

Neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Juan Jiang^{1,2,3,4,5,6}, Yuling Wang¹, Yang Gao^{2,6,7}, Haruhiko Sugimura⁸, Fabrizio Minervini⁹, Junji Uchino^{10,11}, Balazs Halmos¹², Sai Yendamuri¹³, Jeffrey B. Velotta¹⁴, Min Li^{1,2,3,4,5,6}

¹Department of Respiratory Medicine, National Key Clinical Specialty, Branch of National Clinical Research Center for Respiratory Disease, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China; ²Xiangya Lung Cancer Center, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China; ³Center of Respiratory Medicine, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China; ⁴Clinical Research Center for Respiratory Diseases in Hunan Province, Changsha, China; ⁵Hunan Engineering Research Center for Intelligent Diagnosis and Treatment of Respiratory Disease, Changsha, China; ⁶National Clinical Research Center for Geriatric Disorders, Xiangya Hospital, Changsha, China; ⁷Department of Thoracic Surgery, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China; ⁸Department of Tumor Pathology, Hamamatsu University School of Medicine, Hamamatsu, Shizuoka, Japan; ⁹Department of Thoracic Surgery, Cantonal Hospital Lucerne, Lucerne, Switzerland; ¹⁰Department of Pulmonary Medicine, Graduate School of Medical Science, Kyoto Prefectural University of Medicine, Kyoto, Japan; ¹¹Bannan Central Hospital, Iwata, Shizuoka, Japan; ¹²Department of Oncology, Montefiore Medical Center/Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, NY, USA; ¹³Department of Thoracic Surgery, Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center, Buffalo, NY, USA; ¹⁴Department of Thoracic Surgery, Kaiser Permanente Oakland Medical Center, Kaiser Permanente Northern California, Oakland, CA, USA

Contributions: (I) Conception and design: M Li; (II) Administrative support: M Li; (III) Provision of study materials or patients: M Li; (IV) Collection and assembly of data: J Jiang, Y Wang, Y Gao; (V) Data analysis and interpretation: J Jiang, M Li; (VI) Manuscript writing: All authors; (VII) Final approval of manuscript: All authors.

Correspondence to: Min Li. Department of Respiratory Medicine, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China. Email: limin2050@csu.edu.cn.

Background: In recent years, a series of clinical trials have explored the application of neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). However, no randomized control trials comparing neoadjuvant immunotherapy with chemoimmunotherapy have yet been reported. This study aimed to summarize and compare the efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy and chemoimmunotherapy in NSCLC.

Methods: Literature focusing on the efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy in NSCLC published before June 2021 was retrieved from PubMed, Embase, and the Cochrane Library. Study endpoints included major pathological response (MPR), complete pathological response (pCR), treatment-related adverse events (TRAEs), severe adverse events (SAEs), resection rate, surgical delay rate, and conversion to thoracotomy. The risk of bias was assessed using the Cochrane bias risk assessment tool. Subgroup and sensitivity analyses were further performed.

Results: A total of 988 patients from 16 studies were included in this meta-analysis. For patients who received neoadjuvant immunotherapy with single/combined ICIs or chemoimmunotherapy, the pooled MPR rate was 43.5% and the pooled pCR rate was 21.9%. The pooled incidence of TRAEs and SAEs were 54.8% and 15.3%, respectively. The pooled resection rate was 85.8%, the surgical delay rate was 7.4%, and the conversion rate was 17.4%. Patients who received neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy had remarkably improved pathological response (MPR rate: 53.3% *vs.* 28.6%; pCR rate: 28.6% *vs.* 9.9%) compared with those receiving neoadjuvant single-agent immunotherapy, while the incidence of SAEs (18.0% *vs.* 12.3%) and surgical delay rate (3.8% *vs.* 7.4%) did not significantly increase. Neoadjuvant nivolumab combined with ipilimumab also achieved a high pCR rate (28.6%) with tolerable toxicity. Nivolumab- and pembrolizumab-based neoadjuvant therapy showed a higher MPR rate (nivolumab 51.5%, pembrolizumab 46.8%) and pCR rate (nivolumab 29.1%, pembrolizumab 31.5%). Besides, patients with positive programmed death-ligand 1 (PD-L1) expression [tumor proportion score (TPS) $\geq 1\%$] exhibited favorable pathological responses than

PD-L1 negative patients.

Discussion: Overall, neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy is effective and safe in NSCLC. Compared with single-agent immunotherapy, neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy provides a significant improvement in pathological response without increasing the incidence of SAEs or surgical delay. These results need further confirmation by more large-scale randomized controlled trials.

Keywords: Non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC); neoadjuvant immunotherapy; neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy; immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs); efficacy and safety

Submitted Nov 19, 2021. Accepted for publication Feb 18, 2022. doi: 10.21037/tlcr-22-75 View this article at: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tlcr-22-75

Introduction

According to the 2020 global cancer statistics, non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) accounts for 80–85% of all lung cancers worldwide and remains the leading cause of cancer deaths (1). Approximately 70% of NSCLC patients are diagnosed at an advanced stage, leading to a 5-year survival rate less than 18% even after comprehensive treatment (2). Over the past decades, the early detection of NSCLC has gradually increased with the wider adoption of chest low-dose CT as a screening modality (3). For patients diagnosed with stages I, II, and selected stage III NSCLC, surgical resection with curative intent is considered to be the best treatment option. However, only 20–25% of tumors overall are suitable for potential curative resection. Moreover, these patients have a high risk of postoperative recurrence, ranging from 25% to 70% based on the disease stage (4).

Neoadjuvant therapy, defined as systemic anticancer treatment given before surgery, is an accepted practice in NSCLC (5). Compared with adjuvant therapy, neoadjuvant therapy has potential advantages including early treatment of micrometastasis, reducing tumor burden before surgery, and better tolerability (6,7). Pathological remission, including major pathological response (MPR) and complete pathological response (pCR), is currently used as a surrogate endpoint to predict survival benefit in clinical trials focusing on neoadjuvant chemotherapy (8). A meta-analysis conducted by the NSCLC Meta-analysis Collaborative Group involving 15 randomized clinical trials in patients with stages IB-IIIA disease has demonstrated that compared with surgery alone, preoperative chemotherapy significantly improves overall survival, time to distant recurrence, and recurrence-free survival in resectable NSCLC (9). However, the median rate of pCR from 15 trials of neoadjuvant chemotherapy was only 4% (range, 0-16%), which suggests

that more effective neoadjuvant therapy modalities are required to further improve prognosis (10).

Immunotherapy with immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs), which boost antitumor immunity by blocking inhibitory signaling through checkpoint receptors expressed on T lymphocytes and their ligands expressed in tumor cells, has revolutionized the treatment of various cancers, including NSCLC (4,11). In recent years, the use of ICIs for the treatment of NSCLC has considerably increased. Monoclonal antibodies that target the programmed cell death protein 1/programmed death-ligand 1 (PD-1/PD-L1) axis have been approved as first- and second-line treatments for advanced NSCLC worldwide (12). So far, several clinical trials have reported the efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy (13-18) or chemoimmunotherapy (19-28) in stages I-III NSCLC. Investigational ICIs included PD-1/ PD-L1 inhibitors such as nivolumab (13,18,25,27,28), pembrolizumab (16,20), sintilimab (15), durvalumab (26), atezolizumab (14,19), avelumab (23), and a CTLA-4 inhibitor ipilimumab (24). In NSCLC patients who receive preoperative immunotherapy, the naive tumor can serve as a "vaccine" boosting the activation of T lymphocytes (29). Based on available research data from previous studies, patients who received neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy before surgery had improved pathological response and downstaging of the tumor compared to those who received neoadjuvant chemotherapy. However, most of these studies are single-armed trials with small sample sizes. On the other hand, while neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy offers numerous advantages, immune-related adverse events (irAEs) have attracted significant attention (30,31). The occurrence of severe irAEs can lead to delayed surgical resection or even death. Moreover, increasing complexity of the surgical

field in the chest, which is caused by fibrosis and nodal flares, has been observed in patients receiving neoadjuvant immunotherapy, even with tumor downstaging (13). So far, no data from randomized controlled trials on neoadjuvant immunotherapy and chemoimmunotherapy have been reported. Therefore, in order to improve the knowledge of and compare the clinical benefits between neoadjuvant immunotherapy and chemoimmunotherapy in NSCLC, a meta-analysis on their efficacy and safety, based on current data from clinical trials, is necessary.

Herein, we conducted a systematic review and metaanalysis of clinical trials focusing on neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy in NSCLC. We analyzed efficacy- and safety-related endpoints including MPR, pCR, incidence of treatment-related adverse events (TRAEs) and severe adverse events (SAEs), resection rate, surgical delay rate, and conversion rate in resectable stages I–III NSCLC patients who received neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy. We further compared these endpoints among different treatment modes and ICI types, and summarized the profiles of TRAEs and SAEs. This meta-analysis was conducted and reported in accordance with the PRISMA reporting checklist (32) (available at https://tlcr.amegroups.com/ article/view/10.21037/tlcr-22-75/rc).

Methods

Literature search strategy and study selection

It was registered in PROSPERO with the registration number CRD42021262202. We combined the English search terms ("NSCLC" or "carcinoma, non-small cell lung" or "nonsmall cell lung cancer") and ("neoadjuvant immunotherapy" or "neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy" or "neoadjuvant immune checkpoint inhibitor") and ("surgery" or "resection" or "lobectomy") in PubMed, Embase, and the Cochrane Library to identify articles published before 30 June 2021. At the same time, we also searched the unpublished updated data of ongoing clinical trials of neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy in NSCLC from international congresses such as ASCO, AACR, ESMO, and other congresses up to 30 June 2021. All publications were limited to human subjects and English language.

Inclusion criteria of publications were defined according to the PICOS criteria, which was listed as follows: (I) patients: resectable stages I–III NSCLC which was histologically confirmed in tissue; (II) intervention: neoadjuvant ICIs, including PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors and CTLA-4 inhibitors, either combined with chemotherapy or not; (III) comparator: how effective and safe are the different neoadjuvant treatment regimens; (IV) outcomes: MPR, pCR, incidence of TRAEs, incidence of SAEs, resection rate, surgical delay rate, and conversion to thoracotomy; (V) study design: randomized controlled trials, non-randomized controlled trials, prospective cohort studies. Publications were excluded if they met any of the following criteria: (I) retrospective studies; (II) anti-NSCLC treatment was performed before neoadjuvant therapy; (III) studies did not focus on any of the endpoints, including MPR, pCR, incidence of TRAEs, incidence of SAEs, resection rate, surgical delay rate, or conversion rate; (IV) publications written in any other language than English; (V) the number of enrolled patients was not more than 10; (VI) repeated publications, case reports, comments, expert opinion, and reviews; (VII) violation of any of the above inclusion criteria. Subsequently, the full texts of the relevant articles and conference abstracts were retrieved to assess eligibility. References to relevant reports were also reviewed manually to identify other studies. Two reviewers (JJ, YW) independently screened titles and abstracts using the above-mentioned search strategies to identify and assess potentially eligible studies. Publications from the reference lists of retrieved articles were also searched. The full-texts of all potentially relevant trials and conference abstracts were assessed using predefined eligibility criteria. Disagreements were resolved by discussion with a third researcher (ML).

Assessment of the risk of bias

According to the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, the risk of bias of randomized trials was assessed by the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool, and that of non-randomized studies was assessed by the ROBINS-I tool. The risk of bias of randomized studies included selection bias (including random sequence generation and allocation concealment), performance bias (blinding of participants and personnel), detection bias (blinding of outcome assessment), attrition bias (incomplete outcome data), reporting bias (selective reporting), and other biases. Non-randomized studies were assessed using the ROBINS-I tool with respect to the following categories: confounding, selection, intervention classification, deviation from intervention, missing data, measurement of outcome, and selection of reported result.

Publication bias

Funnel plot, Egger's test and Begg's test were used to assess the publication bias of included studies.

Data extraction

Two researchers (JJ and YW) independently extracted relevant data using a pre-designed form. Disputed data were discussed with a third researcher (ML). The extracted information were as follows: (I) study features, including the first author, year of publication, basic study design, main inclusion criteria of patients, neoadjuvant treatment regimens, and sample size; (II) baseline characteristics of the enrolled patients, including gender, age, and proportion of squamous cell carcinoma; (III) data on endpoints, including MPR, pCR, incidence of TRAEs, incidence of SAEs, patients with resection, surgical delay rate, and conversion to thoracotomy. To ensure the homogeneity of different studies, the MPR rate, pCR rate, resection rate, surgical delay rate, and conversion rate were all defined as the ratio to the total number of the intention-to-treat population for meta-analysis. The extracted data were mostly represented by counts and percentages.

Definitions of endpoints

The pathological responses of patients, including MPR and pCR, were used to evaluate the efficacy of neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy. MPR was defined as no more than 10% viable tumor cells remaining in tumors and lymph nodes on postoperative pathological review, and pCR was defined as no viable tumor cells remaining on postoperative pathological review. The safety-related endpoints included neoadjuvant TRAEs, SAEs, resection rate, surgical delay rate, and conversion to thoracotomy. TRAEs and SAEs were evaluated according to the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE). SAEs were defined as grade 3-5 TRAEs. The resection rate referred to the ratio of patients who underwent surgical resection to the intention-to-treat population. The surgical delay rate was defined as the ratio of patients with surgical delay caused by TRAEs to the intention-to-treat population. The conversion rate referred to the ratio of patients scheduled to undergo videoassisted thoracoscopic surgery (VATS) or robotic approach but converted to thoracotomy during the operation due to surgical difficulty, complexity, and/or unexpected complications.

Statistical analysis

Data analysis was performed using Review Manager Software (version 5.4). Since most of the included studies were single-arm clinical trials, we performed metaanalysis with non-comparative binary data of MPR, pCR, adverse events, resection, and conversion in Review Manager Software, as described in a previous study (33). Briefly, the log[odds ratio] of an endpoint and its standard error (SE) were calculated with the following formula: $\log[odds \ ratio] = \ln(X/(n-x))$. $SE = \sqrt{1/X + 1/(n-x)}$: where X refers to the number of events, and n refers to the total number of patients. Then, log[odds ratio] and SE were input into the Review Manager Software for analysis. Odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) were the effect measures. Finally, the pooled prevalence (P) of an endpoint and its 95% CI were calculated with the following formula: P = OR/(1 + OR); lower limit (LL) of 95% CI = $LL_{OR}/(1 + LL_{OR})$; upper limit (UL) of 95% CI = $UL_{OR}/(1 + LL_{OR})$ + UL_{OR}). The χ^2 test and I² test were used to evaluate the heterogeneity of the enrolled studies. If the heterogeneity was significant, the random effects model was adopted for meta-analysis; otherwise, the fixed effects model was used. We further performed subgroup analysis and sensitivity analysis to explore the sources of heterogeneity. For subgroup analysis based on PD-L1 expression, histology and smoking status, available individual data was extracted from each study, and the Mantel-Haenszel random effect method was used to obtain the pooled OR and the corresponding 95% CI. A sensitivity analysis was performed by removing one study at a time to evaluate whether the results could be significantly affected by a single study. Significance was fixed at P<0.05 (two-tailed).

Results

Literature search results

The literature search and study selection process are shown in *Figure 1*. The search strategy identified a total of 663 records. After removing duplicate records, the titles and abstracts of 344 records were screened, and 312 records were excluded as they did not meet the inclusion criteria. Full-text articles or conference abstracts of 32 studies were read in detail and further assessed for eligibility. Finally, a total of 16 studies and 988 NSCLC patients were enrolled for quantitative meta-analysis. Study characteristics were shown based on the categories of neoadjuvant treatment regimens (*Table 1*). Among these studies, 14 were single-arm



Figure 1 Flow chart of literature search and study selection.

open-label cohort studies, and the other 2 were dual-arm openlabel randomized trials. The Provencio 2020 (28), Rothschild 2021 (26), and Wang 2021 (21) studies enrolled patients with stage III NSCLC. Six studies focused on neoadjuvant immunotherapy alone (including 1 study on dual ICIs), while the other 10 explored the efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy. Investigational ICIs included nivolumab, pembrolizumab, atezolizumab, durvalumab, sintilimab, ipilimumab, and avelumab. The risk of bias of randomized trials and non-randomized studies were assessed using the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool and ROBINS-I tool, respectively, which was displayed in Figure S1. Publication bias of included studies was overall limited, as suggested by funnel plots (Figure S2).

