

1 **Immune checkpoint inhibitors combined**
2 **with antiangiogenic drugs in the treatment**
3 **of unresectable locally advanced / distant**
4 **metastatic esophageal squamous cell**
5 **carcinoma: a systematic review protocol**

6 Juanjuan Lu¹, Honglin Li², Sisi Chang¹, YahuiZhu¹, Fuyan Gao¹, Shuai Shao²,
7 Chunzheng Ma²

8 1. Henan University of Traditional Chinese Medicine (Second Clinical Medical
9 College)

10 2.Henan Provincial Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine

11 Author: Juanjuan Lu, female, postgraduate student, Henan University of Traditional
12 Chinese Medicine (Second Clinical Medical College),
13 17739221512,1123516147@qq.com.

14 Corresponding author: Honglin Li, female, Doctor degree, attending physician, master
15 supervisor, Department of Oncology, Henan Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine,
16 18801611544,46991701@qq.com.

17 **Abstract**

18 **Background and purpose**

19 Esophageal cancer has the seventh highest incidence and sixth highest fatality rate of
20 all malignant tumors. It's a type of cancer that has a greater fatality rate than morbidity.

21 In the treatment of advanced esophageal and squamous cell carcinoma, targeted and

22 immune checkpoint inhibitors have showed promising outcomes in recent years. The
NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 aim of this research was to examine the effectiveness and safety of immune
24 checkpoint inhibitors in combination with antiangiogenic medicines in the treatment
25 of unresectable patients with locally progressed / distant metastatic esophageal
26 squamous cell carcinoma.

27 **Methods**

28 Before April 15, 2022, randomized controlled trials of immune checkpoint inhibitors
29 combined with anti-angiogenic drugs in the treatment of esophageal cancer will be
30 searched on PubMed, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, WebofScience, China Knowledge
31 Network, Wanfang Data Knowledge Service Platform, and VIP. The two authors
32 independently extracted the data, checked the data, and used the "bias risk" tool in the
33 Cochrane intervention system evaluation manual to independently evaluate the bias
34 included in the study. When the extracted data were similar enough, the Revman5.4
35 software was used for meta analysis. If the summary data could not be collected for
36 meta analysis, the results would be summarized in a narrative way.

37

38 **Discussion**

39 This paper introduces in detail the systematic review and design method of immune
40 checkpoint inhibitors mixture with antiangiogenic drugs in the treatment of
41 unresectable locally advanced / distant metastatic esophageal squamous cell
42 carcinoma.

43 **Systematic review registration**

44 The review protocol has been registered in PROSPERO CRD42022324666

45 **Background**

46 Esophageal cancer (EC) is a type of malignant tumor principally involving the
47 squamous epithelium and columnar epithelium of the esophagus, EC has the seventh
48 incidence rate and the sixth mortality rate^[1]. The prime pathologic patterns of EC are
49 squamous cell carcinoma and adenocarcinoma , while esophageals squamous cell
50 carcinoma (ESCC)make up more than 90% of all EC ^[2-3]. According to statistics, there
51 were only 572000 new cases of EC from poles to poles in 2018, of which ESCC
52 accounted for 482000 cases ^[4]. In recent years, the overall morbidity of EC has
53 decreased, but the mortality rate remains high. The total five-year survival rate of
54 patients with EC is only 16%, while the median survival time is less than 1 year ^[5-6].

55

56 The conventional treatment for EC is surgical resection or subresection combined
57 with lymph node dissection, although more than half of ESCC patients are progressed
58 at the time of treatment and cannot receive routine treatment [7-8]. Patients with EC
59 have a 5-year survival rate of fewer than 20% when treated with radiation,
60 chemotherapy, or surgical combination treatment [9]. This demonstrates that there is a
61 critical need to investigate new treatment options for unresectable locally progressed /
62 distant metastatic ESCC. In the treatment of advanced ESCC, targeted and immune
63 checkpoint inhibitors (ICI)have showed promising outcomes in recent years
64 [10].Wang,F et al. ^[11] showed that canrelizumab combined with apatinib as a
65 second-line treatment of ESCC achieved a good clinical efficacy, and this is also the
66 first randomized controlled trial of the programmed cell death-1 receptor (PD-1)

67 inhibitors combined with anti-angiogenesis inhibitors in the therapy of terminal
68 ESCC.

