

1 **Gamma Knife Stereotactic radiotherapy combined with tislelizumab as later-line**  
2 **therapy in pMMR/MSS/MSI-L metastatic colorectal cancer: A Phase II Trial Analysis**

3  
4 Yiran Zhang<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Hanyang Guan<sup>1\*</sup>, Shijin Liu<sup>1\*</sup>, Haoquan Li<sup>1</sup>, Zili Bian<sup>1</sup>, Jiashuai He<sup>1</sup>, Zhan Zhao<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Shenghui Qiu<sup>1</sup>, Tianmu Mo<sup>1</sup>, Xiangwei Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Zuyang Chen<sup>1</sup>, Hui Ding<sup>1</sup>, Xiaoxu Zhao<sup>1</sup>, Liang  
6 Wang<sup>3#</sup>, Yunlong Pan<sup>1,4#</sup>, Jinghua Pan<sup>1#</sup>

7  
8 1. Department of General Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of Jinan University, 510632,  
9 Guangzhou, Guangdong, P. R. China

10 2. Department of Body Gamma Knife, The First Affiliated Hospital of Jinan University, 510632,  
11 Guangzhou, Guangdong, P. R. China

12 3. Department of Oncology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Jinan University, 510632, Guangzhou,  
13 Guangdong, P. R. China

14 4. MOE Key Laboratory of Tumor Molecular Biology and Key Laboratory of Functional Protein  
15 Research of Guangdong Higher Education Institutes. Institute of Life and Health Engineering, Jinan  
16 University, Guangzhou, China.

17  
18 \*These authors contributed equally

19  
20 **Running title:** Combined SBRT and Immunotherapy in pMMR mCRC.

21  
22 **#Corresponding author:**

23 Jinghua Pan, Department of General Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of Jinan University,  
24 510632, Guangzhou, Guangdong, P. R. China; E-mail: huajanve@foxmail.com

25 Yunlong Pan: Department of General Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of Jinan University,  
26 510632, Guangzhou, Guangdong, P. R. China; E-mail: tpanyl@jnu.edu.cn

27 Liang Wang: Department of Oncology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Jinan University, 510632,  
28 Guangzhou, Guangdong, P. R. China. E-mail: wangliang@jnu.edu.cn.

29  
30  
31 **Conflict of interest:** The authors disclosed no potential conflicts of interest.

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **Abstract**

44 An immunosuppressive tumor microenvironment limits the efficacy of immunotherapy, thus patients  
45 with MSS and pMMR mCRC often face great challenges. In this phase II trial, patients received  
46 Gamma Knife SBRT combined with Tislelizumab . P Biomarker analysis was performed pre- and  
47 post-treatment . From November 2022 to July 2024, 13 of 20 patients achieved PR, 6 achieved SD.  
48 mPFS was 10.7 months (95% CI, 6.4-15.0). With no grade 4 events noted, common adverse events  
49 included nausea (65%), anemia (55%), and fatigue (45%). For patients who had not responded to  
50 first and second-line therapies, the combo of Gamma Knife SBRT and tislelizumab showed high  
51 efficacy and reasonable safety. Significant post-radiotherapy improvements in the tumor's  
52 immunosuppressive microenvironment. These results imply that patients with pMMR/MSS/MSI-L  
53 mCRC who were unresponsive to the first and second-line chemotherapy, Gamma Knife SBRT with  
54 tislelizumab provides a safe and powerful later-line treatment alternative.

55

56 **Keywords:** Gamma Knife Stereotactic body radiation therapy; mismatch repair-proficient;  
57 tislelizumab; Metastatic colorectal cancer; Immune checkpoint inhibitors; PD-L1.

58

59 **Statement of significance**

60 This study offers a safe and powerful option for pMMR/MSS/MSI-L mCRC patients fail to first and  
61 second-line chemotherapy. And discover Gamma Knife SBRT contributed to potentially converting  
62 the suppressive "cold" tumor immune microenvironment into an activated "hot" microenvironment  
63 conducive to immunotherapy efficacy in pMMR CRC.

64

65

## 66 **Introduction**

67 Colorectal cancer continues to represent a significant threat to life. As reported in the 2020 Global  
68 Cancer Statistics, colorectal cancer accounts for 10% of all cancer cases, ranking third in incidence,  
69 while its mortality rate is 9.4%, second only to lung cancer (1,2). Especially, 20% of newly diagnosed  
70 colorectal cancer patients present show metastases, and 40% have recurrence and metastases after  
71 local treatment (3). The FOLFOX/FOLFIRI chemotherapy regimen, which comprises oxaliplatin,  
72 5-fluorouracil, and irinotecan is the mainstay of clinical treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer  
73 (mCRC). For patients harboring wild-type RAS and BRAF, the addition of the epidermal growth factor  
74 receptor (EGFR) inhibitor cetuximab is recommended(4,5). For patients with RAS mutations, the  
75 anti-angiogenic agent bevacizumab is advised. Nevertheless, RAS-mutant patients exhibit poorer  
76 prognoses and shorter survival times compared to their wild-type counterparts (6,7). The efficacy of  
77 chemotherapy in combination with targeted therapy remains suboptimal (7).

