- 1 Equalizing prognostic disparities in stage III KRAS-mutant NSCLC: addition of
- 2 durvalumab to combined chemoradiotherapy improves survival
- 3
- 4 Ella A. Eklund<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Mathilda Orgard<sup>1,2</sup>, Delice Wallin<sup>1,2</sup>, Sama I. Sayin<sup>,3</sup>, Henrik Fagman<sup>4,5</sup>,
- 5 Sukanya Raghavan<sup>6</sup>, Levent M Akyürek<sup>4,5</sup>, Jan Nyman<sup>3,7</sup>, Clotilde Wiel<sup>1</sup>, Andreas Hallqvist<sup>3,7</sup>,
- 6 Volkan I. Sayin<sup>1,2</sup>
- 7 <sup>1</sup>Department of Surgery, Institute of Clinical Sciences, Sahlgrenska Center for Cancer
- 8 Research, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden; <sup>2</sup>Wallenberg Centre for Molecular
- 9 and Translational Medicine, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden; <sup>3</sup>Department of
- 10 Oncology, Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Gothenburg, Sweden; <sup>4</sup>Department of Laboratory
- 11 Medicine, Institute of Biomedicine, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden;
- <sup>5</sup>Department of Clinical Pathology, Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Gothenburg, Sweden;
- <sup>13</sup> <sup>6</sup>Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Institute for Biomedicine, Sahlgrenska
- Academy, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden; <sup>7</sup>Department of Oncology,
- 15 Institute of Clinical Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden
- 16 Correspondence to:
- 17 V.I.S volkan.sayin@wlab.gu.se
- 18 Keywords: lung cancer, NSCLC, locally advanced, stage III, KRAS, real-world data,
- 19 chemoradiotherapy, immunotherapy, durvalumab

### 20 Abstract

- 21 *Introduction*: Stage III non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) is heterogeneous and
- 22 identification of subgroups with differential responses is crucial to optimize treatment.
- 23 Addition of durvalumab to concurrent chemoradiotherapy (cCRT) has previously been shown
- to improve survival outcomes. Meanwhile, subgroups harboring KRAS mutations have been
- 25 shown to have worse prognosis. We investigated whether KRAS mutational status may
- 26 affect survival outcomes after adjuvant durvalumab following cCRT in stage III NSCLC.
- 27 Methods: In this retrospective study, we present a real-world dataset of all stage III NSCLC
- patients treated with cCRT with a curative intent and molecularly assessed between 2016-
- 2021 in West Sweden. Primary study outcomes were overall survival (OS) and progressionfree survival (PFS).
- 31 **Results**: We identified 145 patients receiving cCRT with a curative intent, 32% harbored an
- 32 activating mutation in the KRAS gene (KRAS<sup>MUT</sup>). Compared to KRAS wild-type (KRAS<sup>WT</sup>),
- KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> had a worse OS (p=0.047) and PFS (p=0.038). The finding persisted on
- 34 multivariate analysis with OS (HR 1.703, 95%CI 1.074-2.702, *p* = 0.024) and PFS (HR 1.628,
- 95% CI 1.081-2.453, p = 0.020). After the addition of durvalumab to cCRT, there were no
- 36 longer any significant differences between KRAS<sup>WT</sup> and KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> in OS or PFS.
- 37 **Conclusions**: KRAS mutations are a negative prognostic factor after cCRT in stage III
- 38 NSCLC, and the addition of durvalumab equalizes the negative impact of harboring this
- 39 mutation.
- 40
- 41 1490 characters

### 42 Introduction

43 Lung cancer remains the leading cause of cancer mortality, and non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) accounts for 80-85% of cases. Stage at diagnosis is an important prognostic factor 44 45 in NSCLC, since patients in later stages have increasingly worse prognosis.<sup>1</sup> Staging (I-IV) is based on the TNM system, which describes the size and infiltration status of the primary 46 47 tumor, number and location of regional lymph nodes involved, and number and location of 48 metastases. About 30% of new cases of NSCLC are stage III at diagnosis. Stage III, also 49 referred to as locally advanced NSCLC, is defined as having spread locoregionally through 50 primary tumor extension into extrapulmonary structures and involving hilar or mediastinal lymph nodes but having no evidence of distant metastases.<sup>2-4</sup> 51 Importantly, stage III NSCLC is a heterogenous group, with overall survival (OS) rates 52 ranging between 35% and 10%.<sup>2, 5, 6</sup> There are large variations between patients belonging to 53 this group in the degree of local disease advancement, clinical presentation, and treatment

this group in the degree of local disease advancement, clinical presentation, and treatment
 options.<sup>7-9</sup> Treatment regimens are generally determined in multidisciplinary case discussions

at high volume centers including oncologists, radiologists, pneumologists and thoracic