Pooled analysis of efficacy- and safety-related endpoints

Research data on efficacy- and safety-related endpoints in these clinical trials are shown in *Table 2*. We firstly conducted a meta-analysis of the MPR rate, pCR rate, incidence of TRAEs and SAEs, resection rate, surgical delay rate, and conversion rate for all studies (Figure 2 and Table 3). The pooled MPR rate was 43.5% (95% CI: 32.4-55.0%) and the pooled pCR rate was 21.9% (95% CI: 15.3-30.6%). There was significant heterogeneity for both MPR (P<0.001, I^2 =85%) and pCR (P<0.001, I^2 =81%), so the random effects model was adopted. The pooled incidence of TRAEs and SAEs were 54.8% (95% CI: 41.5-67.3%) and 15.3% (95% CI: 10.7–21.3%), respectively. The pooled resection rate was 85.8% (95% CI: 80.4-89.8%) and the pooled surgical delay rate was 7.4% (95% CI: 3.8-12.3%). Only 3 studies reported the incidence of conversion to thoracotomy. The pooled conversion rate based on these studies was 17.4% (95% CI: 7.4-35.9%). The random effects model was used for meta-analysis of the above endpoints due to significant heterogeneity among the included studies. It is worth mentioning that only patients who received neoadjuvant ICIs were included in the pooled analysis of these endpoints. Therefore, those who received neoadjuvant chemotherapy alone in the CheckMate 816 trial were excluded herein.

patient demographics
Ъ
characteristics at
Study
-
e

Table 1 Stuc	ly characteristics and pat	ient demo	graphics									
Treatment	First author	Publicatio	n Clinical trial	NCT number	Study S	tudy design	Main inclusion criteria	Neoadjuvant treatment regimen	Sample	Proportion of	Median age, F	roportion of
mode		year		_	phase				size	males (%)	years	SCC (%)
ICI + chemo	Forde PM (25)	2021	CheckMate 816	NCT02998528	≥ ≌ ∾	Iulticenter, andomized	Stage IB-IIIA resectable NSCLC	Nivolumab + chemotherapy	179	72	64	49
ICI + chemo	Zinner R (27)	2020	I	NCT03366766	N N	ingle center, ingle-arm	Stage I–IIIA NSCLC	Nivolumab + pemetrexed/ gemcitabine + cisplatin	13	62	65	38
ICI + chemo	Rothschild SI (26)	2021	SAKK 16/14	NCT02572843	2 0	Iulticenter, ingle-arm	Resectable IIIA (N2) NSCLC	Chemotherapy with cisplatin/ docetaxel followed by durvalumab	68	I	I	I
ICI + chemo	Provencio M (28)	2020	MADIM	NCT03081689	2 0	Iulticenter, ingle-arm	Stage IIIA, N2- resectable NSCLC	3 cycles of nivolumab + paclitaxel + carboplatin	46	74	63	35
ICI + chemo	Shu CA (19)	2020	I	NCT02716038	2 0	Iulticenter, ingle-arm	Resectable NSCLC	4 cycles of atezolizumab + nab-paclitaxel + carboplatin	30	50	67	40
ICI + chemo	Tfayli A (23)	2020	I	NCT03480230	2	ipen label, ingle-arm	Stage IB-IIIA NSCLC	3 cycles of avelumab + chemotherapy	15	47	65	13
ICI + chemo	Yang CJ (24)	2018	TOP1201	NCT01820754	N N	ingle center, ingle-arm	Stage II-IIIA NSCLC	Cycles 2 and 3 ipilimumab + 3 cycles of paclitaxel + platinum	24	50	59	37
ICI + chemo	Wang J (21)	2021	I	I	م رہ	ingle center, ingle-arm	Stage IIIA NSCLC	2 cycles of pembrolizumab + paclitaxel + carboplatin	72	92	62.2	92
ICI + chemo	Shen D (20)	2021	I	I	م رہ	ingle center, ingle-arm	Stage IIB-IIIB resectable SCC	2 cycles of pembrolizumab+ paclitaxel + carboplatin	37	95	62.8	100
ICI + chemo	Duan H (22)	2021	I	I	≥ 0 I	lulticenter, ingle-arm	Stage IIA-IIIB resectable NSCLC	3-4 cycles of ICIs+ chemotherapy	23	96	61.8	83
Mono-ICI	Carbone D (14)	2021	LCMC3	NCT02927301	2 0	Iulticenter, ingle-arm	Stage IB-IIIB resectable NSCLC	2 cycles of atezolizumab	181	51	65	38
Mono-ICI	Cascone T (18)	2021	NEOSTAR	NCT03158129	S 22	ingle center, andomized	Stage I–IIIA NSCLC	Nivolumab	23	65	99	43
Mono-ICI	Eichhorn F (16)	2021	NEOMUN	NCT03197467	N N	ingle center, ingle-arm	Stage II/IIIA resectable NSCLC	2 cycles of pembrolizumab	15	47	59.8	13
Mono-ICI	Forde PM (13), Bott MJ (17)	2018, 2019	CheckMate159	NCT02259621	2	wo centers, ingle-arm	Stage I–IIIA NSCLC	2 cycles of nivolumab	22	48	67	29
Mono-ICI	Gao S (15)	2020	I	ChiCTR-OIC-17013726	dt ∑ ≥ ∞	Iulticenter, ingle-arm	Stage IA-IIIB resectable NSCLC	2 cycles of sintilimab	40	83	62	83
Dual-ICIs	Cascone T (18)	2021	NEOSTAR	NCT03158129	8 22	ingle center, andomized	Stage I-IIIA NSCLC	Nivolumab + ipilimumab	21	62	65	33
Chemo	Forde PM (25)	2021	CheckMate 816	NCT02998528	≥ ≌ ∾	Iulticenter, andomized	Stage IB-IIIA resectable NSCLC	Chemotherapy	179	71	65	53
ICI, immune	checkpoint inhibitor; cl	hemo, che	motherapy; mono-l	ICI, single-agent immune c	heckpoir	nt inhibitor; du	ual-ICIs, combination of two	o immune checkpoint inhibitors; NCT	number, ⁷	The National Clir	nical Trial numt	per; NSCLC,

non-small cell lung cancer; SCC, squamous cell carcinoma.

Table 2 Research	data on endpoints report	ed in the	clinical trials						
Treatment mode	First author	Ē	Patients with resection	MPR rate	pCR rate	Incidence of TRAEs	Incidence of SAEs	Surgical delay rate	Conversion rate
ICI + chemo	Forde PM	179	149	37% (66/179)	24% (43/179)	47% (82/176)	19% (34/176)	17% (31/179)	I
ICI + chemo	Zinner R	13	13	85% (11/13)	38% (5/13)	I	15% (2/13)	I	I
ICI + chemo	Rothschild SI	68	55	60% (33/55)	15% (10/68)	I	I	I	I
ICI + chemo	Provencio M	46	41	74% (34/46)	57% (26/46)	93% (43/46)	30% (14/46)	0	I
ICI + chemo	Shu CA	30	26	57% (17/30)	33% (10/30)	I	10% (3/30)	0	I
ICI + chemo	Tfayli A	15	1	20% (3/15)	7% (1/15)	I	27% (4/15)	I	I
ICI + chemo	Yang CJ	24	13	I	8% (2/24)	I	25% (6/24)	8% (2/24)	13% (3/24)
ICI + chemo	Wang J	72	72	I	29% (21/72)	I	4% (3/72)	0	I
ICI + chemo	Shen D	37	37	65% (24/37)	46% (17/37)	70% (26/37)	11% (4/37)	0	I
ICI + chemo	Duan H	23	20	43% (10/23)	26% (6/23)	I	I	I	9% (2/23)
Mono-ICI	Carbone D	181	159	17% (30/181)	6% (10/181)	41% (75/181)	9% (16/181)	I	I
Mono-ICI	Cascone T	23	21	22% (5/23)	9% (2/23)	I	13% (3/23)	I	I
Mono-ICI	Eichhorn F	15	15	27% (4/15)	13% (2/15)	53% (8/15)	33% (5/15)	7% (1/15)	I
Mono-ICI	Forde PM, Bott MJ	22	20	41% (9/22)	14% (3/22)	23% (5/22)	5% (1/22)	0	32% (7/22)
Mono-ICI	Gao S	40	37	38% (15/40)	15% (6/40)	53% (21/40)	10% (4/40)	5% (2/37)	I
Dual-ICIs	Cascone T	21	16	38% (8/21)	29% (6/21)	I	10% (2/21)	I	I
Chemo	Forde PM	179	135	9% (16/179)	2% (4/179)	51% (89/176)	21% (37/176)	13% (24/179)	I
ICI, immune chec	kpoint inhibitor; chemo, reat; MPR, major pathol	, chemoi ogical re	therapy; mono-ICI sponse; pCR, cor	I, single-agent immi mplete pathological	une checkpoint inh response; TRAE, t	ibitor; dual-ICIs, c reatment-related a	ombination of two adverse event: SA	o immune checkp \E, severe adverse	oint inhibitors; event.



Figure 2 Forest plot of the efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy and chemoimmunotherapy. (A) MPR rate; (B) pCR rate; (C) incidence of TRAEs; (D) Incidence of SAEs; (E) resection rate; (F) surgical delay rate; (G) conversion rate. MPR, major pathological response; pCR, complete pathological response; TRAE, treatment-related adverse event; SAE, severe adverse event; SE, standard error; IV, inverse variance; CI, confidence interval.

Exploratory subgroup analysis

Neoadjuvant treatment modes

To identify the potential sources of heterogeneity, exploratory subgroup analysis was performed. Among all the included studies, there were 4 kinds of neoadjuvant treatment modes used in patients with resectable NSCLC, including ICI plus chemotherapy, mono-ICI, dual ICIs (nivolumab plus ipilimumab), and chemotherapy alone. Subgroup analysis based on neoadjuvant treatment modes is shown in *Figure 3* and *Table 3*. The pooled MPR rates for ICI plus chemotherapy, mono-ICI, dual ICIs, and chemotherapy alone were 53.3% (95% CI: 40.5–65.8%), 28.6% (95% CI: 18.7–40.8%), 38.3% (95% CI: 20.6–59.7%), and 9.1% (95% CI: 5.7–13.8%), respectively. A significant difference was observed among these subgroups

(P<0.001) (*Figure 3A*). The pooled pCR rates for ICI plus chemotherapy, mono-ICI, dual ICIs, and chemotherapy alone were 28.6% (95% CI: 20.0–38.7%), 9.9% (95% CI: 5.7–15.3%), 28.6% (95% CI: 13.8–50.7%), and 2.0% (95% CI: 1.0–5.7%), respectively. The difference in the pCR rate among subgroups was also statistically significant (P<0.001) (*Figure 3B*). These results highlight the advantages of neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy and dual ICIs over other treatment modes in terms of pathological response.

The incidence of TRAEs in patients who received neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy tended to be higher [73.9% (95% CI: 43.2–91.3%)] compared with the mono-ICI [42.9% (95% CI: 32.4–53.9%)] and chemotherapy alone [49.7% (95% CI: 42.5–57.1%)] subgroups (*Figure 3C*). However, no significant difference was found (P=0.15).

	son of enupoints and	nig unicicilit subgrou	ips after fieldaujuv	ant minufoutera	ру		
Subgroups	MPR rate (95% CI)	pCR rate (95% CI)	Incidence of TRAEs (95% CI)	Incidence of SAEs (95% CI)	Resection rate (95% CI)	Surgical delay rate (95% Cl)	Conversion rate (95% CI)
Pooled	43.5 (32.4–55.0)	21.9 (15.3–30.6)	54.8 (41.5–67.3)	15.3 (10.7–21.3)	85.8 (80.4–89.8)	7.4 (3.8–12.3)	17.4 (7.4–35.9)
Treatment mode							
ICI + chemo	53.3 (40.5–65.8)	28.6 (20.0–38.7)	73.9 (43.2–91.3)	18.0 (12.3–26.5)	84.4 (75.8–90.3)	3.8 (1.0–13.0)	-
Mono-ICI	28.6 (18.7–40.8)	9.9 (5.7–15.3)	42.9 (32.4–53.9)	12.3 (6.5–21.3)	89.2 (84.9–92.4)	7.4 (4.8–11.5)	-
Dual ICIs	38.3 (20.6–59.7)	28.6 (13.8–50.7)	-	9.9 (2.0–31.0)	76.2 (53.9–89.7)	13.0 (9.9–18.0)	-
Chemo	9.1 (5.7–13.8)	2.0 (1.0–5.7)	49.7 (42.5–57.1)	20.6 (15.3–27.0)	75.4 (68.6–81.2)	7.4 (4.8–12.3)	_
P value	<0.001	<0.001	0.15	0.32	0.002	0.02	-
ICI types							
Nivolumab	51.5 (32.4–70.0)	29.1 (16.0–46.2)	60.0 (22.5–88.5)	18.7 (12.3–27.5)	84.9 (80.3–88.6)	12.3 (6.5–23.1)	-
Pembrolizumab	46.8 (15.3–81.1)	31.5 (18.0–49.2)	64.4 (47.6–78.2)	12.3 (3.8–35.5)	95.5 (76.0–99.3)	1.0 (0.0–6.5)	_
Durvalumab	48.5 (37.1–60.3)	14.5 (8.3–25.4)	-	-	86.1 (82.6–89.0)	-	_
Atezolizumab	33.3 (7.4–75.9)	14.5 (2.0–58.2)	41.5 (34.6–48.7)	9.1 (5.7–14.5)	87.7 (82.5–91.5)	6.5 (2.0–18.7)	-
Sintilimab	37.5 (24.2–53.3)	15.3 (6.5–29.6)	52.6 (37.1–67.3)	9.9 (3.8–23.7)	92.5 (79.2–97.6)	4.8 (1.0–18.0)	_
Avelumab	20.0 (6.5–47.1)	6.5 (1.0–35.1)	-	26.5 (10.7–53.3)	73.3 (46.8–89.6)	-	-
P value	0.39	0.18	0.06	0.11	0.22	0.07	-

Table 3 Comparison of endpoints among different subgroups after neoadjuvant immunotherapy

ICI, immune checkpoint inhibitor; chemo, chemotherapy; mono-ICI, single-agent immune checkpoint inhibitor; dual-ICIs, combination of two immune checkpoint inhibitors; MPR, major pathological response; pCR, complete pathological response; TRAE, treatment-related adverse event; SAE, severe adverse event; CI, confidence interval.

No data on the incidence of TRAEs was provided in the Cascone 2021 study (18), the only one study using dual ICIs. The incidence of SAEs in the ICI plus chemotherapy, mono-ICI, dual ICIs, and chemotherapy alone subgroups were 18.0% (95% CI: 12.3-26.5%), 12.3% (95% CI: 6.5-21.3%), 9.9% (95% CI: 2.0-31.0%), and 20.6% (95% CI: 15.3-27.0%), respectively. There was no significant difference among subgroups (P=0.32). The resection rates for the ICI plus chemotherapy, mono-ICI, dual ICIs, and chemotherapy alone subgroups were 84.4% (95% CI: 75.8-90.3%), 89.2% (95% CI: 84.9-92.4%), 76.2% (95% CI: 53.9-89.7%), and 75.4% (95% CI: 68.6-81.2%), respectively. Patients who received neoadjuvant ICI plus chemotherapy had the lowest surgical delay rate [3.8% (95% CI: 1.0-13.0%)]. Since only 3 studies reported the data of conversion rate, subgroup analysis on this endpoint was not conducted. Through this subgroup analysis, heterogeneity among studies of the mono-ICI subgroup was remarkably decreased. Significant heterogeneity was still observed for the MPR rate of the mono-ICI subgroup and all endpoints of the ICI plus chemotherapy subgroup.