78

79 The development of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) transforms cancer immunotherapy (8).  
80 Particularly CRCs with mismatch repair deficiency (dMMR) and high microsatellite instability (MSI-H)  
81 show a strong response to ICIs (9). But most CRC cases are either microsatellite-stable/low  
82 microsatellite instability (MSS/MSI-L) or mismatch repair-proficient (pMMR), which reduces the efficacy  
83 of immunotherapy in a significant number of mCRC patients (9). Chemotherapeutic agents can  
84 cause immunogenic cell death in tumors, thus coordinating with ICIs improves anti-tumor efficacy  
85 (10). Additionally, anti-angiogenic therapies targeting VEGFR facilitate the normalization of tumor  
86 vasculature and promote immune cell infiltration, subsequently amplifying immune-mediated tumor  
87 eradication (11). Clinical studies, however, have revealed that combining mFOLFOX6 or other

88 chemotherapy regimens with anti-VEGF, anti-EGFR, and ICIs does not produce better clinical  
89 outcomes in mCRC (12,13). Consequently, identifying alternative strategies to augment the efficacy  
90 of immunotherapy remains a pivotal objective in the field of cancer immunotherapy in  
91 pMMR/MSS/MSI-L mCRC.

92

93 Stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT), effectively targets and eradicates tumor cells with  
94 high-dose radiation (14). Although traditional radiotherapy is sometimes linked with  
95 immunosuppressive effects (15), SBRT's exact targeting can expose tumor neoantigens, mobilize  
96 and activate immune cells, increase their infiltration into the tumor, and improve the tumor immune  
97 microenvironment (16,17). The Gamma Knife is a principal modality in SBRT, employing gamma  
98 rays generated by cobalt-60 to deliver a single, high-dose focused irradiation to the target lesion. The  
99 Gamma Knife provides several benefits over conventional radiotherapy, including hiexact  
100 stereotactic targeting, increased delivery dose to the lesion, prevention of accelerated repopulation  
101 of tumor cells, and better local control rates of tumors(18). Our team firstly observed a case with  
102 pMMR-type mCRC who exhibited local recurrence and distant metastasis following first-line and  
103 second-line chemotherapy combined with targeted therapy(19). After undergoing gamma knife SBRT  
104 followed by tislelizumab treatment, intrahepatic metastatic lesions were reduced and stabilized, the  
105 patient showed a partial response (PR) with notable reduction of recurrent lesions in the rectal wall  
106 and stabilization of intrahepatic metastases, so extending the progression-free survival (PFS)  
107 exceeded beyond 3 months (19). These findings suggest that Gamma Knife SBRT might improve  
108 ICBs sensitivity in mCRC.

109

110 The results of a phase II clinical trial assessing the combination of Gamma Knife SBRT combined  
111 with tislelizumab as a later-line therapy in patients with pMMR/MSS/MSI-L mCRC are presented in  
112 this report together with safety and efficacy. NanoString assay for transcriptome analysis was  
113 employed to elucidate changes in the tumor immune microenvironment during the combined  
114 treatment, offering insights into the therapeutic potential and mechanistic underpinnings of this  
115 integrated approach.

116

## 117 **Results**

### 118 **Patients**

119 In this clinical trial, twenty patients with pMMR/MSS/MSI-L tumors refractory to first or second-line  
120 treatment were enrolled. The cohort comprised 15 males and 5 females, with ages ranging from 47  
121 to 77 years. Predominantly, the primary tumors were located in the left colon and rectum (17/20,  
122 85%), with the liver being the most common site of metastasis, followed by the lung (3/20)( **Table 1** ).  
123 Flowchart of therapeutic regimen and flow diagram of enrolled participants in the study were shown  
124 in **Figure 1A** and **Figure 1B**.

125

126 Molecular profiling revealed RAS mutations in 11 patients (55%), with 5 exhibiting KRAS mutations  
127 and 6 presenting NRAS mutations. PD-L1 expression was assessed in 18 patients, 12 (60%)  
128 patients had combined positive score (CPS )  $\leq 1$ . Tumor mutation burden (TMB) data were  
129 available for 8 patients, with a median TMB of 4.62 mutations/Mb (IQR 3.08-8.97). Notably, only one  
130 patient exhibited a TMB > 10 mutations/Mb (**Table 1**).