57 surgeons.<sup>10, 11</sup> Treatment of stage III NSCLC patients can be highly personalized and the

identification of subgroups that are more responsive to certain treatment combinations thanothers is

In recent years there has been growing interest in KRAS-mutated (KRAS<sup>MUT</sup>) NSCLC due to

61 the introduction of new tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKI) targeting KRAS, offering new

62 treatment possibilities for this subgroup. KRAS mutation is the most prevalent oncogenic

driver in NSCLC (35%) but the prognostic and predictive role of KRAS mutations is under

debate. While we and others have shown KRAS mutations to negatively influence the

prognosis of NSCLC,<sup>12-15</sup> some studies found no difference in OS.<sup>16-18</sup> In addition, some have

<sup>66</sup> reported shorter OS for KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> compared to wild type (KRAS<sup>WT</sup>) patients following first-line

67 platinum-based chemotherapy.<sup>19-21</sup> Hence, the significance of KRAS mutation for prognosis

and treatment response in NSCLC disease remains a pending topic.<sup>22</sup>

69 First-line treatment for unresectable stage III NSCLC is concurrent chemoradiotherapy

70 (cCRT) provided that patients have a decent performance status, adequate lung function and

no discouraging comorbidity. Treatment is typically given with a platinum doublet and

conventionally fractioned radiotherapy to a total dose of 60-66 Gy.

73 Addition of immune check point blockades were first approved in stage IV treatment schedules and was found to be associated with substantial improvements in overall survival. 74 marking a new paradigm in lung cancer care.<sup>13, 14</sup> Patients in this group receive targeted 75 therapy depending on specific mutations if present, or immunotherapy-containing regimens, 76 either as monotherapy or in combination with chemotherapy or a second immunotherapy 77 drug.<sup>23</sup> Consolidation therapy with the programmed death-ligand (PD-L1) inhibitor 78 79 durvalumab after chemoradiotherapy in stage III NSCLC was approved in 2018 Europe based on findings from the PACIFIC trial.<sup>15</sup> This trial demonstrated the superiority of 80 durvalumab over placebo in terms of increased overall survival among patients with stage III 81 NSCLC treated with chemoradiotherapy. Several studies reporting similar findings have 82 83 followed <sup>16</sup>, and recently a 5-year follow up of the PACIFIC trial showed that these changes persisted over time.<sup>17</sup> Durvalumab is now part of standard treatment regimens for stage III 84 85 NSCLC patients where those with no disease progression after first-line therapy with cCRT

86 and PD-L1 expression  $\geq$  1 %, are recommended adjuvant treatment with durvalumab for 12 months.18 87

88 Although relatively few studies have been conducted regarding the impact of KRAS mutation 89 on prognosis after cCRT in stage III NSCLC, the available data suggests KRAS mutation as a negative predictor for treatment response and OS.<sup>20, 21</sup> Furthermore, data on KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> in 90 the context of ICB treatment in stage III disease is scarce. In summary, given previous 91 findings of heterogeneity of stage III NSCLC, worsened prognosis in the presence of KRAS 92 93 mutations in this group, and improved prognosis after the introduction of consolidation 94 therapy with durvalumab in the overall group, we wondered whether KRAS mutation 95 subgroups may respond differentially to durvalumab. Here, we investigate whether 96 consolidation therapy with durvalumab affects survival outcomes in KRAS mutated stage III NSCLC patients. Our aim with this study is to assess outcomes in KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> vs KRAS<sup>WT</sup> in 97 locally advanced NSCLC patients receiving cCRT with and without durvalumab. 98

99

### 100 **Material and Methods**

#### 101 Study Design and Study Population

102 This retrospective cohort study includes all consecutive patients with stage III NSCLC in the

- 103 Västra Götaland region, Sweden, between the years 2016-2021 who underwent molecular
- 104 assessment and received combined chemoradiotherapy with curative intent (n = 145).
- 105 Patients were excluded if they underwent surgery or received sequential chemoradiotherapy

106 (n = 45) (Figure 1). The study period encompasses the standard practice before the

107 introduction of durvalumab, allowing for the evaluation of the potential impact of ICB. For

108 inclusion in the durvalumab analyses, a single dose of durvalumab was deemed sufficient.