ICI types

Different types of ICIs used in the included studies could be a source of heterogeneity. Therefore, we conducted a subgroup analysis of ICI types to explore the potential correlations between ICI types and endpoints (Figure 4). As shown in Table 3, nivolumab- and pembrolizumab-based neoadjuvant therapy showed a higher MPR rate [51.5% (95% CI: 32.4-70.0%) for nivolumab, 46.8% (95% CI: 15.3-81.1%) for pembrolizumab] and pCR rate [29.1% (95% CI: 16.0-46.2%) for nivolumab, 31.5% (95% CI: 18.0-49.2%) for pembrolizumab], while avelumab-based neoadjuvant therapy had a relatively lower MPR rate [20.0% (95% CI: 6.5-47.1%)] and pCR rate [6.5% (95% CI: 1.0-35.1%)]. However, no significant differences were observed among these subgroups. The pooled incidence of TRAEs and SAEs for atezolizumab- and sintilimabbased neoadjuvant therapy appeared to be lower than other ICIs, without statistical significance. The resection rates of different ICIs were overall comparable. Patients who received pembrolizumab-based neoadjuvant therapy tended to have less surgical delay [1.0% (95% CI: 0.0-6.5%)], while

Jiang et al. Neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy in NSCLC

A Odds Ratio	o Odds Ratio	B Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 9: 12.1.1 Mono-ICIs	5% CI IV, Random, 95% CI	Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI 13.1.1 Mono-ICIs	IV, Random, 95% CI
Carbone 2021 -1.6161 0.1999 7.6% 0.20 [0.13, Cascone 2021 -0.869 0.3304 7.0% 0.42 [0.22	0.29]	Carbone 2021 -2.8391 0.3253 6.8% 0.06 [0.03, 0.11] Cascone 2021 -2.3514 0.74 4.6% 0.10 [0.02, 0.41]	
Eichhorn 2021 -1.0116 0.5839 5.6% 0.36 [0.12, Eochorn 2021 -0.2677 0.4226 6.5% 0.60 [0.20]	1.14]	Eichhorn 2021 -1.8718 0.7596 4.5% 0.15 [0.03, 0.68] Forde 2018 -1.8458 0.6213 5.2% 0.16 [0.05, 0.53]	
Gao 2020 -0.5108 0.3266 7.1% 0.60 [0.32, Gao 2020 -0.5108 0.3266 7.1% 0.60 [0.32, Cuber 1 (05% Cl)		Gao 2020 -1.7346 0.4428 6.2% 0.18 [0.07, 0.42] Subtotal (95% CI) 27.3% 0.11 [0.06, 0.18]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.26; Chi ² = 13.26, df = 4 (P = 0.01); $I^2 = 70\%$		Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.08$; $Chi^2 = 5.23$, $df = 4$ (P = 0.26); $I^2 = 23\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 8.43$ (P < 0.00001)	
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.27 (P = 0.001)		13.1.2 ICIs+chemo	
Duan 2021 -0.2624 0.4206 6.5% 0.77 [0.34,	1.75]	Duan 2021 -1.0415 0.4749 6.0% 0.35 [0.14, 0.90]	
Forde 2021 -0.5377 0.1549 7.8% 0.58 [0.43, Provencio 2020 1.0415 0.3358 7.0% 2.83 [1.47,	0.79]	Provencio 2020 0.2624 0.2974 6.9% 1.30 [0.73, 2.33]	+
Rothschild 2020 -0.0588 0.2426 7.5% 0.94 [0.59, Shen 2021 0.6131 0.3444 7.0% 1.85 [0.94,	1.52]	Konschlud 2020 -1.7379 0.3424 6.7% 0.17 [0.05, 0.34] Shen 2021 -0.1625 0.3299 6.8% 0.85 [0.45, 1.62]	
Shu 2020 0.2683 0.3684 6.8% 1.31 [0.64, Tfavli 2020 -1.3863 0.6455 5.3% 0.25 [0.07,	2.69]	Shu 2020 -0.6951 0.3673 6.5% 0.50 [0.25, 1.07] Tfayli 2020 -2.6391 1.0351 3.3% 0.07 [0.01, 0.54]	
Zinner 2020 1.7047 0.7687 4.6% 5.50 [1.22, 2 Subtotal (95% CI) 52.4% 1.14 [0.68,	4.81]	Wang 2021 -0.88/3 0.2593 7.1% 0.41 [0.25, 0.68] Yang 2018 -2.3979 0.7385 4.6% 0.09 [0.02, 0.39]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.40; Chi ² = 34.49, df = 7 (P < 0.0001); I ² = 80% Test for overall effect: $7 = 0.50$ (P = 0.62)	- F	Zinner 2020 -0.47 0.5701 5.5% 0.63 [0.20, 1.91] Subtotal (95% CI) 60.9% 0.40 [0.25, 0.63]	•
12.1.3 Dual ICIs		Heterogeneity: $1 au^{+} = 0.36$; $Chi^{+} = 36.44$, $dt = 9 (P < 0.0001)$; $l^{+} = 75\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 3.92 (P < 0.0001)	
Cascone 2021 -0.4855 0.4494 6.4% 0.62 [0.26, Subtotal (95% CI) 6.4% 0.62 [0.26,	1.48]	13.1.3 Dual ICIs	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable		Cascone 2021 -0.9163 0.483 6.0% 0.40 [0.16, 1.03] Subtotal (95% CI) 6.0% 0.40 [0.16, 1.03]	•
12 1 4 Chemo		Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.90 (P = 0.06)	
Forde 2021 -2.3212 0.262 7.4% 0.10 [0.06, Subtract (05% C) 7.4% 0.10 [0.06]	0.16]	13.1.4 Chemo	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable		Forde 2021 -3.7785 0.5057 5.8% 0.02 [0.01, 0.06] Subtotal (95% CI) 5.8% 0.02 [0.01, 0.06]	•
Total (95% CI) 100.0% 0.65 [0.40	1.071	Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 7.47 (P < 0.00001)	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.80; Chi ² = 128.56, df = 14 (P < 0.00001); $I2 = 89$	^{1.07} 0.001 0.1 1 10 1000	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 0.23 [0.14, 0.38]	. •
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 45.09$, $df = 3$ (P < 0.00001), $i^2 = 93$:.3%	Heterogeneity: $1au^* = 0.82$; $Chi^* = 103.73$, $df = 16$ ($P < 0.00001$); $I^* = 85\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.82$ ($P < 0.00001$)	0.1 i 10 1000
		Test for subgroup differences: Chi [*] = 34.82, df = 3 ($P < 0.00001$), $I^* = 91.4\%$	
С		D	
Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 9!	Odds Ratio 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl	Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI	Odds Ratio IV, Random, 95% Cl
14.1.1 Mono-ICIs Carbone 20210 346_0 1509_17.1% 0.71 (0.53		15.1.1 Mono-ICIs Carbone 2021 -2.2667 0.2548 11.5% 0.10 [0.06, 0.17]	-
Eichhorn 2021 -0.346 0.1309 17.1% 0.71 (0.33, Bichhorn 2021 0.1335 0.5175 8.2% 1.14 [0.41,	3.15]	Cascone 2021 -1.8971 0.6191 5.1% 0.15 [0.04, 0.50]	
Forde 2018 -1.2238 0.5087 8.3% 0.29 [0.11, Gao 2020 0.1001 0.3166 12.7% 1.11 [0.59,	2.06]	Forde 2018 -3.0445 1.0235 2.4% 0.05 [0.01, 0.35]	
Subtotal (95% Cl) 46.4% 0.75 [0.48, Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10; Chi ² = 5.69, df = 3 (P = 0.13); $I2 = 47\%$		Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.25; Chi ² = 7.94; df = 4 (P = 0.09); l ² = 50%	◆
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.26$ (P = 0.21)		Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.88 (P < 0.00001)$	
14.1.2 ICIs+chemo Forde 2021 -0.0568 0.1066 18.0% 0.94 [0.77,	1.16]	15.1.2 ICIs+chemo Forde 2021	-
Provencio 2020 2.6626 0.5972 6.9% 14.33 [4.45, 4 Shen 2021 0.8602 0.3597 11.6% 2.36 [1.17]	6.21]	Provencio 2020 -0.8267 0.3204 10.0% 0.44 [0.23, 0.82]	
Subtotal (95% CI) 36.5% 2.83 [0.76, 1 Hotoranophy Taud = 1.20; Chil = 25.04, df = 2 (8 < 0.00001); ll = 9.2%	0.53]	Tfayli 2020 -1.0116 0.5839 5.5% 0.36 [0.12, 1.14]	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.55$ (P = 0.12)		Yang 2018 -1.0986 0.4714 7.1% 0.33 [0.13, 0.84] Zinner 2020 -1.7047 7.587 3.7% 0.33 [0.04, 0.14]	
14.1.4 Chemo		Subtotal (95% CI) $52.0\% 0.22 [0.14, 0.36]$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.21; Chi ² = 14.6% df = 6 ($\beta = 0.02$); $l^2 = 50\%$	◆
Forde 2021 -0.0112 0.1495 17.1% 0.99 [0.74, Subtotal (95% Cl) 17.1% 0.99 [0.74,	1.33]	Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.12$ (P < 0.00001)	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.07$ (P = 0.94)		15.1.3 Dual ICIs Cascone 2021 -2.2513 0.7434 3.9% 0.11 [0.02. 0.45]	
Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 1.14 [0.78,	1.68]	Subtotal (95% CI) 3.9% 0.11 [0.02, 0.45] Heterogeneity: Not applicable	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 36.63, df = 7 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 81% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.68 (P = 0.50)	0.001 0.1 1 10 1000	Test for overall effect: Z = 3.03 (P = 0.002)	
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 3.79$, $df = 2$ (P = 0.15), $I^2 = 47.2\%$		15.1.4 Chemo Forde 2021 -1.3449 0.1846 13.0% 0.26 [0.18, 0.37]	-
_		Subtotal (95% Cl) 13.0% 0.26 [0.18, 0.37] Heterogeneity: Not applicable	•
E Odds Rat	tio Odds Ratio	Test for overall effect: $Z = 7.29 (P < 0.00001)$	
Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random 16.1.1 Mono-ICIs	1, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 0.19 [0.14, 0.27] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19; Chi ² = 33.18, df = 13 (P = 0.002); l ² = 61%	0,1 1 10 1000
Carbone 2021 1.9779 0.2275 10.7% 7.23 [4.6] Cascone 2021 2.35137526 0.74001287 4.1% 10.50 [2.4]	3, 11.29]	Test for overall effect: $Z = 9.63$ (P < 0.00001) Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 3.52, df = 3 (P = 0.32), i ² = 14.8%	
Eichhorn 2021 3.4012 1.4376 1.4% 30.00 [1.79, Forde 2018 2.3026 0.7416 4.1% 10.00 [2.3	, 502.12] 4, 42.78]	_	
Gao 2020 2.5123 0.6003 5.4% 12.33 [3.8] Subtotal (95% CI) 25.8% 8.24 [5.6] Hotomorphic Turi2 = 0.00. Chi2 = 1.77. df = 4.09 = 0.78% 12.9	2, 12.08]	F	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 10.80$ (P < 0.00001)		Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% Cl 37.1 J. Mano. ICI.	IV, Random, 95% Cl
16.1.2 ICIs+chemo Duan 2021 1.8971 0.6191 5.2% 6.67 [1.9	8, 22.43]	Carbone 2021 -2.4039 0.2696 20.1% 0.09 [0.05, 0.15]	
Forde 2021 1.60274892 0.20011183 11.1% 4.97 [3.7] Provencio 2020 2.1041 0.4737 6.9% 8.20 [3.2]	4, 20.75]	Forde 2018 -3.7842 1.4302 2.9% 0.02 [0.00, 0.37]	
Rothschild 2020 1.4424 0.3084 9.4% 4.23 [2.: Shen 2021 4.3041 1.4237 1.5% 74.00 [4.54,]	31, 7.74] 1205.32]	Subtotal (95% Cl) 34.5% 0.08 [0.05, 0.13] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00: Chi ² = 1.68. df = 3 (P = 0.64): l ² = 0%	•
Shu 2020 1.8718 0.5371 6.1% 6.50 [2.2] Tfayli 2020 1.0116 0.5839 5.5% 2.75 [0.1]	7, 18.62]	Test for overall effect: Z = 10.34 (P < 0.00001)	
Wang 2021 4.9698 1.4191 1.5% 144.00 [8.92, Yang 2018 0.1671 0.4097 7.8% 1.18 [0.17]	2324.32] 53, 2.64]	17.1.2 ICls+chemo Forde 2021 -1.5632251 0.20011183 22.2% 0.21 [0.14. 0.31]	+
2inner 2020 3.2581 1.4412 1.4% 26.00 [1.54] Subtotal (95% Cl) 5.39 [3.]	(436.25) 14, 9.26]	Provencio 2020 -4.5218 1.4219 3.0% 0.01 [0.00, 0.18] Shen 2021 -4.3041 1.4237 3.0% 0.01 [0.00, 0.22]	
Test for overall effect: Z = 6.11 (P < 0.00001)		Shu 2020 -4.0943 1.4259 3.0% 0.02 [0.00, 0.27] Wang 2021 -4.9698 1.4191 3.0% 0.01 [0.00, 0.11]	
16.1.3 Dual ICIs Cascone 2021 1.16315081 0.51234754 6.4% 3.20 [1	17, 8.73]	Yang 2018 -2.3979 0.7385 8.4% 0.09 [0.02, 0.39] Subtotal (95% CI) 42.5% 0.04 [0.01, 0.15]	-
Subtotal (95% CI) 6.4% 3.20 [1.: Heterogeneity: Not applicable	17, 8.73]	Heterogeneity: Tau [*] = 1.63; Chi [*] = 16.38, df = 5 (P = 0.006); i^2 = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.72 (P < 0.00001)	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.27$ (P = 0.02)		17.1.3 Chemo	_
16.1.4 Chemo Forde 2021 1.12108514 0.17359343 11.5% 3.07 [2.	18, 4.31]	rorae 20211.8653713 0.17359343 23.076 0.15 [0.11, 0.22] Subtotal (95% CI) 23.0% 0.15 [0.11, 0.22]	↓
Subtotal (95% Cl) 11.5% 3.07 (2.) Heterogeneity: Not applicable	18, 4.31]	Test for overall effect: $Z = 10.75$ (P < 0.00001)	
Test for overall effect: Z = 6.46 (P < 0.00001)	88 7 031	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 0.09 [0.05, 0.14] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.27; Chi ² = 24.39, df = 10 (P = 0.007): l ² = 59% →	• •
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.26; Chi ² = 42.03, df = 16 (P = 0.0004); l ² = 62% Test for overall effect: Z = 9.38 (P < 0.00001) Test for subroup differences: Chi ² = 15.11. df = 3 (P = 0.002). l ² = 90.1%		Test for overall effect: Z = 9.41 (P < 0.00001)	0.1 1 10 1000

Figure 3 Forest plot of the efficacy and safety of subgroup analysis based on different neoadjuvant treatment modes. (A) MPR rate; (B) pCR rate; (C) incidence of TRAEs; (D) incidence of SAEs; (E) resection rate; (F) surgical delay rate. MPR, major pathological response; pCR, complete pathological response; TRAE, treatment-related adverse event; SAE, severe adverse event; ICIs, immune checkpoint inhibitors; chemo, chemotherapy; ICI + chemo, immune checkpoint inhibitors plus chemotherapy; SE, standard error; IV, inverse variance; CI, confidence interval.