131

Characteristics	Patients (n=20)
<b>Age, years, median (IQR), n (%)</b>	60 (56-65)
<60	8 (40%)
≥60	12 (60%)
<b>Sex, n(%)</b>	
Male	15 (75%)
Female	5 (25%)
<b>ECOG performance status, n (%)</b>	
0	12 (60%)
1	8 (40%)
<b>Primary tumor location, n (%)</b>	
Left colon and rectum	17 (85%)
Right colon	3 (15%)
<b>Number of metastatic organs<sup>a</sup>, n (%)</b>	
1	14 (70%)
≥2	6 (30%)
<b>Metastatic organ, n (%)</b>	
Liver	14 (70%)
Lung	7 (35%)
Lymph node	2 (10%)
Other	3 (15%)
<b>Ras mutation type, n (%)</b>	
KRAS	5 (25%)
NRAS	6 (30%)
Other	9 (45%)
<b>PD-L1 expression, CPS, n (%)</b>	
CPS≤1	12 (60%)
CPS > 1	6 (30%)
Unknown	2 (10%)
<b>TMB (mut/Mb), median (IQR), n (%)</b>	4.62 (3.08-8.97)
TMB<5	4 (20%)
TMB≥5, ≤10	3 (15%)
TMB>10	1 (5%)
Unknown	12 (60%)

Abbreviations: CPS, combined positive score; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; IQR, interquartile range; TMB, tumor mutation burden.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple answers allowed.

**Table 1: Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics.**

132

133 **Efficacy**

134 In our cohort of 20 patients meeting inclusion criteria, 13 (65%) achieved a partial response (PR),  
 135 and 6 (35%) maintained stable disease (SD), resulting in a robust disease control rate (DCR) of 95%  
 136 (**Table 2**). Patients with liver metastases achieved 92.9% DCR, and patients with metastases in  
 137 non-liver locations notably achieved a remarkable 100% DCR, only 1 patient with liver metastases  
 138 experienced disease progression (PD) (**Figure 2A**). As of the data cutoff date, 7 patients remained  
 139 on maintenance treatment, and 1 patient underwent surgery due to disease progression (**Figure 2A**).  
 140 Remarkably, 3 patients refractory to first-line treatment responded to SBRT combined with  
 141 tislelizumab, achieving rapid regression to NED status, with durations ranging from 6 to 18 months  
 142 before progression. Encouragingly, 1 patient remains in a state of NED, under ongoing monitoring  
 143 (**Figure 2A**).

	All patients (N = 20)	Liver metastasis (N = 14)	Other metastasis (N = 6)
<b>Best overall response</b>			
Complete response (CR), n (%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Partial response (PR), n (%)	13 (65%)	8 (57%)	5 (83%)
Stable disease (SD), n (%)	6 (30%)	5 (36%)	1 (17%)
Progressive disease (PD), n (%)	1 (10%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
<b>ORR, n (%), 95% CI</b>	13 (65%, 40.8-84.6%)	8 (57.1%, 28.9-82.3%)	5(83.3%, 35.9-99.6%)
<b>DCR, n (%), 95% CI</b>	19 (95%, 75.1-99.9%)	13 (92.9%, 66.1-99.8%)	6(100%, 54.1-100%)

Abbreviations: ORR, objective response rate; DCR, disease control rate.

---

**Table 2: Efficacy outcomes.**

144

145 Most patients exhibited favorable survival outcomes throughout the treatment (**Figure 2B**), and  
146 median progression-free survival (PFS) was 10.7 months (95% CI, 6.4, 15.0) (**Figure 2C**).  
147 Additionally, a comparative survival analysis included 23 patients who underwent first and  
148 second-line treatment and Gamma Knife SBRT without immunotherapy, revealing a median PFS of  
149 6.7 months (95% CI, 5.6, 7.0), this data shown Gamma Knife SBRT combined with tislelizumab as  
150 later-line treatment prolong PFS in mCRC (Log-rank test = 5.638, P = 0.0176) (**Figure 2D**). These  
151 findings suggest Gamma Knife SBRT combined with tislelizumab can effectively inhibiting mCRC  
152 progression.

