2 Tautor correal effect 2 - 2 Heterogeneth, Tau ² - 00 Heterogeneth, Tau ² - 00 Heterogene	- 1.5 0 - 0.5 0 - 0	$0.0785 \\ 0.0037 \\ 0.0195 \\ 0.1196 \\ (P = 0.011 \\ 1 (P = 0.111 \\ 0.1567 \\ 0.1547 \\ 0.1547 \\ 0.1547 \\ 0.1547 \\ 0.1547 \\ 0.1547 \\ 0.1549 \\ 0.1549 \\ 0.1549 \\ 0.1549 \\ 0.1549 \\ 0.1549 \\ 0.1549 \\ 0.1549 \\ 0.1549 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.011442 \\ 0.000 \\$	7.3% 10.3% 10.3% 10.5% 48.2% 48.2% 40.0% (r = 75% 40.0% (r = 55% 40.0% 42.3% 42.3% 42.3% 42.3% 42.3% 52.3% 52.3% 100.0% (r = 5% 52.3% 100.0% (r = 7% 14.8% 52.3% 100.0% (r = 7% 100.0% (r = 7% 100.0% 100.0% (r = 7% 100.0% (r = 7%) (r = 7% 100.0% (r = 7%) (r = 7%) (Not estimate 0.55 (20,01,01) 0.55 (20,01,01) 0	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0	Pacus adjCC Facus (control)
Zenner HVO 202 Experiment VIO 202 Experiment VIO 202 Experiment VIO 202 Experiment VIO 202 Experiment Turk of exact effects and experiment Turk of exact effects that experiment Turk of exact effects that experiment Turk of exact effects that experiment Turk of exact effects Experiment VIO 202 Experiment VIO 202 Expe		$\begin{array}{c} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 &$	7.9% 10.2% 10.2% 21.5% 48.2% 48.2% 10.0% (), r = 56% Weight 7, r = 75% 48.2% 48.2% 48.2% 49.2% 44.3% (r = 0% 4.3% 52.3% 52.3% 4.5% 4.6%	Not estimate 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 0.05) 0.55 (0.00, 0.05)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0	Hazard Ratio
Zammer NAV 2020 Eggermond 2020 Subbind (1954, C) Heterogramit, Tauf = 0.06, Subbind (1954, C) Heterogramit, Tauf = 0.07, Subbind (1954, C) Heterogramit, Tauf = 0.07, Zimmer Nith 0.020, Zimmer Nith 0.		$0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\$	7.9% 10.2% 10.2% 21.5% 48.2% 100.0% 10.2% 48.2% 100.0% 10.2% 44.2% (P = 0% 44.3% 47.7% 47.7% 42.3% 47.7% 42.3% 100.0% (P = 0% 10.2% 4.6% 10.2% 4.6% (P = 0% 10.2% 4.6% 10.2% 4.6% (P = 0% 10.2% 4.6% (P = 0% 10.2% 10.2% 4.6% (P = 0% 10.2% 10.2% (P = 0% 10.2% 10.2% (P = 0% 10.2% (P = 0% (P = 0%) (P = 0% (P = 0% (P = 0%) (P =	Not estimate 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 0.05) 0.55 (0.00, 0.05)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0	Paout selici Facus (control)
Zmmer HVO 202 Zmmer HVO 202 Eggermod 202 Statistical (SPA C) Heterograme, Turk - 0 10 Heterograme, Turk - 0 10 Heterograme, Turk - 0 10 Heterograme, Turk - 0 10 Heterograme, Turk - 0 10 Eggermod 201 Eggermod 201 Fact Koronal effect 2 - 2 Tark to conal effect 2 - 1 Tark to conal effect 2 - 2 Tark to conal		0 - 0 - 0 0 - 0 - 0 0.3935 0.3935 0.3935 0.3935 0.3935 0.3935 0.3937 0.3937 0.3937 0.1567 0 - 0 - 0 0.1547 0 - 0 - 0 0.1526 0 - 0 - 0 0.2357 P = 0.647 1 - 0 - 0 0.2357 P = 0.647 0 - 0 - 0 0.3575 P = 0.06(3) 0.3575 P = 0.06(3) 0.3575 P = 0.06(3) 0.4477 0 - 0 0.5681 0 - 0 0 - 0 0.5681 0 - 0 0 - 0	7.9% 10.2% 10.2% 24.3% 48.2% 10.0% 10.7% 48.2% 10.0% 10.7% 48.2% 48.2% 49.2% 49.2% 49.2% 49.2% 49.2% 49.2% 49.2% 49.2% 40.	Not estimate 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 1.01) 0.55 (0.00, 0.05) 0.55 (0.00, 0.05)	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0	Hazard Rato History Sciller Favous sciller Pavous sciller History Scil
Zammer No. 200 Experiment No. 200 Experiment No. 200 Experiment Xiao 200 Experiment Xi	. Chip*e 10.72 df = 1 . Chip*e 10.72 df = 3 . Chip*e 0.78 df = 1 . Chip*e 0.78 d	0 - 0 - 0 0 - 0 - 0 0.3935 - 0 0.1546 - 0 0.1547 - 0 0.	7.9% 10.2% 10.2% 21.5% 21.5% 48.2% 48.2% 49.2% 40.0% (P = 0% 42.3% 47.7% 4	Not estimate 0.52 (0) 10, 00 (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 00 (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 01 (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 01 (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 01 (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 00 (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 00 (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 00 (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 00 (0) (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 00 (0) (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 00 (0) 10, 00 (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 00 (0) 10, 00 (0) 10, 00 (0) 0.52 (0) 10, 00 (0) 10, 00 (0) 10, 00 (0) 10, 00 (0) 10, 00 (0) 10, 00 (0) 10, 00 (0) 10, 00	2019 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020 2020	0	Paout salici Facus (control)