A Odds Ratio Odds Ratio	B Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI	Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI 18.2.1 Nivolumab
Cascone 2021 -0.869 0.3304 8.9% 0.42 [0.22, 0.80]	Cascone 2021 -1.5041 0.3909 8.2% 0.22 [0.10, 0.48]
Forde 2018 -0.5377 0.4358 8.0% 0.09 [0.30, 1.62]	Forde 2021 -1.1515 0.175 9.7% 0.32 [0.22, 0.45]
Provencio 2020 1.0415 0.3358 8.9% 2.83 [1.47, 5.47] Zinner 2020 1.7047 0.7687 5.3% 5.50 [1.22, 24.81]	Provencio 2020 0.2624 0.2974 8.9% 1.30 [0.73, 2.33] Zinner 2020 -0.47 0.5701 6.7% 0.63 [0.20, 1.91]
Subtotal (95% CI) 41.3% 1.06 [0.48, 2.33]	Subtotal (95% Cl) 39.8% 0.41 [0.19, 0.86] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.55; Chi ² = 22.62, df = 4 (P = 0.0002); i ² = 82%
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.14$ (P = 0.89)	Test for overall effect: Z = 2.36 (P = 0.02)
18.1.2 Pembrolizumab	18.2.2 Pembrolizumab
Eichhorn 2021 –1.0116 0.5839 6.7% 0.36 [0.12, 1.14] Shen 2021 0.6131 0.3444 8.8% 1.85 [0.94, 3.63]	Shen 2021 -0.1625 0.3299 8.7% 0.85 [0.45, 1.62]
Subtotal (95% CI) 15.5% 0.88 [0.18, 4.29] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.09: Chi ² = 5.74. df = 1 (P = 0.02): l ² = 83%	Wang 2021 -0.88/3 0.2593 9.2% 0.41 [0.25, 0.68]
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.16$ (P = 0.87)	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.26; Chi ² = 5.56, df = 2 (P = 0.06); l ² = 64% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.05 (P = 0.04)
18.1.3 Durvalumab	18.2.3 Durvalumab
Kothschild 2020 –0.0588 0.2426 9.6% 0.94 [0.59, 1.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 9.6% 0.94 [0.59, 1.52]	Rothschild 2020 -1.7579 0.3424 8.6% 0.17 [0.09, 0.34]
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.24 (P = 0.81)	Heterogeneity: Not applicable
1814 Aterolizumah	Test for overall effect: Z = 5.13 (P < 0.00001)
Carbone 2021 -1.6161 0.1999 9.9% 0.20 [0.13, 0.29]	18.2.4 Atezolizumab Carbone 2021 -2.8391 0.3253 8.7% 0.06 (0.03. 0.11)
Shu 2020 0.2683 0.3684 8.6% 1.31 [0.64, 2.69] Subtotal (95% CI) 18.5% 0.50 [0.08, 3.15]	Shu 2020 -0.6931 0.3873 8.2% 0.50 [0.23, 1.07]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.69; Chi ² = 20.21, df = 1 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95% Test for overall effect: $7 = 0.74$ (P = 0.46)	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.17; Chi ² = 18.00, df = 1 (P < 0.0001); i ² = 94%
1915 Circiliansh	lest for overall effect: $Z = 1.66 (P = 0.10)$
Gao 2020 -0.5108 0.3266 8.9% 0.60 [0.32, 1.14]	18.2.5 Sintilimab Gao 2020 -1.7346 0.4428 7.8% 0.18 [0.07, 0.42]
Subtotal (95% CI) 8.9% 0.60 [0.32, 1.14]	Subtotal (95% Cl) 7.8% 0.18 [0.07, 0.42]
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.56 (P = 0.12)	Test for overall effect: Z = 3.92 (P < 0.0001)
18.1.6 Avelumab	18.2.6 Avelumab
Trayli 2020 -1.3863 0.6455 6.2% 0.25 [0.07, 0.89] Subtotal (95% CI) 6.2% 0.25 [0.07, 0.89]	Tfayli 2020 -2.6391 1.0351 3.7% 0.07 [0.01, 0.54] Subtotal (95% Cl) 3.7% 0.07 [0.01, 0.54]
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.15$ (P = 0.03)	Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Total (95% CI) 100.0% 0.77 [0.47, 1.26]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.61; Chi ² = 82.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 87%	1000 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.62; Chi ² = 72.17, df = 12 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 83%
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 5.19$, $df = 5$ (P = 0.39), $I^2 = 3.6\%$	Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.93$ (P < 0.00001) Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 7.63, df = 5 (P = 0.18), l ² = 34.4%
•	-
С	D
Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI
18.3.1 Nivolumab	18.4.1 Nivolumab
Forde 2021 -0.0568 0.1066 19.7% 0.94 [0.77, 1.16]	Forde 2018 -3.0445 1.0235 3.6% 0.05 [0.01, 0.35]
Provencio 2020 2.6626 0.5972 9.5% 14.33 [4.45, 46.21] Subtotal (95% Cl) 40.3% 1.50 [0.29, 7.72]	Provencio 2020 -0.8267 0.328 15.5% 0.25 [0.19, 0.33]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.89; Chi ² = 25.90, df = 2 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 92% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.49 (P = 0.63)	Zinner 2020 -1.7047 0.7687 5.5% 0.18 [0.04, 0.82] Subtotal (95% Cl) 46.2% 0.23 [0.14, 0.38]
18.3.2 Pembrolizumah	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; Chi ² = 7.82, df = 4 (P = 0.10); I ² = 49% Test for overall effect: $7 = 5.82$ (P < 0.00001)
Eichhorn 2021 0.1335 0.5175 10.9% 1.14 [0.41, 3.15]	18.4.2 Pembrolizumah
Shen 2021 0.8602 0.3597 14.4% 2.36 [1.17, 4.78] Subtotal (95% CI) 25.3% 1.81 [0.91, 3.59]	Eichhorn 2021 -0.6931 0.5477 8.2% 0.50 [0.17, 1.46]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 1.33, df = 1 (P = 0.25); l ² = 25% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.69 (P = 0.09)	Shen 2021 -2.1102 0.5294 8.5% 0.12 [0.04, 0.34]
18.3.3 Atezolizumab	Subtotal (95% Cl) 24.2% 0.14 [0.04, 0.55] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.14; Chi ² = 9.39, df = 2 (P = 0.009); l ² = 79%
Carbone 2021 -0.346 0.1509 19.0% 0.71 [0.53, 0.95]	Test for overall effect: Z = 2.83 (P = 0.005)
Heterogeneity: Not applicable	18.4.3 Atezolizumab
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.29 (P = 0.02)	Subtotal (95% CI) 13.5% 0.10 [0.06, 0.17]
18.3.4 Sintilimab	Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 8.90 (P < 0.00001)
Subtotal (95% Cl) 15.4% 1.11 [0.59, 2.06]	18.4.4 Sintilimab
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.32 (P = 0.75)	Gao 2020 -2.1972 0.527 8.5% 0.11 [0.04, 0.31]
Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 1.21 [0.74, 1.99]	Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.31; Chi ² = 36.55, df = 6 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 84%	$\frac{1}{1000}$
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 7.23$, $df = 3$ (P = 0.06), $i^2 = 58.5\%$	Tfayli 2020 -1.0116 0.5839 7.7% 0.36 [0.12, 1.14]
-	Subtotal (95% CI) 7.7% 0.36 [0.12, 1.14]
E	Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.73$ (P = 0.08)
Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 0.17 [0.11, 0.27] ◆
18.6.1 Nivolumab Cascone 2021 1.665 0.4122 8.8% 5.29 [2.36. 11.86]	Test for overall effect: Z = 7.92 (P < 0.00001) 0.1 i 10 1000
Forde 2018 2.3026 0.7416 3.1% 10.00 [2.34, 42.78]	Test for subgroup differences: Chi ⁴ = 7.50, df = 4 (P = 0.11), I' = 46.6%
Provencio 2020 2.1041 0.4737 7.0% 8.20 [3.24, 20.75]	
Subtal (95% CI) 43.4% 5.62 [4.08, 7.74]	F
Heterogenery: $1aU = 0.00$; $Ch' = 2.77$, $dr = 4$ ($r = 0.60$); $r = 0.6$ Test for overall effect: Z = 10.59 (P < 0.00001)	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio SE Weight IV. Random, 95% CI IV. Random, 95% CI
18.6.2 Pembrolizumab	18.5.1 Nivolumab
Eichhorn 2021 3.4012 1.4376 0.9% 30.00 [1.79, 502.12] Shen 2021 1.8718 0.5371 5.6% 6.50 [2.27, 18.62]	Forde 2018 -3.7842 1.4302 4.2% 0.02 [0.00, 0.37]
Wang 2021 4.9698 1.4191 0.9% 144.00 [8.92, 2324.32] Subtotal (95% CI) 7.3% 21.38 [3.16, 144.75]	→ Forde 2021 -1.7064 0.1466 24.1% 0.18 [0.14, 0.24] + Provencio 2020 -4.5218 1.4219 4.2% 0.01 [0.00, 0.18] +
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.67; Chi ² = 4.73, df = 2 (P = 0.09); i ² = 58% Test for everyll effect: $Z = 3.14$ (P = 0.002)	Subtotal (95% CI) 50.9% 0.14 [0.07, 0.30]
18.6.3 Dupulumah	Test for overall effect: Z = 5.16 (P < 0.00001)
Rothschild 2020 1.4424 0.3084 13.8% 4.23 [2.31, 7.74]	18.5.2 Pembrolizumab
Subtotal (95% CI) 13.8% 4.23 [2.31, 7.74]	Eichhorn 2021 -3.4012 1.4376 4.1% 0.03 [0.00, 0.56]
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.68 (P < 0.00001)	Wang 2021 -4.9698 1.4191 4.2% 0.01 [0.00, 0.11] Subtotal (95% Cl) 12.5% 0.01 [0.00, 0.07]
18.6.4 Atezolizumab	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.61, df = 2 (P = 0.74); i ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.14$ (P < 0.00001)
Shu 2020 1.8718 0.5371 5.6% 6.50 [2.27, 18.62]	19 C 2 Atomaliyumsh
Subtrait (95% C) 26.1% /.11 [4.72, 10.72] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.03, df = 1 (P = 0.86); i ² = 0%	Carbone 2021 -2.4039 0.2696 21.5% 0.09 [0.05, 0.15]
Test for overall effect: Z = 9.36 (P < 0.00001)	Shu 2020 -4.0943 1.4259 4.2% 0.02 [0.00, 0.27] Subtotal (95% Cl) 25.7% 0.07 [0.02, 0.23]
18.6.5 Sintilimab	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.38; Chi ² = 1.36, df = 1 (P = 0.24); t ² = 26%
Subtotal (95% CI) 4.6% 12.33 [3.80, 40.00]	1 = 0.1 of overall effect: $Z = 4.34$ ($r < 0.00000$)
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 4.19 (P < 0.0001)	10.5.4 SHITHIMAD Gao 2020 -2.9444 0.7255 11.0% 0.05 [0.01, 0.22]
18.6.6 Avelumab	Subtotal (95% Cl) 11.0% 0.05 [0.01, 0.22]
Tfayli 2020 1.0116 0.5839 4.8% 2.75 [0.88, 8.64]	Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.06 (P < 0.0001)$
Heterogeneity: Not applicable	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 0.08 [0.04, 0.14]
Test (0.00/ CI) 100.00/ C 10 (4.75 0.00)	Test for overall effect: Z = 8.08 (P < 0.00001)
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04; Chi ² = 14.42, df = 12 (P = 0.27); l ² = 17%	Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 7.10, df = 3 (P = 0.07), i ² = 57.8%
0.001 0.1	

Figure 4 Forest plot of the efficacy and safety of subgroup analysis based on different ICI types. (A) MPR rate; (B) pCR rate; (C) incidence of TRAEs; (D) incidence of SAEs; (E) resection rate; (F) surgical delay rate. MPR, major pathological response; pCR, complete pathological response; TRAE, treatment-related adverse event; SAE, severe adverse event; SE, standard error; IV, inverse variance; CI, confidence interval; ICIs, immune checkpoint inhibitors.

A	PD-L1 po	sitive	PD-L1 ne	gative		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Carbone 2021	14	58	7	58	36.5%	2.32 [0.86, 6.26]	
Cascone 2021	5	8	3	16	9.9%	7.22 [1.08, 48.47]	
Eichhorn 2021	4	10	0	5	3.7%	7.62 [0.33, 175.01]	
Forde 2018	3	7	2	8	7.5%	2.25 [0.25, 20.13]	
Gao 2020	7	22	4	10	14.9%	0.70 [0.15, 3.30]	
Provencio 2020	16	18	4	7	8.2%	6.00 [0.74, 48.90]	
Shu 2020	10	16	6	12	15.6%	1.67 [0.37, 7.61]	
Tfayli 2020	1	4	1	9	3.8%	2.67 [0.12, 57.62]	
Total (95% CI)		143		125	100.0%	2.33 [1.28, 4.25]	◆
Total events	60		27				
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.00; Chi ²	= 5.19,	df = 7 (P =	0.64); I	[!] = 0%		
Test for overall effect	t: Z = 2.77 (P = 0.00	6)				Favours [PD-L1 negative] Favours [PD-L1 positive]
В	PD-11 po	citivo	PD-11 ne	astive		Odds Patio	Odde Patio
Study or Subaroup	FU-LI po	Total	FU-LI lie	Total	Weight	M-H Random 95% CL	M-H Random 95% CI
Cascone 2021	Lvents	2	2	16	7 1%	7 00 10 02 52 221	
Eichhorn 2021	2	10	0	10	2.8%	3 24 [0 13 80 99]	
Forde 2018	1	7	1	8	2.0%	1 17 [0 06 22 94]	
Forde 2021	24	98	17	155	62.8%	2 63 [1 33 5 21]	
Gao 2020	24	22	1	10	5 1%	1 42 [0 13 15 64]	
Provencio 2020	13	18	2	7	7.8%	6 50 [0 94 45 11]	
Shu 2020	13	18	2	12	8.7%	13 00 [2 07 81 48]	
Tfayli 2020	1	4	ō	9	2.5%	8.14 [0.26, 250.73]	
Total (95% CI)		185		222	100.0%	3.39 [1.98, 5.83]	•
Total events	61		25				-
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.00; Chi ²	= 4.76,	df = 7 (P =	0.69); I ²	[!] = 0%		
Test for overall effect	t: Z = 4.43 (I	P < 0.00	001)	- ,, .			0.001 0.1 1 10 1000
							Favours [PD-L1 negative] Favours [PD-L1 positive]

Figure 5 Forest plot of the pathological response of subgroup analysis based on PD-L1 expression. (A) MPR among patients with negative or positive PD-L1 expression; (B) pCR among patients with negative or positive PD-L1 expression. PD-L1 negative, PD-L1 TPS <1%; PD-L1 positive, PD-L1 TPS \geq 1%; MPR, major pathological response; pCR, complete pathological response; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; CI, confidence interval; PD-L1, programmed death-ligand 1.

those who received nivolumab-based neoadjuvant therapy were more likely [12.3% (95% CI: 6.5–23.1%)] to have surgical delay. Overall, there were no significant findings on the correlations between ICI types and the efficacy or safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy.

PD-L1 expression, histology subtypes and smoking status

Next, we explored the potential effect of PD-L1 expression, histology subtypes and smoking status on efficacy of neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy. As shown in *Figure 5*, patients with positive PD-L1 expression [defined as tumor proportion score (TPS) $\geq 1\%$] showed significantly improved MPR (OR 2.33, 95% CI: 1.28–4.25, P=0.006) and pCR rates (OR 3.39, 95% CI: 1.98–5.83, P<0.001) than those PD-L1 negative patients (defined as TPS <1%). Neither squamous cell carcinoma nor smoking status had significant effects on MPR and pCR rates (Figure S3). But smokers showed a tendency of better MPR rate than nonsmokers, without statistical significance found (OR 2.18, 95% CI: 0.84–5.65, P=0.11). Analyses of resection rate, incidence of TRAEs and SAEs were not performed in these subgroups, due to no available data provided in enrolled studies.

Sensitivity analysis

Our subgroup analysis data suggested that different

neoadjuvant treatment modes were one of the main sources of heterogeneity. Subsequently, to ensure that the combined results were not severely swayed by certain trials, we performed sensitivity analysis for studies within the mono-ICI subgroup and ICI plus chemotherapy subgroup. As shown in Figure S4, the Carbone 2021 study (14) was the main source of statistical heterogeneity in the meta-analysis for MPR rate in the mono-ICI subgroup. After removing this outlier study, there was no heterogeneity among the remaining studies (P=0.70, $I^2=0\%$).

For studies included in the ICI plus chemotherapy subgroup (namely the chemoimmunotherapy subgroup), significant heterogeneity was observed in the meta-analysis for all endpoints (Figure 3). Therefore, a sensitivity analysis was performed, in which 1 study was removed at a time, to evaluate whether the results could have been significantly affected by a single study (Figure S5). We found that the removal of 3 studies decreased the heterogeneity for the metaanalysis of MPR and pCR rates (Figure S5A, S5B). Removal of any of these studies at a time did not significantly change our results (Table S1). For the incidence of TRAEs, only 3 studies were included in the ICI plus chemotherapy subgroup. Removing the Forde 2021 (25) or Provencio 2020 (28) study markedly reduced the heterogeneity, but the latter one affected the pooled incidence of TRAEs (Figure S5C). The Wang 2021 study (21) made the largest contribution to heterogeneity for the incidence of SAEs (Figure S5D). The

Yang 2018 study (24) and Forde 2021 study (25) were the most significant contributors to heterogeneity in the metaanalysis of resection rate and surgical delay rate, respectively (Figure S5E,S5F). As shown in Table S1, after removal of any of the above studies, the MPR and pCR rates of the ICI plus chemotherapy subgroup were consistently higher than those of the mono-ICI subgroup, and the incidence of SAEs, resection rate, and surgical delay rate appeared to be comparable to the mono-ICI subgroup, confirming the stability of our results.

Profiles of TRAEs and SAEs in patients who received neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy

We further summarized the profiles of TRAEs and SAEs after neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy according to different organ systems. There were 11 studies (n=367) reporting the profiles of TRAEs and 12 studies (n=380) reporting the profiles of SAEs. As shown in *Figure 6A*, TRAEs (any grade) with incidence >10% included fatigue (32.2%), alopecia (27.2%), anorexia (22.3%), nausea (18.0%), rash (16.9%), anemia (14.4%), neutropenia (13.4%), and diarrhea (10.4%). The most common SAEs which occurred in NSCLC patients who received neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy included neutropenia (5.5%), increased liver enzymes (1.8%), pneumonitis (1.3%), rash (1.1%), thrombocytopenia (1.1%), and febrile neutropenia (1.1%) (*Figure 6B*).

Discussion

In this study, we conducted a meta-analysis of 16 studies focusing on neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy in resectable NSCLC. Our results supported the efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy and chemoimmunotherapy. More importantly, we found that neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy had significantly higher MPR and pCR rates than neoadjuvant single-agent immunotherapy, without increasing the incidence of SAEs or surgical delay in patients with NSCLC.

Over the past decades, numerous studies have been conducted to optimize the treatment modalities for NSCLC, but the 5-year survival rate of patients remains poor. Despite surgery and adjuvant therapy, about 20–30% of patients with stage I, 50% of patients with stage II, and 60% of patients with stage IIIA NSCLC die within 5 years (34). In recent years, an increased number of clinical trials have reported the efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy

or chemoimmunotherapy in NSCLC using different treatment modes and various ICIs. Results from a metaanalysis by Jia *et al.* (33) published in 2020 supported the efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy in stages I–III NSCLC. However, only 7 studies and 252 patients were included, among which only 1 study (CheckMate 159 trial) provided complete published data, while the other 6 studies were all ongoing. Limited research was included in this meta-analysis, making it difficult to reveal differences among different treatment modes and ICI types. So far, more data have been released from a series of clinical trials. Thus, it is necessary to perform a meta-analysis with newly updated research data.

Our results showed that the pooled MPR rate and pCR rate of neoadjuvant immunotherapy and chemoimmunotherapy were 43.5% and 21.9%, respectively. These rates were remarkably higher if using previous published data on neoadjuvant chemotherapy as a historical control which showed a pooled pCR rate of 4% (9). Updated data from the CheckMate 816 trial (25) also demonstrated the advantages of neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy over chemotherapy alone in NSCLC by showing a significantly higher MPR rate (37% vs. 9%) and pCR rate (24% vs. 2%) in the chemoimmunotherapy arm. Although the median overall survival and recurrence-free survival were not reached in the studies of our meta-analysis, clinical benefits in survival outcomes can be expected based on the association of MPR or pCR with improved survival (10,35). On the other hand, it has been reported that chemotherapy can enhance the efficacy of immunotherapy by increasing tumor antigen presentation (36,37). However, whether the combination of immunotherapy and chemotherapy before surgery has a synergistic effect remains unclear. Interestingly, in the subgroup analysis based on neoadjuvant treatment modes, the MPR rate and pCR rate of the ICI plus chemotherapy subgroup were higher than those of the mono-ICI subgroup. Meanwhile, dual ICIs of nivolumab plus ipilimumab exhibited a high pCR rate comparable to neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy. These data consistently demonstrate that neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy and dual ICIs are advantageous for the pathological response of NSCLC patients over single-agent immunotherapy or chemotherapy alone.