#### 109 **Data Collection Procedures**

110 Patients were selected for the study through the pathology regional laboratory information 111 system, where they were referred for molecular assessment. The selected patients 112 underwent next-generation sequencing (NGS) on DNA from FFPE blocks or cytological 113 smears using the Ion AmpliSeq<sup>™</sup> Colon and Lung Cancer Panel v2 from Thermo Fisher Scientific until 2019 and thereafter the Thermo Fisher Oncomine<sup>™</sup> Focus Assay, assessing 114 115 hotspot mutations in EGFR, BRAF, KRAS and NRAS. Until June 2017, ALK-fusions were 116 assessed with immunohistochemistry (IHC), and with fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) if positive or inconclusive IHC; ROS1 was analyzed upon request with FISH. 117 118 Thereafter, ALK, ROS1 and RET fusions were assessed on RNA using the Oncomine Solid 119 Tumor Fusion Panel from Thermo Fisher Scientific. The analyzes was done as a part of the 120 diagnostic workup process at the Department of Clinical Pathology at Sahlgrenska University 121 Hospital

122 Demographic data and pathological details were retrieved from the Swedish Lung Cancer

- 123 Registry and patient charts. The trial was approved by the Swedish ethical review authority
- 124 (Dnr 2019-04771, 2021-04987) and conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki
- 125 and Good Clinical Practice guidelines as defined by the International Conference on
- 126 Harmonization.

### 127 Variables

- 128 Collected patient demographic details included age, sex, Eastern Cooperative Oncology
- 129 Group performance status (ECOG PS) and smoking history (current/former/never).

- Pathological details encompassed substage, histology and mutational status. All patients 130
- were classified according TNM 8<sup>th</sup> edition. Treatment characteristics included platinum-131
- doublet chemotherapy regimen, total radiation dose and administration of durvalumab. Time-132
- 133 to-event data included the date of treatment initiation, the date of disease progression and/or
- 134 death and the date of last follow-up.

#### 135 **Outcomes**

- The primary endpoints were overall survival (OS) and progression free survival (PFS). OS 136 137 was defined as the time interval between the date of first treatment and the date of death
- 138 from any cause. PFS was defined as the time interval between the date of first treatment and
- 139 the date of progression or death whichever came first. Patients without disease progression
- 140 and were still alive at the time of data collection were censored at last follow-up. OS and
- PFS, stratified based on KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> versus KRAS<sup>WT</sup> patients, were analyzed both for the entire 141
- cohort and subgroups receiving or not receiving durvalumab. 142

### 143 Statistical Analysis

- Descriptive statistics were used to describe the clinical characteristics, which were further 144 145 evaluated using univariate analysis. OS and PFS, stratified by KRAS mutational status,
- 146 PDL1 and treatment type, were estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method. Log-rank tests
- 147 were used to determine significant differences in PFS and OS between groups. Multivariable
- 148 Cox regression analysis was conducted to compensate for potential confounders. Median
- 149 follow-up time was calculated using the reverse Kaplan-Meier method. Statistical significance
- 150 was set at p < 0.05.
- 151

### 152 Results

### Patients and tumor characteristics 153

- 154 A total number of 145 patients were included in the study (Figure 1) and their characteristics are shown in Table 1. The median age at diagnosis was 69 years for both KRAS<sup>WT</sup> patients 155 and KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> patients. There were more females and a more substantial smoking history in 156 the KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> population. ECOG PS 0 was more common among KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> (45%) than 157 KRAS<sup>WT</sup> patients (34%). A greater proportion of KRAS<sup>WT</sup> patients had substage IIIC at 158 diagnosis. Squamous cell carcinoma was non-existent in the KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> group but common in 159 the KRAS<sup>WT</sup> group (40%). The majority of KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> patients had an adenocarcinoma (89.%). 160 The most common driver mutations were in KRAS and EGFR. KRAS<sup>G12C</sup> was the most 161
- common KRAS sub-mutation (24, 52%). Median follow-up time was 48 months (95% CI 40-162 48).
- 163