69

70 However, there is yet little evidence to support the use of ICI in combination with
71 antiangiogenic medicines in the treatment of advanced esophageal squamous cell
72 carcinoma. In this study, we'll look at progression-free survival (PFS), overall survival
73 (OS), objective remission rate (ORR), quality of life, and adverse events, as well as
74 the efficacy and safety of ICI paired with anti-angiogenic medicines. To provide
75 clinicians with a solid foundation.

76 **Method/design**

77 The method we used will be consistent with the PRISMA-P Statement [12] (see
78 additional file 1) report, the preferred reporting item for the Systems evaluation and
79 Meta-analysis program, and has been registered with the International Prospective
80 Systems Review Registry (PROSPERO), registration number CRD42022324666.

81 We will use the PICO principle to describe the research problem, as shown in Table 1.

82 Table 1:

P	Patients with unresectable locally advanced/distant metastatic esophageal squamous cell carcinoma confirmed by histology or cytology
I	Immune checkpoint inhibitor in combination with antiangiogenic drugs
C	chemotherapy
O	Overall survival, progression-free survival
Immune checkpoint inhibitors include: PD-1 inhibitors: nivolumab, pembrolizumab, toripalizumab, sintilimab, camrelizumab, tislelizumab Anti-, Pienpilimumab; PD-L1 Inhibitors: Durvalumab, Atezolizumab, Avaluzumab; CTLA-4 Inhibitor: Ipilimumab. Anti-angiogenic drugs include: bevacizumab, recombinant human endostatin, sorafenib, sunitinib, apatinib, anlotinib, fruquintinib, ramucirumab. Chemotherapy drugs include, but are not limited to: fluorouracil, cisplatin, taxane, docetaxel, oxaliplatin, leucovorin, and epirubicin, alone or in combination.	

83

84

85 **The study's inclusion as well as exclusion criteria**

86 The following criteria will be met by the researches included in this evaluation:

87 (1)Patients with unresectable advanced or metastatic ESCC diagnosed
88 histologically or cytologically;

89 (2)Patients were treated with ICI and antiangiogenic agents;

90 (3)At least one of the following outcomes should be reported: OS, PFS, ORR,
91 quality of life assessment, and adverse reactions.

92 (4) Randomized controlled trials.

93 The following criteria will be excluded :

94 (1) duplicate publication of data;

95 (2) Outcome indicators are not clear or cannot be combined;

96 (3) Small cell esophageal carcinoma, esophageal adenocarcinoma, or other
97 mixed carcinomas proved by histology or cytology.

98 (4) Animal tests.

99

100 **Outcome measures of the study**

101 The ultimate goal of cancer treatment is to help patients manage the progression of the
102 disease and thus live longer. So we chose two primary endpoints:

103 (1) PFS: the time from randomization to disease progression or death from any
104 cause.

105 (2) OS : time from randomization to death.

106 Secondary outcome measures included:

107 (1) ORR : the proportion of patients whose tumor shrank by a certain amount for
108 a certain period of time.

109 (2) Quality of life evaluation: Karnofsky score was adopted.

110 (3) Adverse reactions.

111

112 **Retrieval strategy**

113 We will search relevant studies published before April 15, 2022 in PubMed, Cochrane

114 Library, EMBASE, Web of Science, CNKI, Wan fang Data Knowledge Service

115 Platform, and VIP through the combination of subject words and free words, without

116 language restrictions. Also, we will re-conduct the search before the final analysis.