Different kinds of ICIs were used in the studies included in this meta-analysis. While these ICIs act against tumor cells through similar molecular mechanisms, they may result in different efficacy and safety profiles in NSCLC (38,39). Our subgroup analysis based on ICI types suggested



Figure 6 Pooled incidence of TRAEs and SAEs reported in clinical trials. TRAE, treatment-related adverse event; SAE, severe adverse event.

that there is no evidence for a dominant or superior ICI in neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy at present. However, nivolumab- and pembrolizumab-based neoadjuvant therapy showed a higher MPR rate (nivolumab 51.5%, pembrolizumab 46.8%) and pCR rate (nivolumab 29.1%, pembrolizumab 31.5%), while avelumab-based neoadjuvant therapy had a relatively lower MPR rate (20.0%) and pCR rate (6.5%). Furthermore, the pooled MPR rate was similar among anti-PD-1 agents (nivolumab 51.5%, pembrolizumab 46.8%) and anti-PD-L1 agents (durvalumab 48.5%, atezolizumab 33.3%), but the pooled pCR rate for neoadjuvant regimens using anti-PD-1 agents (nivolumab 29.1%, pembrolizumab 31.5%) was significantly higher than those using anti-PD-L1 agents (durvalumab 14.5%, atezolizumab 14.5%).

Clinical and histopathological characteristics of NSCLC patients affect the efficacy of immunotherapy. PD-L1 TPS is a well-recognized biomarker for response to ICIs based on abundant clinical research data (40). Single-agent pembrolizumab has been recommended as the first-line treatment in stage IV NSCLC patients with PD-L1 TPS \geq 50% and without EGFR/ALK aberrations. However, potential effect of PD-L1 TPS on efficacy of neoadjuvant immunotherapy remains unclear. In this meta-analysis, our data demonstrate that patients with PD-L1 TPS \geq 1% have a favorable pathological response to neoadjuvant ICIs either combined with chemotherapy or not. It suggests that

PD-L1 TPS may be a useful biomarker of MPR or overall response rate in the era of neoadjuvant immunotherapy, which needs more clinical studies to confirm.

It has been observed that patients with stage III NSCLC appear to have a better response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy than those with stage I or II disease (41). Whether a similar phenomenon exists in neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy remains unknown. In the NADIM trial and SAKK 16/14 trial, which exclusively enrolled patients with stage III NSCLC, the MPR rate after neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy appeared higher than other trials. The NADIM trial reported a remarkable pCR rate of 57%. However, the pCR rates reported in the SAKK 16/14 trial and another prospective single-arm study in stage IIIA NSCLC (21) were 15% and 29%, respectively, which did not support this point.

The key findings of this meta-analysis also include the safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy prior to surgery without significant surgical delays. In a previous meta-analysis including 36 phase II/III clinical trials, the pooled incidence for all-grade irAEs was estimated to range between 54% and 76% in cancers, included lung cancer, melanoma, urinary system cancer, head and neck cancer, and digestive system cancer (39). For patients with lung cancer, Berti *et al.* (42) reported that the incidence of all-grade irAEs and severe irAEs for ICIs were 37.1% and 18.5%, respectively. It is recognized that

the incidence of TRAEs or SAEs significantly increases if ICIs are combined with chemotherapy (43). Therefore, the safety of neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy has attracted significant attention. In the present meta-analysis, only 5 trials enrolled NSCLC patients who received mono-ICIs before surgery, while the others were either combined with chemotherapy or ipilimumab. Thus, the incidence of TRAEs after neoadjuvant therapy was used as a major safety-related endpoint, rather than irAEs. Our results showed that the pooled incidence of TRAEs in the 16 studies was 54.8%, which seemed higher than previously published data of neoadjuvant immunotherapy. The inclusion of patients who received chemoimmunotherapy could explain this difference. Interestingly, while subgroup analysis demonstrated that the combination of chemotherapy before surgery increased the incidence of TRAEs (73.9% vs. 42.9%), it did not significantly increase the incidence of SAEs (18.0% vs. 12.3%, P=0.32). Besides, the incidence of SAEs seemed similar between mono-ICI and dual ICIs subgroups (12.3% vs. 9.9%). Compared with patients who received immunotherapy, the pooled resection rate was similar and the surgical delay rate was even lower in those who received neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy. Therefore, our data demonstrates that both neoadjuvant immunotherapy and chemoimmunotherapy are tolerable for patients with NSCLC.

Fibrosis and adhesion in the chest cavity have been reported after neoadjuvant ICIs, which could potentially increase the risk of conversion from minimally invasive surgery to thoracotomy during the operation. In this metaanalysis, only 3 studies provided data on conversion, and the pooled conversion rate was 17.4%. Notably, the conversion rate in the Forde 2018 study (13) was higher than the other 2 studies [Duan 2021 (22), Yang 2018 (24)], which suggests that chemoimmunotherapy before surgery may help reduce surgical complexity compared with neoadjuvant immunotherapy alone. However, more randomized clinical trials are required to further confirm these observations.

Heterogeneity cannot be ignored in this meta-analysis. Our subgroup analysis demonstrated that different treatment modes are a main source of heterogeneity. After subgroup analysis based on treatment modes, heterogeneity in the mono-ICI subgroup markedly reduced. However, significant heterogeneity was still observed within the ICI plus chemotherapy subgroup. Multiple factors may contribute to the heterogeneity, including clinical staging, histology subtypes, PD-L1 expression level, smoking status and ethnicity of patients. These clinical trials were conducted in America, Asia and Europe, and enrolled patients from different ethnic groups. While most trials enrolled patients with stages I-III NSCLC, some were focused on stage III disease. The proportions of squamous cell carcinoma in these studies were also markedly different, ranging from 13% to 100%. PD-L1 TPS of patients and proportion of smokers also varied in these studies. Diversity in patient characteristics may explain the large heterogeneity in the incidence of TRAEs in the chemoimmunotherapy subgroup. ICI types can also be an important source of heterogeneity. Varying degrees of differences in endpoints were shown in subgroups of different ICIs, even though no statistical significance was seen in the subgroup analysis, which may be explained by the small sample size. Furthermore, study design and quality may also affect the homogeneity of these studies. Only 2 were randomized clinical trials, while the others were phase 1 or 2 single-arm studies. Removal of 1 study at a time could not eliminate the heterogeneity in this meta-analysis. However, based on the data of the sensitivity analysis, removal of any study did not significantly change our results or affect the overall conclusion. The results of sensitivity analyses for different endpoints were consistent (except for TRAEs for the chemoimmunotherapy subgroup), leading to solid conclusions.

There are several limitations in this meta-analysis. Firstly, although 16 studies were included, most were nonrandomized single-arm clinical trials with a small sample size. As a consequence, this set of comparative analyses were based on indirect comparisons. Secondly, not all the included studies provided data on all key endpoints, and some have not yet reached their endpoint. Therefore, complete patient data for these studies are not available at present. Furthermore, the follow-up periods of these studies were relatively short, with limited data reporting on survival outcomes. With the rapid growth in the number of active trials on neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy, we believe that more conclusive meta-analyses can be conducted by including more largescale multicenter randomized clinical trials.

In conclusion, this meta-analysis demonstrated the efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy and chemoimmunotherapy. Neoadjuvant chemoimmunotherapy provide a significant improvement in pathological response versus single-agent immunotherapy, without increasing the incidence of SAEs or surgical delay. Neoadjuvant dual ICIs of nivolumab and ipilimumab also achieve an impressive pCR rate with tolerable toxicity, which needs further confirmation by more clinical trials. Our data support the potential application of neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy for resectable stages I–III disease. However, the effect on long term survival and recurrence is yet to be determined. In addition, there are more frequent TRAEs and SAEs related to chemoimmunotherapy even though significance was not found in our meta-analysis. Therefore, neoadjuvant therapy regimens should be chosen with caution based on comprehensive evaluation of individual benefits and risks when implementing in clinical practice.

Acknowledgments

The authors appreciate the academic support from the AME Lung Cancer Collaborative Group.

Funding: This study was supported by Major Science and Technology Project of Hunan Province (2019SK2251 to ML), Natural Science Foundation of China (81903020 to ML), China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2019M652812 to ML), and National Multidisciplinary Cooperative Diagnosis and Treatment Capacity Building Project for Major Diseases (Lung Cancer, z027002).

Footnote

Reporting Checklist: The authors have completed the PRISMA reporting checklist. Available at https://tlcr. amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/tlcr-22-75/rc

Conflicts of Interest: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at https://tlcr.amegroups. com/article/view/10.21037/tlcr-22-75/coif). Prof. SY serves as an unpaid editorial board member of *Translational Lung Cancer Research* from October 2021 to September 2023. The other authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Open Access Statement: This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the

original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

References

- Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2020. CA Cancer J Clin 2020;70:7-30.
- Zappa C, Mousa SA. Non-small cell lung cancer: current treatment and future advances. Transl Lung Cancer Res 2016;5:288-300.
- Duma N, Santana-Davila R, Molina JR. Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: Epidemiology, Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment. Mayo Clin Proc 2019;94:1623-40.
- Uprety D, Mandrekar SJ, Wigle D, et al. Neoadjuvant Immunotherapy for NSCLC: Current Concepts and Future Approaches. J Thorac Oncol 2020;15:1281-97.
- Blumenthal GM, Bunn PA Jr, Chaft JE, et al. Current Status and Future Perspectives on Neoadjuvant Therapy in Lung Cancer. J Thorac Oncol 2018;13:1818-31.
- Pisters KM, Vallières E, Crowley JJ, et al. Surgery with or without preoperative paclitaxel and carboplatin in earlystage non-small-cell lung cancer: Southwest Oncology Group Trial S9900, an intergroup, randomized, phase III trial. J Clin Oncol 2010;28:1843-9.
- Scagliotti GV, Pastorino U, Vansteenkiste JF, et al. Randomized phase III study of surgery alone or surgery plus preoperative cisplatin and gemcitabine in stages IB to IIIA non-small-cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol 2012;30:172-8.
- Ren S, Xu A, Lin Y, et al. A narrative review of primary research endpoints of neoadjuvant therapy for lung cancer: past, present and future. Transl Lung Cancer Res 2021;10:3264-75.
- 9. NSCLC Meta-analysis Collaborative Group. Preoperative chemotherapy for non-small-cell lung cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data. Lancet 2014;383:1561-71.
- Hellmann MD, Chaft JE, William WN Jr, et al. Pathological response after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in resectable non-small-cell lung cancers: proposal for the use of major pathological response as a surrogate endpoint. Lancet Oncol 2014;15:e42-50.
- Kang J, Zhang C, Zhong WZ. Neoadjuvant immunotherapy for non-small cell lung cancer: State of the art. Cancer Commun (Lond) 2021;41:287-302.
- 12. Mencoboni M, Ceppi M, Bruzzone M, et al. Effectiveness and Safety of Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors for Patients

293

with Advanced Non Small-Cell Lung Cancer in Real-World: Review and Meta-Analysis. Cancers (Basel) 2021;13:1388.

- Forde PM, Chaft JE, Smith KN, et al. Neoadjuvant PD-1 Blockade in Resectable Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med 2018;378:1976-86.
- Carbone D, Lee J, Kris M, et al. Clinical/Biomarker Data for Neoadjuvant Atezolizumab in Resectable Stage IB-IIIB NSCLC: Primary Analysis in the LCMC3 Study. Journal of Thoracic Oncology 2021;16:S115-S116.
- 15. Gao S, Li N, Gao S, et al. Neoadjuvant PD-1 inhibitor (Sintilimab) in NSCLC. J Thorac Oncol 2020;15:816-26.
- Eichhorn F, Klotz LV, Kriegsmann M, et al. Neoadjuvant anti-programmed death-1 immunotherapy by pembrolizumab in resectable non-small cell lung cancer: First clinical experience. Lung Cancer 2021;153:150-7.
- Bott MJ, Yang SC, Park BJ, et al. Initial results of pulmonary resection after neoadjuvant nivolumab in patients with resectable non-small cell lung cancer. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2019;158:269-76.
- Cascone T, William WN Jr, Weissferdt A, et al. Neoadjuvant nivolumab or nivolumab plus ipilimumab in operable non-small cell lung cancer: the phase 2 randomized NEOSTAR trial. Nat Med 2021;27:504-14.
- Shu CA, Gainor JF, Awad MM, et al. Neoadjuvant atezolizumab and chemotherapy in patients with resectable non-small-cell lung cancer: an open-label, multicentre, single-arm, phase 2 trial. Lancet Oncol 2020;21:786-95.
- 20. Shen D, Wang J, Wu J, et al. Neoadjuvant pembrolizumab with chemotherapy for the treatment of stage IIB-IIIB resectable lung squamous cell carcinoma. J Thorac Dis 2021;13:1760-8.
- Wang J, Li J, Cai L, et al. The safety and efficacy of neoadjuvant programmed death 1 inhibitor therapy with surgical resection in stage IIIA non-small cell lung cancer. Ann Transl Med 2021;9:486.
- 22. Duan H, Wang T, Luo Z, et al. Neoadjuvant programmed cell death protein 1 inhibitors combined with chemotherapy in resectable non-small cell lung cancer: an open-label, multicenter, single-arm study. Transl Lung Cancer Res 2021;10:1020-8.
- 23. Tfayli A, Al Assaad M, Fakhri G, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy and Avelumab in early stage resectable nonsmall cell lung cancer. Cancer Med 2020;9:8406-11.
- Yang CJ, McSherry F, Mayne NR, et al. Surgical Outcomes After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy and Ipilimumab for Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. Ann Thorac Surg 2018;105:924-9.

- 25. Forde PM, Spicer J, Lu S, et al. Nivolumab (NIVO) + platinum-doublet chemotherapy (chemo) vs chemo as neoadjuvant treatment (tx) for resectable (IB-IIIA) non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) in the phase 3 CheckMate 816 trial. In: Proceedings of the 112th Annual Meeting of the American Association for Cancer Research; 2021 April 10-15. Philadelphia (PA): AACR; 2021.
- 26. Rothschild SI, Zippelius A, Eboulet EI, et al. SAKK 16/14: Durvalumab in Addition to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Patients With Stage IIIA(N2) Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer-A Multicenter Single-Arm Phase II Trial. J Clin Oncol 2021;39:2872-80.
- 27. Zinner R, Axelrod R, Solomides CC, et al. Neoadjuvant nivolumab (N) plus cisplatin (C)/pemetrexed (P) or cisplatin /gemcitabine (G) in resectable NSCLC. J Clin Oncol 2020;38:9051.
- Provencio M, Nadal E, Insa A, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy and nivolumab in resectable non-small-cell lung cancer (NADIM): an open-label, multicentre, singlearm, phase 2 trial. Lancet Oncol 2020;21:1413-22.
- Waldman AD, Fritz JM, Lenardo MJ. A guide to cancer immunotherapy: from T cell basic science to clinical practice. Nat Rev Immunol 2020;20:651-68.
- Michot JM, Bigenwald C, Champiat S, et al. Immunerelated adverse events with immune checkpoint blockade: a comprehensive review. Eur J Cancer 2016;54:139-48.
- Ramos-Casals M, Brahmer JR, Callahan MK, et al. Immune-related adverse events of checkpoint inhibitors. Nat Rev Dis Primers 2020;6:38.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. BMJ 2009;339:b2535.
- Jia XH, Xu H, Geng LY, et al. Efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant immunotherapy in resectable nonsmall cell lung cancer: A meta-analysis. Lung Cancer 2020;147:143-53.
- 34. Goldstraw P, Chansky K, Crowley J, et al. The IASLC Lung Cancer Staging Project: Proposals for Revision of the TNM Stage Groupings in the Forthcoming (Eighth) Edition of the TNM Classification for Lung Cancer. J Thorac Oncol 2016;11:39-51.
- Pataer A, Kalhor N, Correa AM, et al. Histopathologic response criteria predict survival of patients with resected lung cancer after neoadjuvant chemotherapy. J Thorac Oncol 2012;7:825-32.
- Ramakrishnan R, Gabrilovich DI. Novel mechanism of synergistic effects of conventional chemotherapy and immune therapy of cancer. Cancer Immunol Immunother

Jiang et al. Neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy in NSCLC

2013;62:405-10.

- Emens LA, Middleton G. The interplay of immunotherapy and chemotherapy: harnessing potential synergies. Cancer Immunol Res 2015;3:436-43.
- Pillai RN, Behera M, Owonikoko TK, et al. Comparison of the toxicity profile of PD-1 versus PD-L1 inhibitors in non-small cell lung cancer: A systematic analysis of the literature. Cancer 2018;124:271-7.
- Xu C, Chen YP, Du XJ, et al. Comparative safety of immune checkpoint inhibitors in cancer: systematic review and network meta-analysis. BMJ 2018;363:k4226.
- 40. Camidge DR, Doebele RC, Kerr KM. Comparing and contrasting predictive biomarkers for immunotherapy and targeted therapy of NSCLC. Nat Rev Clin Oncol

Cite this article as: Jiang J, Wang Y, Gao Y, Sugimura H, Minervini F, Uchino J, Halmos B, Yendamuri S, Velotta JB, Li M. Neoadjuvant immunotherapy or chemoimmunotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Transl Lung Cancer Res 2022;11(2):277-294. doi: 10.21037/ tlcr-22-75 2019;16:341-55.