### 164 KRAS mutation worsens survival outcomes in stage III NSCLC patients

- 165 Among our entire study population (n=145) there was a significantly lower median OS among
- KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> patients (25 months) compared with KRAS<sup>WT</sup> (46 months; p=0.047). Additionally, 166
- PFS was significantly lower among KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> patients (9 months) compared to 16 months for 167
- KRAS<sup>WT</sup> (16 months; p = 0.038) (Figure 2A & B). The results were further controlled for 168
- confounders with multivariate cox regression. We found that KRAS mutation was an 169
- independent prognostic factor for worse OS (HR 1.703, 95% Cl 1.074-2.702, p = 0.024) and 170
- 171 PFS (HR 1.628, 95% CI 1.081-2.453, p = 0.020) (Figure 2C & D).

### KRAS mutation worsens survival outcomes after cCRT among stage III NSCLC 172

### 173 patients

174 When studying the impact of KRAS mutational status on prognosis following cCRT, we found

significantly worse median OS for KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> (24 months) vs KRAS<sup>WT</sup> (35 months) (p = 0.036)

- 176 (Figure 3A) and, additionally, worse median PFS of 8 vs 13 months (p = 0.037), respectively
- 177 (Figure 3B).

# Adjuvant durvalumab significantly improves survival outcomes after cCRT among all stage III NSCLC patients

- 180 When analyzing the effect of consolidation durvalumab on the full cohort we observed a
- 181 significant improved OS and PFS with median OS not reached for the durvalumab group
- (mean OS 41 months) and 30 months for the group not receiving durvalumab (p = 0.037) and
- a median PFS of 19 months vs 10 months, respectively (p < 0.001)(Supplemental figure 1A
- 184 & B).

## 185 KRAS mutation groups show improved survival outcomes after adjuvant durvalumab

- 186 While KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> groups showed worse prognosis (24 months) than wildtype (35 months) after
- treatment with cCRT alone (p = 0.036) (Figure 3A), addition of durvalumab to the treatment
- regimen equalized this difference and KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> patients had no longer any significant
- differences in survival outcomes (40 months) from KRAS<sup>WT</sup> (40 months) (p = 0.788) (Figure
- 190 3C). Similarly, when measuring PFS, while KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> had significantly decreased PFS (8
- 191 months) compared to KRAS<sup>WT</sup> (13 months) among patients treated with cCRT alone (p =
- 192 0.037) (Figure 3B), addition of durvalumab to the treatment regimen abolished the
- additionally negative prognosis of KRAS<sup>MUT</sup>, and this group had no longer had significant
- difference in PFS (19 months) compared to KRAS<sup>WT</sup> (23 months) (p = 0.855) (Figure 3D).

# Adjuvant durvalumab equalizes the negative impact of KRAS mutation on survival outcomes after cCRT

- To further investigate whether KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> is a subgroup in stage III NSCLC that especially gains from adjuvant therapy with durvalumab after cCRT, we analyzed the effect of treatment within each mutational group separately. We observed that treatment with durvalumab had greater effect on improving OS in KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> group (p = 0.063) compared to KRAS<sup>WT</sup> (p =0.345) (Supplemental figure 2A, 2C). Both KRAS<sup>WT</sup> (p = 0.033) and KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> (p = 0.011)
- 202 groups had a significant benefit of adjuvant durvalumab on PFS (Supplemental figure 2B,
  203 2D).

204

## 205 Discussion

This study suggests that the previously inferior prognosis of stage III KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> compared to 206 KRAS<sup>WT</sup> patients treated with cCRT has improved to a similar outcome in both groups due to 207 the introduction of ICB in the stage III setting. There is no survival difference between the 208 209 KRAS populations when durvalumab is administered in contrast to the findings from the era 210 before ICB. The predictive role of KRAS mutation in relation to outcome in NSCLC is a 211 controversial topic, particularly for stage III NSCLC where the literature is relatively sparse in 212 contrast to earlier stages and metastatic stage IV disease. In the latter, treated with chemotherapy, some studies describe KRAS mutation as a negative prognostic factor for OS 213 214 and PFS <sup>13-15</sup> while others demonstrate an equal survival benefit for KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> and KRAS<sup>WT</sup> patients<sup>16-18</sup>. After the introduction of ICB in the stage IV treatment paradigm new 215 216 assessment of the impact of KRAS have been performed but do not consistently point in the 217 same direction, and the predictive value of KRAS related to ICB treatment remains