node dissection in the case of sentinel biopsy positivity, currently dramatically increasing in clinical practice, but still missing in pivotal clinical trials.

Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest

Melissa Bersanelli received research funding from Seqirus UK, Pfizer, Novartis, BMS, Astra Zeneca, Roche S.p.A., and Sanofi Genzyme; honoraria as speaker at scientific events by Bristol-Myers Squibb (BMS), Novartis, Astra Zeneca, and Pfizer and as consultant for advisory role by Novartis, BMS, and Pfizer; she also received fees for copyright transfer by Sciclone Pharmaceuticals.

Sebastiano Buti received honoraria as speaker at scientific events and advisory role by Bristol-Myers Squibb (BMS), Pfizer; MSD, Ipsen, Roche, Eli-Lilly, AstraZeneca and Novartis; he also received research funding from Novartis.

Ignazio Stanganelli received honoraria as speaker at scientific meetings by BMS, Novartis, MSD.

The other authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

ORCID

Melissa Bersanelli D http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6527-6281 Sebastiano Buti D http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0876-0226

References

- Faries MB, Thompson JF, Cochran AJ, Andtbacka RH, Mozzillo N, Zager JS, Jahkola T, Bowles TL, Testori A, Beitsch PD, et al. Completion dissection or observation for sentinel-node metastasis in melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2017 June 8;376(23):2211–22. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1613210.
- Leiter U, Stadler R, Mauch C, Hohenberger W, Brockmeyer N, Berking C, Sunderkötter C, Kaatz M, Schulte K-W, Lehmann P, et al. Complete lymph node dissection versus no dissection in patients with sentinel lymph node biopsy positive melanoma (DeCOG-SLT): a multicentre, randomised, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2016 June;17 (6):757–67. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(16)00141-8.
- Cascinelli N, Belli F, MacKie RM, Santinami M, Bufalino R, Morabito A. Effect of long-term adjuvant therapy with interferon alpha-2a in patients with regional node metastases from cutaneous melanoma: a randomised trial. Lancet. 2001 Sept 15;358(9285):866–69. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(01)06068-8.
- 4. Garbe C, Radny P, Linse R, Dummer R, Gutzmer R, Ulrich J, Stadler R, Weichenthal M, Eigentler TK, Ellwanger U, et al. Adjuvant low-dose interferon {alpha}2a with or without dacarbazine compared with surgery alone: a prospective-randomized phase III DeCOG trial in melanoma patients with regional lymph node metastasis. Ann Oncol. 2008 June;19(6):1195–201. Epub 2008 Feb 14. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdn001.
- 5. McMasters KM, Egger ME, Edwards MJ, Ross MI, Reintgen DS, Noyes RD, Martin RCG, Goydos JS, Beitsch PD, Urist MM, et al. Final results of the sunbelt melanoma trial: a multi-institutional prospective randomized phase III study evaluating the role of adjuvant high-dose interferon Alfa-2b and completion lymph node dissection for patients staged by sentinel lymph node biopsy. J Clin Oncol. 2016 Apr 1;34(10):1079–86. doi:10.1200/JCO.2015.63.3776.
- Eggermont AM, Suciu S, MacKie R, Ruka W, Testori A, Kruit W, Punt CJ, Delauney M, Sales F, Groenewegen G, et al. Post-surgery adjuvant therapy with intermediate doses of interferon alfa 2b versus observation in patients with stage IIb/III melanoma (EORTC 18952): randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2005 Oct 1;366(9492):1189–96. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(05)67482-X.
- 7. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) clinical practice guidelines in oncology (NCCN Guidelines, US). Version