117 Additional file 2 for more detailed Pubmed database search strategy.

118

119 **Study selection**

120 The two authors (HLL,JJL) will independently search the literature, select the

121 potential studies that meet the inclusion criteria, import the literature management

122 software NoteExpress to delete the duplicate literatures, then read the literature title

123 and abstract, and include the preliminary qualified literatures according to the

124 established criteria. Then, after reading the full text, the literatures will be screened

125 again and the reasons for the exclusion of the full text will be recorded. Then

126 cross-check. If the two parties disagree, we will communicate with the third author

127 (SSC) until consensus is reached to ensure that the included literature is

128 comprehensive and accurate. We will document the selection process in detail in the

129 PRISMA flowchart, see additional file 3.

130

131 **Data extraction and management**

132 We will extract the data eventually included in the study according to the pre-designed
133 inclusion study feature table (Table 2). Two authors (HLL,JJL) will extract the data
134 independently and record the following specific data in the table.

135 (1) Study characteristics and methods: first author, publication date,
136 randomization, allocation hiding, and median follow-up time.

137 (2) Participants: Total number of participants in each group, country, gender, age,
138 tumor stage, pathological diagnosis, PD-L1 protein expression level.

139 (3) Intervention: specific treatment plan.

140 (4) Other data: OS, PFS, ORR, adverse reactions, quality of life assessment, 95%
141 confidence interval.

142 If the data in the report is missing or unclear, the first author will be contacted by
143 email for specific data.

144 Table 2:

Author	Year	Country	Gender	Number	T/C	Age	Pathological diagnosis	Tumor stage	PD-L1	Randomization method	Allocation hidden	Median follow-up	Interventions(T)	Interventions(C)	95%CI	Outcomes

145 T:Therapy group C:Control group CI:Confidence Interval Outcomes:overall survival,progression-free survival,objective response rate,Quality of Life assessment,Adverse reactions.

146

147 **Quality evaluation method**

148 Two authors (HLL,JJL) independently assessed the bias of the included studies using
149 the "risk of bias" tool in the Handbook of Systematic Review of Cochrane
150 Interventions ^[13].A third author (SSC) will be consulted when differences arise.

151 Each of the following areas will be evaluated: random sequence generation (selection
152 bias);Allocation hiding (selection bias);Blindness of subjects and intervention

153 implementors (implementation bias);Blind method of outcome evaluators (detection
154 bias);Results data were incomplete (lost to follow-up bias);Selective reporting
155 (reporting bias);Other biases (common other biases: availability of clear
156 inclusion/exclusion criteria; Whether to calculate the sample size; Sample size
157 balance between groups; Whether baseline data are comparable; Financial support and
158 conflict of interest).Each area will be assessed for high risk, low risk, or uncertain risk
159 bias. The evaluation results will be reported on the Risk quality assessment chart.

160

161 **Statistical analysis**

162 We will use Revman5.4 software to analyze the data. We will conduct meta analysis
163 only if the participants, interventions and outcome measurements included in the
164 study are similar enough. For the analysis of event occurrence time results, we use the
165 Hazard ratio (HR) and its 95% confidence interval (CI)as the effect measure of each
166 study ^[14]. For binary data, we will calculate relative risk (RR) and 95% CI based on
167 the analysis of the number of events and the number of participants in the intervention
168 group and the control group. For consecutive results, if all the results are measured on
169 the same scale, we will summarize the mean difference (MD) between the treatment
170 groups. We will use Cochran Q and I^2 statistics to assess the statistical heterogeneity
171 between trials. When $P < 0.10$ or $I^2 > 50\%$, it indicates that there is obvious
172 heterogeneity ^[15], then choose the random effect model to analyze the data, otherwise
173 we will use the fixed effect model. If the same study results use different
174 measurement methods, we will use the inverse variance method to calculate

175 standardized mean difference(SMD) and 95%CI, and we will analyze the data based
176 on the mean, standard deviation and number of participants between the intervention
177 group and the control group to calculate the mean difference and 95%CI between the
178 treatment group. If we are unable to count the aggregate data for meta analysis, we
179 will conduct a narrative summary of the results. When there is significant
180 heterogeneity, we will do a subgroup analysis of the main outcome indicators, such as
181 the selection of immune checkpoint inhibitors. When the sample size is sufficient to
182 support the analysis (randomized controlled trial > 10), we will investigate the
183 publication bias of the funnel chart and do sensitivity analysis.