debatable.<sup>21</sup> The prognostic value of mutated KRAS in stage III patients treated with 218 concurrent chemoradiotherapy likely indicates an association with an inferior prognosis, as 219 suggested by previous data where mutated KRAS was independently connected to a 220 decrease in overall survival in multivariate analysis.<sup>22, 24</sup> Regarding the significance of KRAS 221 222 mutations in stage III disease after the introduction of durvalumab, there are a few reported cohorts. Riudavets et al observed in a study with 323 patients that there was no PFS 223 difference between patients with a mix of oncogenic drivers compared to wild type patients<sup>25</sup>. 224 In the group with oncogenic drivers (n=43) the KRAS<sup>G12C</sup> mutated stage III NSCLC patients 225 had superior PFS compared to other driver genetic alterations (EGFR<sup>del119/ex21</sup>, BRAF<sup>V600E</sup>, 226 ALK-rearrangements) following consolidative durvalumab treatment but no difference in OS 227 228 was seen at a median follow-up time of 18 months. This finding is in line with previous data 229 where oncogenic drivers usually associated with never smokers are known not to correlate with response to ICB treatment,<sup>26</sup> at least not to ICB monotherapy.<sup>27</sup> Liu et al observed in a 230 cohort of 104 patients a shorter PFS for both KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> and non-KRAS driver variations 231 compared to KRAS<sup>WT</sup> in stage III NSCLC and no difference in OS was found at a median 232 follow-up time of 23.6 months.<sup>28</sup> In accordance with the current study, Guo et al recognized 233 KRAS mutated stage III NSCLC as having equal PFS and OS as tumors with no driver 234 mutations in a cohort of 74 patients.<sup>8</sup> Lastly, in a recent study by Cortiula et al they assessed 235 outcome in a cohort of 66 patients harbouring KRAS mutations and uncommon genetic 236 237 alterations (PIK3CA, TP53, MET, BRAF, HER2, uncommon EGFR) where a beneficial effect of durvalumab on OS and PFS was demonstrated.<sup>29</sup> 238

Another potential improvement strategy is the addition of KRAS inhibitors in the stage III
 treatment schedule. At present sotorasib is the only approved drug, but only in stage IV
 NSCLC second line.<sup>30</sup> In theory TKI's could be added to the stage III approach, either up front, or as an adjuvant therapy in line with the addition of EGFR and ALK-directed therapy
 after surgery.<sup>31, 32</sup>

The findings herein are limited by the retrospective design and low sample size, furthermore the impact of co-mutational partners like KEAP1 or STK11 is not known. Nevertheless, the results represent a consecutive cohort in a real-world setting. The findings contribute the knowledge in line with other small cohorts and in conclusion: addition of durvalumab after cCRT in stage III NSCLC patients has improved outcome for the KRAS<sup>MUT</sup> patients to a similar level as for the KRAS<sup>WT</sup> group.

250

## 251 Acknowledgements

252 We thank members of the Swedish Lung Cancer Registry and the continuous reporting by 253 Swedish healthcare employees. This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council 254 (2018-02318 and 2022-00971 to VIS, 2021-03138 to CW), the Swedish Cancer Society (23-255 3062 to VIS, 22-0612FE to CW), the Gothenburg Society of Medicine (2019: 19/889991 to 256 EAE), Assar Gabrielsson Research Foundation (to EAE, CW, and VIS), the Swedish state 257 under the agreement between the Swedish government and the county councils, the ALF-258 agreement (to HF), Department of Oncology, Sahlgrenska University Hospital (to EAE and 259 AH), the Swedish Society for Medical Research (2018; S18-034 to VIS), the Knut and Alice 260 Wallenberg Foundation, and the Wallenberg Centre for Molecular and Translational Medicine 261 (to VIS).

262

## 263 Authors' contributions

Conceptualization, E.A.E., A.H. and V.I.S.; Data curation, E.A.E., M.O., D.W., H.F.; Formal analysis, E.A.E., M.O. and D.W.; Funding acquisition, E.A.E., H.F., S.R., L.M.A., J.N., C.W., A.H. and V.I.S.; Methodology, E.A.E.; Resources, H.F.; Supervision, A.H. and V.I.S.; Visualization, E.A.E., S.I.S., C.W. and V.I.S.; Writing—original draft, E.A.E., S.I.S, A.H. and V.I.S.; Writing—review & editing, E.A.E., S.I.S., H.F., S.R., L.M.A., J.N., C.W., A.H. and V.I.S.; Project coordination, A.H. and V.I.S. All authors have read and agreed to the publiched version of the manuagript

270 published version of the manuscript.