1.2021. Melanoma: Cutaneous; 2020 Nov 25. [accessed 2021 Feb]. www.NCCN.org .

- Eggermont AM, Chiarion-Sileni V, Grob JJ, Dummer R, Wolchok JD, Schmidt H, Hamid O, Robert C, Ascierto PA, Richards JM, et al. Prolonged survival in stage III melanoma with ipilimumab adjuvant therapy. N Engl J Med. 2016;375 (19):1845–55. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1611299.
- Weber J, Mandala M, Del Vecchio M, Gogas HJ, Arance AM, Cowey CL, Dalle S, Schenker M, Chiarion-Sileni V, Marquez-Rodas I, et al. Adjuvant nivolumab versus ipilimumab in resected stage III or IV melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(19):1824–35. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1709030.
- Eggermont AMM, Blank CU, Mandala M, Long GV, Atkinson V, Dalle S, Haydon A, Lichinitser M, Khattak A, Carlino MS, et al. Adjuvant pembrolizumab versus placebo in resected stage III melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(19):1789–801. doi:10.1056/ NEJMoa1802357.
- 11. Zimmer L, Livingstone E, Hassel JC, Fluck M, Eigentler T, Loquai C, Haferkamp S, Gutzmer R, Meier F, Mohr P, et al. 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.
- 12. Eggermont AMM, Chiarion-Sileni V, Grob JJ, Dummer R, Wolchok JD, Schmidt H, Hamid O, Robert C, Ascierto PA, Richards JM, et al. Adjuvant ipilimumab versus placebo after complete resection of stage III melanoma: long-term follow-up results of the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer 18071 double-blind phase 3 randomised trial. Eur J Cancer. 2019;119:1–10. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2019.07.001.
- Ascierto PA, Del Vecchio M, Mandalá M, Gogas H, Arance AM, Dalle S, Cowey CL, Schenker M, Grob -J-J, Chiarion-Sileni V, et al. Adjuvant nivolumab versus ipilimumab in resected stage IIIB-C and stage IV melanoma (CheckMate 238): 4-year results from a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, controlled, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2020;21(11):1465–77. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30494-0.
- 14. Eggermont AMM, Blank CU, Mandala M, Long GV, Atkinson VG, Dalle S, Haydon AM, Meshcheryakov A, Khattak A, Carlino MS, et al. Longer follow-up confirms recurrence-free survival benefit of adjuvant pembrolizumab in high-risk Stage III melanoma: updated results from the EORTC 1325-MG/KEYNOTE-054 trial. J Clin Oncol. 2020;38(33):3925–36. doi:10.1200/JCO.20.02110.
- Elmore JG, Elder DE, Barnhill RL, Knezevich SR, Longton GM, Titus LJ, Weinstock MA, Pepe MS, Nelson HD, Reisch LM, et al. Concordance and reproducibility of melanoma staging according to the 7th vs 8th edition of the AJCC cancer staging manual. JAMA Netw Open. 2018 May;1(1):e180083. doi:10.1001/jamanetw orkopen.2018.0083.
- Edge SB, Compton CC, Fritz AG, Greene FL, Trotti A, eds. AJCC cancer staging manual. 7th ed. New York (NY): Springer; 2010.
- Amin MB, Edge SB, Greene FL, Byrd DR, eds. AJCC cancer staging manual. 8th ed. New York (NY): Springer; 2017.
- Crocetti E, Stanganelli I, Mancini S, Vattiato R, Giuliani O, Ravaioli A, Balducci C, Falcini F, Pimpinelli N. Evaluation of the agreement between TNM 7th and 8th in a population-based series of cutaneous melanoma. JEADV. 2019;33:521–24. doi:10.1111/jdv.15285.
- Eggermont AMM, Blank CU, Mandala M, Long GV, Atkinson VG, Dalle S, Haydon A, Lichinitser M, Khattak A, Carlino MS, et al. Prognostic and predictive value of AJCC-8 staging in the phase III EORTC1325/KEYNOTE-054 trial of pembrolizumab vs placebo in resected high-risk stage III melanoma. Eur J Cancer. 2019 July;116:148–57. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2019.05.020.
- Dummer R, Hauschild A, Santinami M, Atkinson V, Mandalà M, Kirkwood JM, Chiarion Sileni V, Larkin J, Nyakas M, Dutriaux C, et al. Five-year analysis of adjuvant dabrafenib plus trametinib in stage III melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2020 Sept 17;383(12):1139–48. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2005493.