184 **Evidence quality assessment**

185 The included outcome indicators were evaluated according to the GRADE tool. The
186 GRADE system evaluates evidence grades based on five grading factors (bias risk,
187 indirectness, imprecision, inconsistency, and publication bias), with drop 1 grade to
188 medium quality, drop 2 grade to low quality, drop 3 grade to very low quality. High
189 quality evidence is strong recommendation, low quality and very low quality is weak
190 recommendation. Finally, the quality of evidence is divided into four levels: high
191 quality, medium quality, low quality and very low quality. High quality evidence is
192 strong recommendation, low quality and very low quality is weak recommendation.

193 **Discussion**

194 EC is a global medical and health problem. It is an aggressive malignant tumor.
195 Surgical resection is a radical treatment. However, most of the patients have local
196 advanced/distant metastasis and cannot be treated by surgery when they come to the

197 clinic. Therefore, the prognosis is poor and new treatment methods are urgently
198 needed. Targeted and ICI have been shown to be efficacious in the management of
199 advanced esophageal squamous cell carcinoma in recent years. Wang, F et al. [11]
200 were the first to study the combination of PD-1 inhibitors and anti-angiogenic
201 inhibitors in the treatment of advanced ESCC, and the clinical results were
202 encouraging, which would be the beginning of a new therapy. Currently, ICI
203 combined with antiangiogenic agents in the therapy of terminal esophageal squamous
204 cell carcinoma are limited, and there is no systematic evaluation of this new therapy.
205 This study will be the first systematic review of immuncheckpoint inhibitors
206 combined with antiangiogenic agents in the treatment of unresectable locally
207 advanced/distant metastatic esophageal squamous cell carcinoma.

208 This article follows PRISMA-P standards and has been registered with the
209 International Registry for Prospective Systems Review (PROSPERO), registration
210 number CRD42022324666. The research and design methods of system evaluation
211 and meta-analysis are introduced in detail, including inclusion/exclusion criteria,
212 outcome indicators, search strategies, study selection, data extraction and
213 management, quality assessment methods, statistical analysis, and the GRADE system
214 evaluation will be used to evaluate the grade of outcome indicators. Our primary
215 objective is to provide reliable data on the efficacy and safety of immuncheckpoint
216 inhibitors combined with antiangiogenic agents in the treatment of advanced
217 esophageal squamous cell carcinoma for scientific use in clinical studies.

218 **Abbreviations**

- 219 EC:Esophageal cancer
- 220 ESCC:Esophageals squamous cell carcinoma
- 221 ICI:Immune checkpoint inhibitors
- 222 PD-1:Programmed cell death-1 receptor
- 223 PFS:Progression-free survival
- 224 OS:Overall survival ,
- 225 ORR:Objective remission rate
- 226 PRISMA-P:Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
- 227 Protocols
- 228 CNKI:China National Knowledge Internet
- 229 HR:Hazard ratio
- 230 CI:Confidence interval
- 231 RR:Relative risk
- 232 MD:Mean difference
- 233 SMD:Standardized mean difference
- 234 **Declarations**
- 235 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**
- 236 Not applicable.
- 237 **Consent for publication**
- 238 Not applicable.
- 239 **Availability of data and materials**

240 Not applicable.

241 **Competing interests**

242 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

243 **Funding**

244 Henan Provincial Administration of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Henan Provincial
245 Traditional Chinese Medicine Scientific Research Special Project, 2022ZY1089, The
246 funders had no role in developing the review protocol.

247 **Authors' contributions**

248 This study was primarily conceived by HLL, JJJ, and SSC, with JJJ writing the first
249 draft of the protocol manuscript and rigorously revising it by HLL. SSC, YHZ, FYG,
250 SS registered the protocol in the PROSPERO database. CZM reviewed the manuscript.
251 All authors have read and approved this agreement for publication.