- 41. Abratt RP, Lee JS, Han JY, et al. Phase II trial of gemcitabine-carboplatin-paclitaxel as neoadjuvant chemotherapy for operable non-small cell lung cancer. J Thorac Oncol 2006;1:135-40.
- 42. Berti A, Bortolotti R, Dipasquale M, et al. Meta-analysis of immune-related adverse events in phase 3 clinical trials assessing immune checkpoint inhibitors for lung cancer. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol 2021;162:103351.
- Gandhi L, Rodríguez-Abreu D, Gadgeel S, et al. Pembrolizumab plus Chemotherapy in Metastatic Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med 2018;378:2078-92.

(English Language Editor: C. Betlazar-Maseh)

294

Α				Risk	of bias of	domains			
;	~	D1a	D1b	D2	D3	D4	F 1	D5	D6
4	Ford 2021	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+		+)	(?)
ŭ	0	Domains: D1a: Randor D1b: Allocati D2 : Blinding D3 : Blinding D4 : Incompl D5 : Selectiv D6 : Other b	m sequenc ion concea of particip of outcom lete outcon re reporting ias	e generation Iment (sele ants and p ne assessm ne data (att g (reporting	on (selectic ection bias) ersonel (pe ient (detec trition bias) bias)	on bias) erformance tion bias)	e bias)	Judgeme Low No i	nt nformation
В				R	isk of bia	ıs domaiı	าร		
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	Overall
	Carbone 202	21 +	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Cascone 202	21 +	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Duan 2021	+	—	X	+	+	+	$\overline{}$	X
	Eichhorn 202	21 +	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
	Forde 2018			+	+	+	+	(+)	<u> </u>
	Gao 2020	+	+	+	(+)	+	+	(+)	+
ndy	Provencio 20	20 +	-	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	$\overline{}$
St	Rothchild 20	20 ?	-	+	+	?	+	?	?
	Shen 2021	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	+	+	-	+	+	$\overline{}$
	Shu 2020	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Tfayli 2020	+	—	-	+	+	+	+	$\overline{}$
	Wang 2021	+	$\overline{}$	+	+	+	+	$\overline{}$	$\overline{}$
	Yang 2018	+	(?)	+	+	<u> </u>	-	-	?
	Zinner 2020			+	(+)	(?)	(+)		(?)
		Domain D1: Bias D2: Bias D3: Bias D4: Bias D5: Bias D6: Bias D7: Bias	s: due to col due to sel in classifie due to de due to mis in measur in selectio	nfounding. lection of p cation of inf viations fro ssing data. rement of o on of the re	articipants terventions m intended outcomes. ported resi	3. d interventi ult.	ons.	Judgen S - M + La ? N	nent erious oderate ow o information

Figure S1 The risk of bias of the included studies. (A) Risk of bias of randomized trials; (B) Risk of bias of non-randomized trials.



Figure S2 Publication bias of included studies. (A) Funnel plot for MPR; (B) Funnel plot for pCR; (C) Funnel plot for incidence of TRAE; (D) Funnel plot for incidence of SAE; (E) Funnel plot for resection rate; (F) Funnel plot for surgical delay rate.

A	6		N				Odda Batta	
Study or Subaroup	Evente	Total	Non-3	Total	Woight	M-H Bandom 05%	Cl M_H Bandom 95% Cl	
Study of Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	100	weight	м-п, капоот, 95%	CI M-H, Random, 95% CI	_
Carbone 2021	14	69	10	112	38.4%	1.53 [0.69, 3.		
Fishhorn 2021	1	19	2	12	4 20/	2 22 10 16 70 0	25]	
Elcimorn 2021	2	6	2	14	4.2%	0 50 10 07 2 4	571	
Cao 2020	15	22	<i>,</i>	14	9.5%	12 57 10 66 229 (011	
Brovencio 2020	11	16	23	30	18 1%	0 67 [0.00, 238.0	501	
Shu 2020	2	12	25	18	15 1%	2 00 [0 44 9]	10]	
Tfavli 2020	1	2	2	13	4.0%	5 50 [0 23 128 0	971	
114911 2020	-	-	-	15	4.0%	5.50 [0.25, 120.	5/1	
Total (95% CI)		159		211	100.0%	1.29 [0.68, 2.4	46] 🔶	
Total events	59		63				•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.12; Cł	$ni^2 = 8$	07, df =	7 (P =	0.33); I ² =	= 13%		ł
Test for overall effect	: Z = 0.79	$\Theta (P = 0)$).43)				0.001 0.1 1 10 1000	1
							Favours [non=scc] Favours [scc]	
_								
В								
-	Sco		Non-S	SCC		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95%	CI M-H, Random, 95% CI	_
Duan 2021	3	19	3	4	8.5%	0.06 [0.00, 0.8	82]	
Eichhorn 2021	1	2	1	13	5.3%	12.00 [0.38, 374.8	84]	
Forde 2018	1	6	2	14	8.3%	1.20 [0.09, 16.4	44]	
Forde 2021	25	182	23	176	29.6%	1.06 [0.58, 1.9	95] —	
Gao 2020	5	33	0	7	6.7%	2.89 [0.14, 58.4	42]	
Provencio 2020	7	16	19	30	20.3%	0.45 [0.13, 1.5	55]	
Shu 2020	5	12	5	18	16.5%	1.86 [0.40, 8.6	59]	
Tfayli 2020	1	2	0	13	4.9%	27.00 [0.72, 1006.0	03]	,
Total (95% CI)		272		275	100.0%	1.11 [0.47, 2.6	52] •	
Total events	48		53					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.56; Cł	$1i^2 = 1i$	2.38, df =	= 7 (P =	= 0.09); l ²	= 43%	0.001 0.1 1 10 1000	1
Test for overall effect	Z = 0.23	B (P = 0)).82)				Favours [non-Scc] Favours [Scc]	
<u> </u>								
C								
	Smoker	N	on-smok	er		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events T	otal E	vents T	'otal V	Veight M	-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI	_
Carbone 2021	28	163	2	18	38.9%	1.66 [0.36, 7.63]		
Forde 2018	8	17	1	3	13.6%	1.78 [0.13, 23.52]		
Gao 2020	13	32	1	8	18.5%	4.79 [0.52, 43.70]		
Shen 2021	21	21	2	0	29.0%	2.10 [0.56, 12.51]	-	
Total (95% CI)		243		35 1	00.0%	2.18 [0.84, 5.65]		
Total events	70		7				-	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi ²	= 0.64	, df = 3 (P = 0.8	9); I ² = 0%		10001 011 10 1000	ł.
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.61 (P = 0.1	1)				Eavours [non-smoker] Eavours [smoker])
							ratours [non-smokel] ratours [smokel]	
D								
	Smoker	N	on-smok	er		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events T	otal E	vents T	'otal V	Veight M	-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	_
Forde 2018	2	17	1	3	18.1%	0.27 [0.02, 4.46]		
Forde 2021	26	318	10	39	65.5%	0.26 [0.11, 0.59]		
Gao 2020	5	32	0	8	16.4%	3.40 [0.17, 67.98]		
Total (95% CI)		367		50 1	00.0%	0.40 [0.10, 1.52]		
Total events	22	507	11	30 1	00.0%	0.40 [0.10, 1.55]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² -	0.55 · Chi ²	= 2.80	df = 2.0	P = 0.2	4) $ ^2 = 31$	%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ł
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.35 (P = 0.1	8)	- 0.2	.,, 51		0.001 0.1 1 10 1000)
or overall effect.	1.55 (Favours [non-smoker] Favours [smoker]	

Figure S3 Forest plot of the pathological response of subgroup analysis based on histology subtypes and smoking status. (A) MPR among patients who are diagnosed with squamous cell carcinoma or non-squamous cell carcinoma; (B) pCR among patients diagnosed with squamous cell carcinoma; or non-squamous cell carcinoma; (C) MPR among patients who are smokers or non-smokers; (D) pCR among patients who are smokers or non-smokers. Smokers, including current and former smokers; MPR, major pathological response; pCR, complete pathological response; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; CI, confidence interval.

Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	Odds Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI		Odds Ratio IV, Random, 95% Cl	
Cascone 2021	-0.869	0.3304	34.2%	0.42 [0.22, 0.80]			
Eichhorn 2021	-1.0116	0.5839	10.9%	0.36 [0.12, 1.14]			
Forde 2018	-0.3677	0.4336	19.9%	0.69 [0.30, 1.62]			
Gao 2020	-0.5108	0.3266	35.0%	0.60 [0.32, 1.14]			
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.52 [0.35, 0.76]		◆	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Chi ² = 1.43	, df = 3 ((P = 0.70)	$ _{1}^{2} = 0\%$	0.001		1000
Test for overall effect	Z = 3.41 (P = 0.0)	006)			0.001	0.1 1 10	1000

Figure S4 Forest plot of the MPR rate of the mono-ICI subgroup after removal of the Carbone 2021 study in the sensitivity analysis. MPR, major pathological response; ICI, immune checkpoint inhibitor.