271

## 272 Declaration of potential conflict of interest

273 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## 274 Institutional Review Board Statement

- Approval from the Swedish Ethical Review Authority (Dnr 2019-04771 and 2021-04987) was
- 276 obtained prior to the commencement of the study. No informed consent was required due to
- all data presented in a de-identified form according to the Swedish Ethical Review Authority.

### 278 Consent for publication

- 279 Not applicable. Patient consent statements were not required due to the retrospective nature
- of this study. No informed consent was required due to all data presented in a de-identified
- 281 form according to the Swedish Ethical Review Authority.

## 282 Data Availability Statement

- 283 The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study available from the corresponding
- author on reasonable request.

285

### 286 References

Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of
 Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2021;71:209 249.

Lungcancer Nationellt Vårdprogram Version 6.0. Regionala Cancercentrum i Samverkan:
 2022-05-10.

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.

- König D, Savic Prince S, Rothschild SI. Targeted Therapy in Advanced and Metastatic Non Small Cell Lung Cancer. An Update on Treatment of the Most Important Actionable Oncogenic Driver
   Alterations. *Cancers* 2021;13.
- Majem M, Hernandez-Hernandez J, Hernando-Trancho F, et al. Multidisciplinary consensus
   statement on the clinical management of patients with stage III non-small cell lung cancer. *Clin Transl Oncol* 2020;22:21-36.

3016.Casal-Mourino A, Ruano-Ravina A, Lorenzo-Gonzalez M, et al. Epidemiology of stage III lung302cancer: frequency, diagnostic characteristics, and survival. *Transl Lung Cancer Res* 2021;10:506-518.

3037.Ferrer I, Zugazagoitia J, Herbertz S, et al. KRAS-Mutant non-small cell lung cancer: From304biology to therapy. Lung Cancer 2018;124:53-64.

Substantiation and Durvalumab
 Guo MZ, Murray JC, Ghanem P, et al. Definitive Chemoradiation and Durvalumab
 Consolidation for Locally Advanced, Unresectable KRAS-mutated Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. *Clin Lung Cancer* 2022;23:620-629.

3089.Mascaux C, Iannino N, Martin B, et al. The role of RAS oncogene in survival of patients with309lung cancer: a systematic review of the literature with meta-analysis. Br J Cancer 2005;92:131-139.

31010.Johnson ML, Sima CS, Chaft J, et al. Association of KRAS and EGFR mutations with survival in311patients with advanced lung adenocarcinomas. Cancer 2013;119:356-362.

31211.Guan JL, Zhong WZ, An SJ, et al. KRAS mutation in patients with lung cancer: a predictor for313poor prognosis but not for EGFR-TKIs or chemotherapy. Ann Surg Oncol 2013;20:1381-1388.

31412.Meng D, Yuan M, Li X, et al. Prognostic value of K-RAS mutations in patients with non-small315cell lung cancer: a systematic review with meta-analysis. Lung Cancer 2013;81:1-10.

Marabese M, Ganzinelli M, Garassino MC, et al. KRAS mutations affect prognosis of non small-cell lung cancer patients treated with first-line platinum containing chemotherapy. *Oncotarget* 2015;6:34014-34022.

31914.Hames ML, Chen H, Iams W, et al. Correlation between KRAS mutation status and response320to chemotherapy in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer 2. Lung Cancer 2016;92:29-34.

32115.Eklund EA, Wiel C, Fagman H, et al. KRAS Mutations Impact Clinical Outcome in Metastatic322Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. Cancers (Basel) 2022;14.

Brady AK, McNeill JD, Judy B, et al. Survival outcome according to KRAS mutation status in
newly diagnosed patients with stage IV non-small cell lung cancer treated with platinum doublet
chemotherapy. *Oncotarget* 2015;6:30287-30294.

Mellema WW, Dingemans AM, Thunnissen E, et al. KRAS mutations in advanced
 nonsquamous non-small-cell lung cancer patients treated with first-line platinum-based
 chemotherapy have no predictive value. *J Thorac Oncol* 2013;8:1190-1195.