252 **Acknowledgements**

253 Not applicable.

254 **Authors' information**

255 Corresponding author:HLL

256 **References**

- 257 [1] Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates
258 of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2018 Nov;68(6):394-424. doi:
259 10.3322/caac.21492.
- 260 [2]Pennathur A, Gibson MK, Jobe BA, Luketich JD. Oesophageal carcinoma. *Lancet*. 2013 Feb 2;381(9864):400-12. doi:

- 261 10.1016/S0140-6736.
- 262 [3]Arnold M, Soerjomataram I, Ferlay J, Forman D. Global incidence of oesophageal cancer by histological subtype in
263 2012. *Gut*. 2015 Mar;64(3):381-7. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2014-308124.
- 264 [4]Arnold M, Ferlay J, van Berge Henegouwen MI, Soerjomataram I. Global burden of oesophageal and gastric cancer
265 by histology and subsite in 2018. *Gut*. 2020 Sep;69(9):1564-1571. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2020-321600.
- 266 [5]Fujihara S, Morishita A, Ogawa K, Tadokoro T, Chiyo T, Kato K, Kobara H, Mori H, Iwama H, Masaki T. The angiotensin
267 II type 1 receptor antagonist telmisartan inhibits cell proliferation and tumor growth of esophageal adenocarcinoma
268 via the AMPK α /mTOR pathway in vitro and in vivo. *Oncotarget*. 2017 Jan 31;8(5):8536-8549. doi:
269 10.18632/oncotarget.14345.
- 270 [6]Li J, Xu J, Zheng Y, Gao Y, He S, Li H, Zou K, Li N, Tian J, Chen W, He J. Esophageal cancer: Epidemiology, risk factors
271 and screening. *Chin J Cancer Res*. 2021 Oct 31;33(5):535-547. doi: 10.21147/j.issn.1000-9604.2021.05.01.
- 272 [7]Tsuchiya N, Kunisaki C, Sato S, Tanaka Y, Sato K, Watanabe J, Takeda K, Kosaka T, Akiyama H, Endo I.
273 Chemoradiotherapy for Locally Advanced Esophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma. *Langenbecks Arch Surg*. 2022 Mar 1.
274 doi: 10.1007/s00423-022-02445-4.
- 275 [8]Thoen H, Ceelen W, Boterberg T, Van Daele E, Pattyn P. Tumor recurrence and in-field control after multimodality
276 treatment of locally advanced esophageal cancer. *Radiother Oncol*. 2015 Apr;115(1):16-21. doi:
277 10.1016/j.radonc.2015.03.012.
- 278 [9]Samson P, Lockhart AC. Biologic therapy in esophageal and gastric malignancies: current therapies and future
279 directions. *J Gastrointest Oncol*. 2017 Jun;8(3):418-429. doi: 10.21037/jgo.2016.11.13.
- 280 [10]He S, Xu J, Liu X, Zhen Y. Advances and challenges in the treatment of esophageal cancer. *Acta Pharm Sin B*. 2021
281 Nov;11(11):3379-3392. doi: 10.1016/j.apsb.2021.03.008.
- 282 [11]Wang, F., et al., Camrelizumab in combination with apatinib as second-line treatment for advanced esophageal

283 squamous cell carcinoma: A single-arm, open-label, phase II study. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 2021. 39(3_suppl): p.
284 215-215.

285 [12]Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates
286 of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2018 Nov;68(6):394-424. doi:
287 10.3322/caac.21492.

288 [13]Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, Savovic J, Schulz KF, Weeks L, Sterne JA; Cochrane
289 Bias Methods Group; Cochrane Statistical Methods Group. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias
290 in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2011 Oct 18;343:d5928. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d5928.

291 [14]Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Ghersi D, Burdett S, Sydes MR. Practical methods for incorporating summary time-to-event
292 data into meta-analysis. *Trials*. 2007 Jun 7;8:16. doi: 10.1186/1745-6215-8-16.

293 [15]Yu G, Yu W, Xu X, Ye B, Yao L. Neoadjuvant immunotherapy for resectable esophageal cancer: A protocol of
294 meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2021 Jun 4;16(6):e0252829. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0252829.

295