		D C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
$\frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000$	C Odds Ratio Odds Ratio	D Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
	Staty of Subgroup log(Stats Ratio) Se weight 19, Ration, SS C1 (9, Ration, SS C1)	Study of Subgroup logicals ratio] Se weight R, Randon, 55% CI (V, Randon, 55% CI)
	Provencio 2020 1.0415 0.3358 16.6% 2.83 [1.47, 5.47]	Forde 2021 -1.1515 0.175 18.7% 0.32 [0.22, 0.45]
	Rothschild 2020 -0.0588 0.2426 18.8% 0.94 [0.59, 1.52]	Kotrischild 2020 - 1.7579 0.3424 13.3% 0.17 (0.09, 0.34)
	She 2020 0.2683 0.3684 15.8% 1.31 (0.64, 2.69)	Shu 2020 -0.6931 0.3873 12.0% 0.50 [0.23, 1.07]
$\frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000$	Tfayli 2020 -1.3863 0.6455 9.9% 0.25 [0.07, 0.89]	Ttayli 2020 - 2.6391 1.0351 3.2% 0.07 (0.01, 0.54)
$\frac{1}{1000} + \frac{1}{1000} + 1$	Zinner 2020 1.7047 0.7687 8.0% 5.50 [1.22, 24.81]	Yang 2018 -2.3979 0.7385 5.5% 0.09 (0.02, 0.39)
$\frac{ _{1}}{ _{1}} = \frac{1}{ _{1}} + \frac{1}{ _{1}} $	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 1.30 [0.76, 2.23]	Zinner 2020 -0.47 0.5701 7.9% 0.63 [0.20, 1.91]
The first end disk $z = 0.40 + 0.30$ dis $disk = 0.00$ dis $disk = 0.00$ $disk = $	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.34; Chi ² = 19.77, df = 6 (P = 0.003); l ² = 70%	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 0.35 [0.24, 0.52]
	Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.98$ (P = 0.33)	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19; Chi ² = 19.79, df = 8 (P = 0.01); i ² = 60% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.24 (P < 0.00001) 1000 1001 0.1 1 10 1000
$\frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}$	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio	renter erenn enden miller i erennen.
$\frac{\left \sum_{k=1}^{k} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{k} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{k$		Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
	Duan 2021 -0.2624 0.4206 13.7% 0.77 [0.34, 1.75]	Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI
	Rothschild 2020 -0.0588 0.2426 18.6% 0.94 (0.59, 1.52)	Duan 2021 -1.0415 0.4749 10.4% 0.35 [0.14, 0.90]
	Shen 2021 0.6131 0.3444 15.8% 1.85 [0.94, 3.63]	Provencio 2020 0.2624 0.2974 13.9% 1.30 (0.73, 2.33]
$\frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}$	Shu 2020 0.2683 0.3684 15.1% 1.31 (0.64, 2.69)	Shen 2021 -0.1625 0.3299 13.3% 0.85 [0.45, 1.62]
	Ziner 2020 1.7047 0.7687 7.1% 5.50 [1.22, 24.81]	Tfayli 2020 -2.6391 1.0351 4.1% 0.07 [0.01, 0.54]
b b b b b b b b b b		Wang 2021 -0.8873 0.2593 14.7% 0.41 (0.25, 0.68)
The for owner at first $z = 6.10^{\circ} - 0.50^{\circ}$ (b) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	$\begin{array}{c} 10000, 0.550 (10, 0.159) \\ \text{Heterogeneity: Tau^2} = 0.27: \text{Ch}^2 = 21.80. \text{ df} = 6 (P = 0.001); \begin{array}{c} 10000, 0.159 \\ = 72\% \end{array}$	Tanig 2010 -2.5979 0.7583 0.009 0.009 (0.02, 0.59]
$\frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}$	Test for overall effect: Z = 0.10 (P = 0.92) 0.001 0.1 1 10 1000	Total (95% CI) 100.0% 0.45 (0.28.0.72)
$\frac{b_{12}}{b_{12}} \frac{v_{12} b_{12} b_{13} b$		Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.32; Chi ² = 29.14, df = 8 (P = 0.0003); l ² = 73%
$\frac{1}{10000} \frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SF Weight IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI	Test for overall effect: Z = 3.36 (P = 0.0008) 0.001 0.1 1 10 1000
$ \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{100$	Duan 2021 -0.2624 0.4206 12.9% 0.77 [0.34, 1.75]	
$\frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$	Forde 2021 -0.5377 0.1549 18.3% 0.58 [0.43, 0.79]	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Colored Satio Colored Satio Colored Statio Colored Satio Study or Subaroun Jog(Odds Ratio) SF. Weight IV, Random 95% Cl
$\frac{9 \text{ m} 2021 \text{ m} 1}{12020 \text{ m} 12020 \text{ m} 1203 $	Provencio 2020 1.0415 0.3358 14.7% 2.83 [1.47, 5.47]	20.21.2 ICIs+chemo
$\frac{B_{12}}{Pm} 2020$ $-2.883 0.848 1.408 1.31 [0.64, 2.69]$ $\frac{1}{Pm} 1.202 0.203 0.248 0.948 1.408 0.13 [0.64, 2.69]$ $\frac{1}{Pm} 1.202 0.218 0.248 0.948 1.408 0.13 [0.64, 2.69]$ $\frac{1}{Pm} 1.202 0.218 0.248 0.948 1.408 0.100 0.10 0.1 0.1 10 0.10$ $\frac{1}{Pm} 1.202 0.218 0.100 0.100 0.10 0.1 0.1 10 0.10$ $\frac{1}{Pm} 2020 0.100 0.100 0.100 0.10 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1$	Shen 2021 0.6131 0.3444 14.5% 1.85 [0.94, 3.63]	Duan 2021 -1.0415 0.4749 10.6% 0.35 [0.14, 0.90]
The first constrained code states $\frac{1}{2} = 35, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0,$	Shu 2020 0.2683 0.3684 14.0% 1.31 [0.64, 2.69]	Provence 2021
$\frac{1}{1005 \text{ CO}} \underbrace{1}{1000 \text{ CO}} \underbrace{1000 \text{ CO}}{1000 \text{ CO}} \underbrace{10000 \text{ CO}}{1000 \text{ CO}} \underbrace{100000 \text{ CO}}{1000 \text{ CO}} \underbrace{10000 \text{ CO}}{100$	Tfayli 2020 -1.3863 0.6455 8.8% 0.25 [0.07, 0.89]	Rothschild 2020 -1.7579 0.3424 13.0% 0.17 [0.09, 0.34]
Heterogeneity: Tur ² = 0.35, Cu ² = 2.89, df = 6 $\frac{9}{2}$ 0.001, $\frac{1}{2}$ = 728 Turt or vesil differ: 2 = 0.36 $\frac{9}{2}$ 0.001, $\frac{1}{2}$ = 728 Turt or vesil differ: 2 = 0.37 $\frac{1}{2}$ 0.005 $\frac{1}{2}$ 0.001, $\frac{1}{2}$ 0.001 $\frac{1}{2$	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 1.02 [0.61, 1.69]	Shu 2020 -0.6931 0.3873 12.1% 0.50 (0.25, 1.07)
The overall effect $2 = 0.06$ ($p^{-} = 0.35$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.35$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.35$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.35$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.35$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000$ ($p^{-} = 0.000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.0000$ ($p^{-} = 0.0000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.0000$ ($p^{-} = 0.0000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.00000$ ($p^{-} = 0.00000$) Constrained by the overall effect $2 = 0.000000$ ($p^{-} = 0.0000000000000000000000000000000000$	Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.34$; $Chi^2 = 28.90$, $df = 6$ (P < 0.0001); $l^2 = 79\%$	Wang 2021 -0.8873 0.2593 14.5% 0.41 [0.25, 0.68]
$\frac{C}{10055 \text{ CD}} \frac{100000 \text{ Ratio}}{100000 \text{ Ratio}} \frac{100000 \text{ Sol} (10000 \text{ Ratio}}{100000 \text{ Ratio}} \frac{100000 \text{ Ratio}}{100000 Rati$	Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.06 (P = 0.95)$	Yang 2018 -2.3979 0.7385 6.8% 0.09 (0.02, 0.39)
$\frac{1}{2402 \text{ yr shaprop} \log[0ds \operatorname{Rulo}]}{\frac{2402 \text{ yr shaprop}}{2402 \text{ yr shaprop}} \log[0ds \operatorname{Rulo}]}{\frac{2402 \text{ yr shaprop}}{2402 \text{ yr shaprop}}} \log[0ds \operatorname{Rulo}]}{2402$	C	Subtotal (95% CI) 100.0% 0.36 (0.22, 0.59)
$\frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000$	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio	Heterogeneity: $ au^* = 0.35; Ch^* = 31.26, dl = 8 (l = 0.0001); l^* = 74%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 4.11 (l < 0.0001)
$\frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000$	Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI	Taral (05% CD) 100.0% 0.35 (0.32,0.50)
$\frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{10000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{100$	20222 ICIS+CHEMIC Forde 2021 -0.0568 0.1066 57.0% 0.94 [0.77, 1.16]	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35; Chi ² = 31.26, df = 8 (P = 0.0001); l ² = 74%
$\frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000$	Shen 2021 0.8602 0.3597 43.0% 2.36 [1.17, 4.78]	Test for overall effect: Z = 4.11 (P < 0.0001) 0.001 0.1 1 10 1000
$ \frac{1}{1005 \text{ C}} \frac{1}{1005 \text{ C}} \frac{1}{1005 (1 + 0.53, 241)} \frac{1}{1000 (1 + 0.53, 241)} \frac{1}{10000 (1 + 0.53, 241)} \frac{1}{1000 (1 + 0.53, 241)} $	Subtotal (95% C) 100.0% 140 (0.56, 5.41) Heteropresity: $7a^2 = 0.35$; $Ch^2 = 5.97$, $df = 1.(p = 0.01)$; $l^2 = 8.3\%$	Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable
$\frac{1}{1005 \text{ CO}} \underbrace{10005}_{\text{ test}} (0.57, 0$	Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.74$ (P = 0.46)	
Meterogenerity: Tua ¹ = 0.35; Ch ¹ = 5.97, df = 1.0P = 0.01; l ¹ = 8.3% Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Test for overall effect: 2 = 0.34 P = 0.460 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Total OSS CO Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Total OSS CO Interogenetic, Tua ¹ = 1.35; Ch ² = 6.58, df = 1.0P = 0.010; l ² = 5.58; Cl ² = 1.00; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0;		
Test for overall effects: $2 = 0.24 \text{ (} = 0.46)$ Test for overall effects: $2 = 0.24 \text{ (} = 0.46)$ Sudy or Subgroup log(Odds Ratio 2022 22 Cls+cheme Provencio 2020 2.665 6.0597 46.5% 14.31 (4.45, 46.21) Shen 2021 2.24 (5.4 cheme) Provencio 2020 2.2652 6.5597 46.5% 14.31 (4.45, 46.21) Shen 2021 2.24 (5.4 cheme) Provencio 2020 2.2656 0.5977 46.5% 14.31 (4.45, 46.21) Shen 2021 2.24 (5.4 cheme) Provencio 2020 2.2656 0.5977 46.5% 14.31 (4.45, 46.21) Shen 2021 2.24 (5.4 cheme) Provencio 2020 2.2665 6.56, df = 1.0^{-0} - 0.010; l' = 85X Test for overall effect: $2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 6.56, df = 1.0^{-0} - 0.010; l' = 85X Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 6.56, df = 1.0^{-0} - 0.010; l' = 85X Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.60;Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.60;Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.60;Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.60;Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.60;Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.010; l' = 55XTest for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.60;Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.00;Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.00; l' = 55XTest for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.00; l' = 55XTest for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.00; l' = 55XTest for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.00; l' = 55XTest for overall effect: 2 = 1.80 \text{ (r)} = 0.00; l' = 55XTest for overall effect: 2 = 1.84 \text{ (r)} = 0.00; l' = 0.00;$	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 1.40 [0.58, 3.41]	D
The field of the	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 1.40 [0.58, 3.41]	D Odds Ratio Study of Subarana Inc/Odd Battol 55 Walate IV Bandon 057 (1 V) Bandon 057 (1
$\frac{\text{Odds Ratio}}{\text{240227 Odds Charlos}} = \frac{\text{Odds Ratio}}{\text{240223 Clss+cheme}} + \frac{\text{Odds Ratio}}{\text{24023 Clss+cheme}} + \frac{\text{Odds Ratio}}{\text{24023 Clss+cheme}} + \frac{\text{Odds Ratio}}{\text{24000 Clss+clss}} + \frac{132, \text{Cls}+6, \text{Sd}}{\text{2400 Clss+3, 318, 31}} + 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, $	Total (95% C) 100.0% 1.40 (0.58, 3.41) Heterogeneity: Tay 2 0.35; Chi ² = 5.97; df = 1 (P = 0.01); l ² = 83% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.74 (P = 0.46)	D Study or Subgroup toglOdds Ratio SE Weight IV, Random, 5% CI V, Random, 5% CI Fords 2021 1-1377 0-1328 603% 0-25 (0.14) 0-331 0
$\frac{1000}{1000} y tubproup} \log[00der Ratio] St Weight (V, Random, 93% Cl V, Random, 9$	Total (95% CI) 100.0% 1.40 (0.58, 3.41) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.35; Ch ² = 5.97; df = 0.01; l ² = 83% 0.001 0.1 10000 Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable	Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Odds Ratio Forder 2021 -1.3757 0.1328 60.3% 0.25 [0.19, 0.33] IV, Random, 95% CI Provencio 2020 -0.08267 0.3201 IV IV IV
Procession 2020 2.6656 0.597 46.558 14.33 14.43 46.211 14.34 46.421 14.34 46.421 15.0000 2.66 0.470 0.680 0.48	Total (95% C) 100.05% 1.40 (0.5.8, 3.41) Hetrocynenity: Tau" = 0.35; Chi" = 5.97, df = 1 (P = 0.01); P = 83% 0.001 0.1 10 1000 Test for overall effect; Z = 0.7.4 (P = 0.46) Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable 0dds Ratio 0dds Ratio	Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI VV, Random, 95% CI Forde 2021 -1.3757 0.128 60.3% 0.25 (0.19, 0.33) Povencio 2020 -0.8267 0.2124 6.3% 0.41 (0.21, 0.03) Povencio 2020 -0.8267 0.2124 6.5% 0.41 (0.21, 0.04, 0.34) Povencio 2020 -0.8267 0.5% 0.21 (0.40, 0.34) Povencio 2020 -0.8267 0.5% 0.21 (0.40, 0.34) Povencio 2020 -0.8267 0.36 (0.12, 1.14)
She 2021 0.6602 0.357 0.35% 2.26 (1):7.478 Junt 2015 CD - 0.000; P = 53% 2.278 Junt 2015 L1 - 1.278 Junt 2015	Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 1.40 (0.58, 3.41) Heterogeneity: Tau' = 0.35; Chi' = 5.97; df = 1 (P = 0.01); l' = 83% 0.001 0.1 1 1000' Test for oreal effect: 2 = 0.74 (P = 0.46) Test for oreal effect: 2 = 0.74 (P = 0.46) 10 1000' 1 1000' Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable Odds Ratio 0.4 1 1000' Study or Subgroup leg(Odds Ratio) SE Weight IV, Random, 95% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 0.4 1	Dit Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 5rody 2021 -1.3757 0.128 60.3% 0.25 (0.10, 0.23) Provencio 2020 -0.8267 0.3204 16.3% 0.441 (0.23, 0.82) Shen 2021 -0.210 0.216 (0.12, 0.12) 0.216 (0.12, 0.12) 0.217 (0.12, 0.12) Ymyrosica 2020 -1.0116 0.5389 5.4% 0.26 (0.12, 0.14)
$\frac{Were regressive train 1 = 0.5 C C D^{1} = 5.6 S, d^{2} = 1 = (p = 0.010); t^{2} = 85x \\ Test for overall effect Z = 1.89 (p = 0.06); t^{2} = 0.05; t^{2} = 0.00; t^{2}$	State State <th< td=""><td>Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI V/, Random, 95% CI Forder 2021 -1.3757 0.128 60.3% 0.25 0.19, 0.33] Forder 2020 -0.8267 0.3204 65.3% 0.414 0.23, 0.04 0.25 0.44 0.24, 0.04 0.24</td></th<>	Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI V/, Random, 95% CI Forder 2021 -1.3757 0.128 60.3% 0.25 0.19, 0.33] Forder 2020 -0.8267 0.3204 65.3% 0.414 0.23, 0.04 0.25 0.44 0.24, 0.04 0.24
Test for overall effect $Z = 1.89 \ (P = 0.06)$ Historgraphic, Tun ² = 1.35, Ch ² = 6.65, df = 1 (P = 0.010), l ² = 65% Est for overall effect $Z = 1.89 \ (P = 0.06)$ Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable E Subj or Subgroup (applicate Ratio) Society (Applicate Ratio) Society (Applicate Ratio) (Applic	Study or Subgroup Iog(Ods Ratio SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Iog(Ods Ratio) SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI Study or Subgroup Iog(Ods Ratio) SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI Provencio 2020 2.6626 0.5972 3.435 (4.45, 46.21] SIGU IV, IV, Random, 95% CI IV	D Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Statyroug log/Odds Ratio SE Weight IV, Random, 55% C1 V, Random, 55% C1 Forde 2021 -1.3757 0.1288 60.3% 0.25 (0.12, 0.03)1 V/ Provensic 2020 -0.8267 0.3204 16.5% 0.41 (0.23, 0.82)1 V/ Shen 2021 -2.1102 0.5294 6.5% 0.12 (0.04, 0.03)1 V/ They 2020 -1.0116 0.5389 5.4% 0.36 (0.12, 1.14) V/ Zminer 2020 -1.0747 0.7687 3.2% 0.18 (0.04, 0.82) V/ Zminer 2020 -1.0747 0.7687 3.2% 0.18 (0.04, 0.82) V/
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Study or Subgroup log(Odds Ratio Docds) Study or Subgroup 1.04 (D, Sa, 3.41) Odds Ratio 0.001 Odds Ratio 0.01 Odds Ratio 0.001 Study or Subgroup log(Odds Ratio) SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI V/, Random, 95% CI Provencio 2020 2.6626 0.5972 46.5% 1.33 [4.45, 46.21] Provencio 2020 2.6626 0.5972 46.5% 1.43 [4.45, 46.21] Provencio 2020 2.6626 0.5972 46.5% 1.43 [4.45, 46.21] Provencio 2020 2.6626 0.5972 3.5% 2.11 [1, 1, 47.8] Hetrogenetry, Tut' 1.35, CH ² 0.5802 3.597 3.588 2.467.881	D Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 1007d 2021 1.337.7 0.1328 6639. 0.446 Ratio VV, Random, 95X.C1 1007d 2021 -0.207.0 1.328. 6639. 0.246 Ratio VV, Random, 95X.C1 1007d 2021 -0.207.0 1.328. 6639. 0.246 Ratio VV, Random, 95X.C1 1007d 2021 -0.2167.0 0.2304 16.3%.0 0.241 (0.21, 0.32) Image: Comparison of Compariso
Heterogenerity: Tut ¹ = 1.85, Ch ¹ = 6.56, df = 1 (P = 0.10); P = 55% 0.001 0.1 1 0 Test for ovail differences: Not applicable Odds Ratio Steve or subgroup differences: Not applicable Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study of subgroup legiodef Ratiol St. Weight IV, Random, 95% Cl Nr. Random, 95% Cl Nr. Random, 95% Cl Nr. Random, 95% Cl Dun 201 1.602/148 (2, 23.5) 1.607/148 (2, 2.43.5) Nr. Random, 95% Cl Nr. Random, 95% Cl Provencio 2020 1.402/148 (2, 3.23.5) 4.97 (1.36, 7.35) Nr. Random, 95% Cl Test (20201 1.602/148 (2, 3.23.5) 4.32 (1.21.77.6) 1.606 (1.60, 0.21.7) Starty ozi 1 1.602/148 (2, 3.23.5) 4.32 (1.21.77.6) 1.606 (1.60, 0.21.7) Starty ozi 1 1.607 (1.60, 2.23.5) 1.606 (1.60, 0.21.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) Starty ozi 1 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) Starty ozi 1 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) Starty ozi 1 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) Starty ozi 1 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) Starty ozi 1 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0.22.2) 1.607 (1.60, 0	Open Signed Si	D Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup toglOdds Ratio) SE weight: Nr, Random, 95% (1 Nr, Random, 95% (1 Nr, Random, 95% (1 Forde 2021 -1.3757 0.1328 0.255 (0.13, 0.33) Nr Nr Shan 2021 -2.13657 0.2304 16.5% 0.446 (0.23, 0.82) Nr Nr Shan 2021 -2.1362 (0.23, 0.2346 6.5% 0.446 (0.23, 0.82) Nr Nr Shan 2021 -2.1362 (0.23, 0.246) 1.5% (0.12, 0.04) Nr Nr Nr Yamp 2018 -1.0986 (0.471.4 8.1% (0.33, 0.13, 0.46) Nr Nr Nr Nr Total (95% C) -1.0747 (0.587) (0.22, 0.96) 0.27 (0.21, 0.36) Im Im Nr Nr<
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Study or Subgroup Iog(205 R, Cl) 1.40 (DS, S, 3.41) Test for overall effect; Z = 0.74 (P = 0.46) 0.01 (D, S, 3.41) 0.001 (D, S, 3.41) Test for overall effect; Z = 0.74 (P = 0.46) 0.01 (D, S, 3.41) 0.001 (D, S, 3.41) Study or Subgroup Iog(2045 Ratio) SE Weight (V, Random, 95% C) 0.048 Ratio 2022.22 (Cls chemo 2.6626 (D, S972 46.5% 14.33 (4.45, 46.21) 0.462 (D, S972 31.368) 0.463 (Ratio) Provencio 2020 2.6626 (D, S972 46.5% 14.33 (4.45, 46.21) 0.463 (Ratio) 1.461 (D, R) (R) (D, R) (R) (R) (R) (R) (R) (R) (R) (R) (R)	D Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 5rde 2021 -1.3757 0.1328 60.38 0.25 (0.14, 0.33) Provensio 2020 -0.8267 0.3204 16.3% 0.44 (0.23, 0.82) Shen 2021 -2.10120 0.5294 16.3% 0.44 (0.23, 0.82) Ymag 2018 -1.016 0.5389 5.4% 0.26 (0.12, 0.41) They 10200 -1.0116 0.5389 5.4% 0.38 (0.12, 0.44) Zimer 2020 -1.7047 0.7857 3.2% 0.38 (0.15, 0.41) Heterogeneity: Tat' = 0.01; Chi' = 5.52, df = 5 (P = 0.36); i' = 5% 0.001 0.1 10 1000
E Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Oli (00, 00, 18] Study or Subgroup bag(0dds Ratio) SE Weight Nr. Random, 955 CI Nr. Random, 955	Study or Subgroup DegOde Satiol Study or Subgroup Odds Ratio 20222 Clist-theme 0.6620 0.5972 46.5% 1.43 [4.45, 46.21] Powercio 2020 2.6626 0.5972 46.5% 1.24 [1.7, 47.6] Subtrati (35% Cl) 0.6620 0.5972 3.5% 2.6626 0.5972 Test for ubgroup 0.6020 0.61 1.0 0.001 0.1 1.0 20222 Clist-theme 0.6620 0.5972 3.5% 2.43 [1.7, 4.78] 0.46 [0.9, 3.18] 1.43 [1.7, 4.78] Subtrati (35% Cl) 1.38; Ch ² = 6.6; df = 1 (0 = 0.00); f = 65% 1.00.00% 5.46 [0.9, 4.3.83] 1.43 [1.7, 4.78] 1.00.01 Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.58; (b ² = 6.6; df = 1 (0 = 0.00); f = 6.5% 1.00.00% 5.46 [0.9, 4.3.83] 1.10 [0.00] 1.10 [0.00]	D <u>Nutrov Schiproup toglOdds Ratio</u> Odds Ratio <u>109/045 Ratio</u> V. Random, 95% Cl <u>109/2021</u> 0.1238 60.5% 0.240 h.123, 0.803 <u>109/2020</u> -2.1120 0.2524 65.5% 0.212 (0.4, 0.03) <u>109/2020</u> -2.1120 0.2524 65.5% 0.212 (0.4, 0.03) <u>109/2020</u> -1.0116 0.5839 5.4% 0.350 [0.12, 0.14] <u>109/2020</u> -1.0747 0.787 3.2% 0.181 (0.4, 0.82] <u>109/2020</u> -1.001: Ch ² = 552, df = 5 (P = 0.36); l ² = 9% <u>100/2020</u> -0.11 10 1000
E State of Status Odds Ratio Odds Ratio State of Status Odds Ratio Odds Ratio State of Status Odds Ratio O	Start 100.05 1.40 (0.58, 3.41) Heteropensity: nut = 0.35; Chi ¹ = 5.97 (f = 1 (P = 0.01); l ² = 83% 0.01 0.1 1.000 ² Test for overall effect; 2 = 0.57 (f = 5.07 6.56; M = 1.07, 0.78 (f = 1.07, 0.01); l ² = 83% 0.01 0.1 1.000 ² Study or Subgroup log(Odds Ratio) SE Weight VV, Random, 95% Cl VV, Random, 95% Cl Study or Subgroup log(Odds Ratio) SE Weight VV, Random, 95% Cl VV, Random, 95% Cl Study or Subgroup log(Odds Ratio) SE Weight VV, Random, 95% Cl VV, Random, 95% Cl Test for subgroup 0.650 cl, 0.572 dl, 65%, 31.83 [l, 44, 54, 621]	D Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup toglOdds Ratio) SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI V, Random, 95% CI Forde 2021 -1.3757 0.1286 0.250 (0.12,0,0.33) V, Random, 95% CI Provencia 2020 -0.8267 0.2304 16.5% (0.12,0,0.43) Image: 0.01 (0.11,0,0.13) Towly 2020 -1.016 0.538 (0.44,0.23,0.82) Image: 0.01 (0.11,0,0.14,0.02) Image: 0.01 (0.11,0,0.14,0.02) Towly 2020 -1.016 (0.538) 5.4% (0.38) (0.12,0.14,0.02) Image: 0.01 (0.11,0,0.14,0.02) Image: 0.01 (0.11,0,0.14,0.02) Towle (95% CI) 10.0064 0.27 (0.21,0.36) Image: 0.01 (0.11,0,0.14,0.02) Image: 0.01 (0.11,0,0.14,0.02) Fest coverall effect 2 = 3.88 (0 < 0.00001)
Study or Subgroup Jost Veglodds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Name 355.Cl N. Random 355.Cl	Study of Subgroup log(Ods Ratio Constraint) Odds Ratio Ratio Odds Ratio Ratio Odds Ratio Ratio Study of Subgroup log(Ods Ratio) SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI Powercio 2022 2.6626 0.5972 46.5% 14.3 [4.45, 46.21] Study of Subgroup 0.8602 0.3972 3.5% 2.16 [1.17, 4.7 8] Hercogenetry: Trait - 1.38; Chit - 6.68, df = 1.0° 0.000; H = 65% 0.001 0.1 10 Total (395% CI) Trait (59, 60, Chit - 0.000; H = 65% 14.33 [4.45, 46.21] 0.001 0.1 1.0 Total (395% CI) Trait (59, 60, Chit - 0.000; H = 0.000; H = 65% 1.00, 000; H = 65% 1.00, 000; H = 65% 1.00, 000; H = 65%	D Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 5 mody or Subgroup log(Odds Ratio) 5E Weight IV Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI Fords 2021 -1.3737 0.128 60.38% 0.45(0.0.33) IV Provencio 2020 -0.8267 0.3290 16.5% 0.41(0.23, 0.82) IV IV Yang 2018 -1.016 0.5399 5.4% 0.35(0.10, 0.34) IV
Duar 1021 1.897 0.619 9.5% 667 1.98, 52.49 7 Yang 2018 -1.704 70783 9.038 (0.04, 0.62) Forde 2021 1.6027482 2001118 27.15 4.37 (1.5, 7.35) 10000 0.038 (0.04, 0.62) Provencio 2020 2.1041 0.0371 1.66 8.03 (2.4, 2.075) 10000 0.0001 (0.01, 0.2) Shar 2020 1.4614 0.138 (1.6, 0.539) 0.38 (0.6, 0.62) 10000 0.038 (0.0, 0.12) 10000 Shar 2020 1.4614 0.358 (2.5, 0.57) 10.05 10000 0.001 (0.1) 10 10000 Shar 2020 1.8718 0.571 (1.68, 8.64) 10000 1.4112 (2.8, 8.64) 10000 1.01 1000 10000 0.01 (0.1) 10 10000 Total 195% C0 10000 0.13 (1.95, 5.52) 0.01 (0.1) 10 10000 10	Study or Subgroup Study or Subgroup Study or Subgroup Odds Ratio 0.01 Odds Ratio 0.001 <	D Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 5 usdy or Subgroup toglOdds Ratio) 55: Weight: V, Random, 95: Cl V, Random, 95: Cl V, Random, 95: Cl Forde 2021 -13:375 0.13: 80: 0.25: 0.3: 0.23: 0.25: 0.3: 0.25
Forder 2021 1.602/4692 0.20011188 27.18 4.97 13.6, 7.35 Total 195% (0) 100.00% 0.03 10.01, 0.12 Provensio 2020 1.4624 0.308 20.38 4.20 13.24, 72.71 Image: Control 100, 0.000 0.00 100, 0.12 Image: Control 100, 0.000 0.001 0.1 1.000 Sim 2020 1.4624 0.308 20.38 4.20 13.24, 72.71 Image: Control 100, 0.000 0.001 0.1 1.000 Sim 2020 1.4624 0.308 1.038 20.38 4.50 13.21, 21.7, 74 Image: Control 100, 0.000 0.001 0.1 1.000 Sim 2020 1.4624 0.308 1.038 20.38 4.50 12.21, 22.72, 04 = 4.09 0.001 0.1 1.000 Sim 2020 1.4624 0.308 1.401 18.22 2.232 Image: Control 100, 0.12 Image: Control 100,	Total (95% CI) 100.00% 140 (10.5.8, 341) Metric conversition of the conversitient of the conversition of the conversitient of the conversited of the conversi	D Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Forde 2021 -1.3737 0.1238 6.236 0.14, 0.031 V. Random, 95% Cl V. Random, 95% Cl Forde 2021 -0.8267 0.1230 16.5% 0.451 0.23, 0.831 V. V. Very Schereit Shen 2021 -2.1012 0.5234 6.5% 0.412 0.04, 0.031 Very Schereit Very Schereit Very Schereit They Stote -1.016 0.5383 5.4% 0.360 0.12, 1.141 Very Schereit Very Schereit Very Schereit Very Schereit They Stote -1.016 0.5383 5.4% 0.358 0.12, 1.041 Very Schereit Very Schereit Very Schereit Very Schereit Total (95% Cl -0.010 c.012 0.012, 0.310 0.01, 0.041 Very Schereit Very S
Rothcolid 2020 1.4424 0.3084 20.90x 4.312 (2.3); 7.21 Heterogenetics: Tur ⁴ = 1.22; Ch ⁴ = 7.20, df = 4 (P = 0.13); P = 44% 0.001 0.1 1.0 1.000 Shm 2021 1.431 0.3371 1.68 50.052; 7.16.82] Test for overall effect: 2 = 4.83 (P < 0.00001)	Study or Subgroup Log (0.58, 3.41) (0.58, 3.41) Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Log (0.58, 3.41) (0.11, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10,	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $
Shen 2020 1.8/12 0.537 11.645, 1205.321 Shu 2020 1.8/11 0.5371 1.66, 550 [22,71.662] Tfwil 2020 1.0116 0.5389 1.038 2.75 [0.85, 6.64] Wang 2021 4.9668 1.4191 2.38 1.4402 [23,22423] Total (95% Ct) 100.0% 6.13 [3.95, 9.52]	Total (95% C) 100.05% 1.40 (0.58, 3.41) Heterogeneity: Tart or overall effect. 2 = 0.27, 4P = 0.46) 0.01 0.1 1.0 0.00 ⁴ Test for overall effect. 2 = 0.46) Odds Ratio VK, Random, 55% CI	D <u>Study or Subgroup toglOdds Ratiol</u> <u>St Weight, IV, Random, 95% Cl</u> <u>Forde 2011</u> <u>Horde 2011</u>
Topil 0200 1.0116 0.5383 10.5x 2.75 [0.68, 8.64] Wang 2021 4.969 84 1.4191 2.3x 1.4101 2.32 422 423 Tomer 2020 3.2581 1.4412 2.3% 2.600 [1.54, 438.25] Total 095x (D) 1000x* 6.31 [3.65, 5.52] Heterogenetic, Tau* = 0.35; (Ch* = 13.07, df = 6 0* = 0.11; h* = 39K 0.001 0.1	Total (95% C) 100.00% 1.40 (0.58, 3.41) Hetrogenetry: variation 2000 0.51 (± - 5.97) (± - 1.000) 0.1 1.0000 Test for overall effect: 2 = 0.57 (± - 0.01); ± = 83% 0.001 0.1 1.0000 Test for overall effect: 2 = 0.57 (± - 0.01); ± = 83% 0.001 0.1 1.0000 Study or Subgroup log(0dds Ratio) St Weight (V, Random, 95% C) V, Random, 95% C) 20222 Clist-cheme 0.662 0.3597 3.5% 2.45 (1.17, 4.7 8) Provencio 2020 2.6626 0.5972 45.5% 1.43 (4.45, 6421) She 7021 0.602 0.3597 3.5% 2.45 (1.17, 4.7 8) 1.0000 Hetrogreenty: Trai ¹ = 1.18; Chi ¹⁺ 6.66, df = 1 (P = 0.010); H = 685K 1.43 (4.45, 6421) 1.0000 1.0000 Total (95% C) 0.660 (± 0.010); H = 685K 1.00000 2.46 (1.0.94, 31.83) 1.0000 1.0000 Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable 0.0010; H = 685K 0.001 0.1 1.0000 E Study or Subgroup beglOdds Ratio) St. Weight M, Mandom, 95% C) Nr. Random, 95% C) Nr. Random, 95% C) Dura 3001 1.8	D Odds Ratio CMdd Ratio Odds Ratio 5 mdr 2021 -1.8375 / 0.128 / 6.031 -1.8375 / 0.128 / 6.031 -1.9385 / 0.250 / 1.033 / 0.250 / 1.033 / 0.250 / 1.033 / 0.250 / 1.033 / 0.250 / 1.033 / 0.250 / 0.23
Wang 2071 4-9998 1.4191 2.88 1.4400 2.83 1.4412 2.83 1.4412 2.83 1.4412 2.83 1.451 <th1.451< th=""> 1.451</th1.451<>	Total (95% C) 100.05% 1.40 (10.58, 8.41) Heterogenetry: Tat' = 0.35; Chi ² = 5.97 (# 1 (P = 0.1); I ² = 83% 0.001 0.1 1.0 1000 ³ Test for overall effect; Z = 0.74 (P = 0.46) 0.01; I ² = 83% 0.001 0.1 1.0 1000 ³ Study or subgroup bolOdd8 Ratio SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI NV, Random, 95% CI NV, Random, 95% CI NV, Random, 95% CI 7002222 Clis-chame 0.6620 0.3597 2 6.55% 1.4.33 [4.4.5, 64.21] 0.461 2.8.13 1.17, 4.7.8] Study or subgroup bolOdd8 Ratio SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI NV, Random, 95% CI NV, Random, 95% CI 700extic: 2020 0.6620 0.3597 3 5.5% 1.4.33 [4.4.5, 64.21] 1.00.05% 5.46 [0.94, 31.8] Study or subgroup bolOdd8 Ratio 100.00% 5.46 [0.94, 31.8] 1.00.01 0.1 1.00 Test for overall effect; 2 = 1.88 (P = 0.60) 100.00% 5.46 [0.94, 31.8] 1.00.01 0.1 1.00 Test for overall effect; 2 = 1.89 (P = 0.60) 1.00.01; I ² = 85% 0.001 0.1 1.00 1.0000 Test for overall effect; 2 = 1.89 (P = 0.60) 1.00.04 5.46 [0.94, 31.8] 1.0001 1.0 1.0000 Test for overall effect; 2 = 1.89 (P = 0.60) 1.00.05 5.46 [0.94, 31.8] 1.0001 0.1 1.0 1.0000 Test for overall effect; 2 = 1.89 (P = 0.6	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $
Total (95% CI) 1000,% 6.13 (3.95, 9.52) Heterogenety: Tuu ² = 0.15; Ch ² = 13.07, df = 8 (P = 0.11); ^P = 39%	Total (95% C) 100.00% 1.40 (0.5.8, 3.41) Hetrogenetry: "ut="0.35; C, Ch ² = 5.97, df = 1, 0 ² = 0.01; l ² = 83% 0.001 0.1 1 0.000 ² Test for overall effect: 2 = 0.27, 40 = 0.46) 54 0.045 Ratio 0.001 0.1 1 0.000 ² Study or Subgroup log(Odds Ratio 0.002 0.397 4.5% 1.4.3 [4.45, 46.21] 0.001 0.1 1.0 1.000 ² Zudz 22 (15x-theme 0.4002 0.397 3.5% 2.16 [1.17, 47, 8] 0.001 0.1 1.0 1.000 ² Provencio 2020 2.6626 0.5972 46.5% 1.4.3 [4.45, 46.21] 0.405 8.410 0.001 0.01 0.01 0.000 0.001 0.01 0.000	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $
Volar 1597 k.y Heterogeneticy Tau ² = 0.15; Ch ² = 13.07; df = 8 (P = 0.11; P = 39%)	Total (95% C) 100.00% 1.40 (10.58, 8.41) Hetrogonetry: Tau ² = 0.35; Ch ² = 5.97, df = 1.0° = 0.01; l ² = 83% 0.001 0.1 1.0 1000 ³ Test for overall effect; Z = 0.74 0° = 0.46) 50 0.01 0.1 1.0 1000 ³ Study or Subgroup bg00ds Ratio) 55 Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI V, Random, 95% CI 7000000000000000000000000000000000000	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $
	Total (95% C) 100.05% 1.40 (10.58, 8.41) Heterogeneity: Tast for subgroup fueldeds Ratio 0.001 0.1 1.0 1.000 ⁴ Study or Subgroup fueldeds Ratio 55 Weight IV, Random, 95% CI VK, Random, 95% CI VK, Random, 95% CI Provencio 2020 2.6526 0.5972 6.55% 2.46 (20.4) 0.43 (4.45, 46.21) Study or Subgroup fueldeds 0.6620 0.5972 6.55% 2.46 (20.4) 0.43 (4.35, 46.21) Study or Subgroup fueldeds 0.6620 0.5972 6.55% 2.46 (20.4) 0.43 (4.35, 46.21) Study or Subgroup fueldeds 0.6662 0.5972 6.55% 2.36 (2.1), 7.4 78 (2.1) 0.6602 Study or Subgroup fueldeds 0.6602 0.5972 6.55% 2.36 (2.1), 7.4 78 (2.1) 0.6602 Test for ovarial leffect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.60) 10.00% 5.46 (10.94, 31.83 (1.1) 0.001 0.1 1.0000 Test for ovarial effect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.60) 10.000% 5.46 (10.94, 31.83 (1.1) 0.001 0.1 1.0000 Test for ovarial effect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.60) 1.0000% 5.46 (10.94, 31.83 (1.1) 0.001 0.1 1.0000 Test for ovarial effect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.60) 1.0000% 5.20 (2.2, 2.43 (2.1) 1.0000 1.0000 Test for ovarial effect:	$\frac{D}{100000000000000000000000000000000000$