Rodenhuis S, Boerrigter L, Top B, et al. Mutational activation of the K-ras oncogene and the
 effect of chemotherapy in advanced adenocarcinoma of the lung: a prospective study. *J Clin Oncol* 1997;15:285-291.

332 19. Goulding RE, Chenoweth M, Carter GC, et al. KRAS mutation as a prognostic factor and 333 predictive factor in advanced/metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: A systematic literature review

and meta-analysis. *Cancer Treat Res Commun* 2020;24:100200.

335 20. Ma SX, Ma N, Han J, et al. [The efficacy and prognostic factors of immunotherapy in 336 advanced non-small cell lung cancer patients with different driver gene mutations]. Zhonghua Yi Xue 337 Za Zhi 2022;102:922-929. 338 21. Uehara Y, Watanabe K, Hakozaki T, et al. Efficacy of first-line immune checkpoint inhibitors in 339 patients with advanced NSCLC with KRAS, MET, FGFR, RET, BRAF, and HER2 alterations. Thorac 340 Cancer 2022;13:1703-1711. 341 22. Yagishita S, Horinouchi H, Sunami KS, et al. Impact of KRAS mutation on response and 342 outcome of patients with stage III non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer. Cancer science 343 2015;106:1402-1407. 344 Hendriks LE, Kerr KM, Menis J, et al. Non-oncogene-addicted metastatic non-small-cell lung 23. 345 cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guideline for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Annals of oncology: 346 official journal of the European Society for Medical Oncology 2023;34:358-376. 347 Hallqvist A, Enlund F, Andersson C, et al. Mutated KRAS Is an Independent Negative 24. 348 Prognostic Factor for Survival in NSCLC Stage III Disease Treated with High-Dose Radiotherapy. Lung 349 cancer international 2012;2012:587424. 350 25. Riudavets M, Auclin E, Mosteiro M, et al. Durvalumab consolidation in patients with 351 unresectable stage III non-small cell lung cancer with driver genomic alterations. Eur J Cancer 352 2022;167:142-148. 353 26. Mazieres J, Drilon A, Lusque A, et al. Immune checkpoint inhibitors for patients with 354 advanced lung cancer and oncogenic driver alterations: results from the IMMUNOTARGET registry. 355 Ann Oncol 2019;30:1321-1328. 27. 356 Hirsch FR, Scagliotti GV, Mulshine JL, et al. Lung cancer: current therapies and new targeted 357 treatments. Lancet 2017;389:299-311. 358 28. Liu Y, Zhang Z, Rinsurongkawong W, et al. Association of Driver Oncogene Variations With 359 Outcomes in Patients With Locally Advanced Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Treated With 360 Chemoradiation and Consolidative Durvalumab. JAMA Netw Open 2022;5:e2215589. 361 29. Cortiula F, De Ruysscher D, Steens M, et al. Adjuvant durvalumab after concurrent 362 chemoradiotherapy for patients with unresectable stage III NSCLC harbouring uncommon genomic 363 alterations. Eur J Cancer 2023;184:172-178. 364 30. Skoulidis F, Li BT, Dy GK, et al. Sotorasib for Lung Cancers with KRAS p.G12C Mutation. The 365 New England journal of medicine 2021;384:2371-2381. 366 31. Tsuboi M, Herbst RS, John T, et al. Overall Survival with Osimertinib in Resected EGFR-367 Mutated NSCLC. The New England journal of medicine 2023;389:137-147. 368 32. Solomon BJ, Ahn JS, Dziadziuszko R, et al. LBA2 ALINA: Efficacy and safety of adjuvant

- 369 alectinib versus chemotherapy in patients with early-stage ALK+ non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC).
- 370 Annals of Oncology 2023;34:S1295-S1296 %@ 0923-7534.
- 371

372

373	List of Supplemental material
374	Supplemental Figure 1. PDF
375	Supplemental Figure 2. PDF
376	
377	
378	Figures legend
379	
380	Figure 1 Patient selection
381	Flow chart showing patient selection for the study.
382	
383 384	NSCLC: Non-small cell lung cancer; CRT: chemoradiotherapy; <i>KRAS</i> <sup>WT</sup> : <i>KRAS</i> wildtype; <i>KRAS</i> <sup>MUT</sup> : <i>KRAS</i> mutated
385	
386	
387 388	<b>Table 1</b> Characteristics of the total cohort as well as stratified by $KRAS^{WT}$ and $KRAS^{MUT}$ . Data are presented as n (%).
389	
390 391 392	cCRT: concurrent chemoradiotherapy; <i>KRAS</i> <sup>WT</sup> : <i>KRAS</i> wildtype; <i>KRAS</i> <sup>MUT</sup> : <i>KRAS</i> mutated; ECOG PS, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status; NSCLC NOS: non-small cell lung cancer not otherwise specified; Gy: Gray
393	
394	
395	Figure 2 KRAS mutation worsens survival outcomes in stage III NSCLC patients
396 397 398	Kaplan-Meier estimates comparing overall survival ( <b>A</b> ) and progression free survival ( <b>B</b> ) stratified on KRAS status for all patients in the cohort. Forest plot of multivariate COX regression analysis for overall survival ( <b>C</b> ) and progression free survival ( <b>D</b> ).
399	
400 401 402	OS: overall survival; PFS: progression free survival; NR Not reached, cCRT: concurrent chemoradiotherapy; HR: Hazard Ratio; CI: Confidence of interval; <i>KRAS</i> <sup>WT</sup> : <i>KRAS</i> wildtype; <i>KRAS</i> <sup>MUT</sup> : <i>KRAS</i> mutated
403	
404	
405 406	Figure 3 Adjuvant durvalumab equalizes the negative impact of KRAS mutation on survival outcomes after cCRT
407 408	Kaplan-Meier estimates comparing overall survival ( <b>A)</b> and progression free survival ( <b>B)</b> stratified on KRAS status for all patients receiving cCRT. Kaplan-Meier estimates comparing

- 409 overall survival (C) and progression free survival (D) stratified on KRAS status for all
- 410 patients receiving cCRT and adjuvant durvalumab.
- 411
- 412 OS: overall survival; PFS: progression free survival; NR Not reached, cCRT: concurrent 413 chemoradiotherapy; *KRAS*<sup>WT</sup>: *KRAS* wildtype; *KRAS*<sup>MUT</sup>: *KRAS* mutated
- 414
- 415

# Supplemental Figure 1 Adjuvant durvalumab significantly improves survival outcomes after cCRT among all stage III NSCLC patients

- Kaplan-Meier estimates comparing overall survival (A) and progression free survival (B)
   stratified on cCRT +/- adjuvant durvalumab.
- 420
- 421 OS: overall survival; PFS: progression free survival; cCRT: concurrent chemoradiotherapy
- 422
- 423
- 424

# Supplemental Figure 2 Improved survival outcomes after adjuvant durvalumab and cCRT among stage III NSCLC patients harboring KRAS mutations

- 427 Kaplan-Meier estimates comparing overall survival (A) and progression free survival (B)
- 428 stratified on cCRT +/- adjuvant durvalumab for all KRAS wild type patients. Kaplan-Meier
- estimates comparing overall survival (**C**) and progression free survival (**D**) Kaplan-Meier
- 430 estimates comparing overall survival (A) and progression free survival (B) stratified on cCRT
- 431 +/- adjuvant durvalumab for all KRAS mutated patients.
- 432

433 434	OS: overall survival; PFS: progression free survival; NR Not reached, cCRT: chemoradiotherapy; <i>KRAS</i> <sup>WT</sup> : <i>KRAS</i> wildtype; <i>KRAS</i> <sup>MUT</sup> : <i>KRAS</i> mutated	concurrent
435		

- 436
- 437
- 438
- 439
- 440
- 441

# Eklund et al. Figure 1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.21.24304669; this version posted March 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.



## Eklund et al. Figure 2

Α

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.21.24304669; this version posted March 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not gertified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is madeiaarablable under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license . median PFS





С	OS			
		HR	[95% CI]	p value
KRAS <sup>MUT</sup> -	<b>⊢</b> I	1.703	[1.074, 2,702]	0.024
Female –	$\vdash \vdash \vdash$	0.672	[0.433, 1.043]	0.076
Age _	Ĥ	1.006	[0.974, 1.039]	0.718
ECOG	<u>⊢</u>	1.142	[0.488, 2.673]	0.760
Never	<b>⊢</b>   −−−−	1.457	[0.717, 2.964]	0.298
Stage IIIA	<b>⊢ − − − −</b>	1.129	[0.723, 1.764]	0.593
	i I			
0	1 2	3		
	Hazard Ratio			



## Eklund et al. Figure 3

Α

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.21.24304669; this version posted March 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC D 4.0 International license RT