Figure S5 Forest plot of the efficacy and safety of the ICI + chemo subgroup in the sensitivity analysis. (A) MPR rate; (B) pCR rate; (C) Incidence of TRAEs; (D) incidence of SAEs; (E) resection rate; (F) surgical delay rate. MPR, major pathological response; pCR, complete pathological response; TRAE, treatment-related adverse event; SAE, severe adverse event; SE, standard error; IV, inverse variance; CI, confidence interval.

Table S1 Sensitivity	analysis of	efficacy- and	safety-related	endpoints
2	~	~	~	1

Subgroup	Endpoints	Ratio (95% CI)
Mono-ICI	MPR rate	34.2 (25.9–43.2)
ICI + chemo	MPR rate	56.5 (43.2–69.0) ^a ; 49.5 (37.5–61.4) ^b ; 50.5 (37.9–62.8) ^c
ICI + chemo	pCR rate	25.9 (19.4–34.2) ^d ; 31.0 (21.9–41.9) ^e ; 26.5 (18.0–37.1) ^f
ICI + chemo	Incidence of TRAEs	58.3 (36.7–77.3) ⁹ ; 84.5 (48.5–97.0) ^h
ICI + chemo	Incidence of SAEs	21.3 (17.4–26.5)
ICI + chemo	Resection rate	86.0 (79.8–90.5)
ICI + chemo	Surgical delay rate	2.9 (1.0–10.7)

^{a, b, c} refer to the pooled MPR rate of the ICI + chemo subgroup after removal of the Forde 2021 study, Provencio 2020 study, or Zinner 2020 study, respectively; ^d, ^e, ^f refer to the pooled pCR rate of the ICI + chemo subgroup after removal of the Provencio 2020 study, Rothchild 2021 study, or Shen 2021 study, respectively; ^g, ^h refer to the pooled incidence of TRAEs of the ICI + chemo subgroup after removal of the Provencio 2020 study and Forde 2021 study, respectively. ICI, immune checkpoint inhibitor; chemo, chemotherapy; mono-ICI, single-agent immune checkpoint inhibitor; MPR, major pathological response; pCR, complete pathological response; TRAE, treatment-related adverse event; SAE, severe adverse event; CI, confidence interval.