153

154 In light of the abscopal effect of radiotherapy, we extended our observations beyond the lesions  
155 directly targeted by stereotactic radiotherapy to include non-irradiated lesions. Imaging examinations  
156 revealed significant tumor regression in both the irradiated target lesions (**Figure 2E, F**) and the  
157 non-irradiated lesions (**Figure 2E, G**) following Gamma Knife SBRT combined with tislelizumab.  
158 These findings suggest that SBRT not only impacts the irradiated lesions but also sensitize distant  
159 metastatic sites for ICBs through the abscopal effect, thereby enhancing the systemic antitumor  
160 response when combined with immunotherapy.

161

**162 Safety**

163 All 20 enrolled patients received the assigned treatment regimen, with safety assessments  
164 conducted every three treatment cycles. Treatment-related adverse events (TRAEs) and



165 immune-related adverse events are summarized in **Table 3**. Predominantly, patients experienced  
 166 mild to moderate adverse events, with the most common being nausea (65%), anemia (55%),  
 167 electrolyte disturbances (55%), fatigue (45%), and anorexia (35%). Notably, only two patients  
 168 experienced grade 3 events of increased blood bilirubin, while no grade 4 adverse events were  
 169 reported throughout the study period.

TEAEs, n (%)	Patient (N=20)				
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Any grade
Anemia	9 (45%)	2 (10%)	0	0	11 (55%)
Neutropenia	1 (5%)	0	0	0	1 (5%)
Nausea	10 (50%)	3 (15%)	0	0	13 (65%)
Poor appetite	3 (15%)	4 (20%)	0	0	7 (35%)
Electrolyte disturbance	7 (35%)	2 (10%)	0	0	11 (55%)
Hand-foot syndrome	0	0	0	0	0
Leukocytopenia	2 (10%)	0	0	0	2 (10%)
Aspartate transaminase increased	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	0	0	4 (20%)
Lipase increased	0	0	0	0	0
Proteinuria	0	0	0	0	0
Thrombocytopenia	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	0	0	4 (20%)
Vomiting	1 (5%)	3 (15%)	0	0	4 (20%)
Hypothyroidism	0	0	0	0	0
Triglycerides increased	0	0	0	0	0
Fatigue	6 (30%)	3 (15%)	0	0	9 (45%)
Blood bilirubin increased	0	0	2 (10%)	0	2 (10%)
Alanine transaminase increased	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	0	0	3 (15%)
Peripheral neurotoxicity	0	0	0	0	0
Hoarseness	0	0	0	0	0
Rash	4 (20%)	0	0	0	4 (20%)
Thyroiditis	0 (0%)	0	0	0	0
Diarrhea	1 (5%)	0	0	0	1 (5%)
Troponin increased	0	0	0	0	0
Fever	0	0	0	0	0
Alkaline phosphatase increased	0	0	0	0	0
Amylase increased	0	0	0	0	0
Hypertension	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 3: Treatment-emergent adverse events (TEAEs) since the initiation of protocol-specified treatment**

170

171 **Identification of differentially expressed genes between responder and non-response groups**

172 To elucidate the impact of the tumor immune microenvironment on combination therapy outcomes,  
173 we employed NanoString assay for transcriptome analysis of tumor samples obtained from 16  
174 enrolled patients before and after treatment, totaling 32 samples (**Figure 3A**). Patients were stratified  
175 into r responder (PR) and non-responder (non-PR) groups based on treatment outcomes. Gene  
176 expression differential analysis between pre- and post-treatment samples within each group  
177 identified significant alterations, detailed in the **Supplementary Data** and illustrated in **Figure 3B**.

178

179 Our findings highlighted notable up-regulation of key genes involved in antigen presentation (CD40,  
180 TNFSF18, TNFSF4), immune checkpoint modulation (PDCD1LG2, CD274, IDO1, VTCN1), and T  
181 cell activation pathways (TNFRSF9, CD28, ICOS, CD40LG, CD2, GZMK, ENTPD1, ITGAE) in the  
182 responder group. Additionally, a diverse array of chemokine family genes (IL2, IL4, IL17A, CCR2,  
183 CCL22) showed enhanced expression in PR group (**Figure 3B**). Furthermore, immune cell  
184 abundance analysis based on 11 predefined immune cell types revealed significantly elevated levels  
185 in the PR group compared to non-PR. included T cells, B cells, mast cells, macrophages, Dendritic  
186 Cell (DC), Cytotoxic cells, NK CD56 cell, CD8 T cell, CD45 cell, Th1 cells and NK cell (**Figure 3C**).  
187 This heightened immune activation in responders encompassed robust antigen presentation, T cell  
188 activation, and co-stimulation processes crucial for effective immune-mediated tumor control.

189

190 Following the combination of stereotactic radiotherapy and immunotherapy, a striking reduction in

191 liver metastasis target lesions was observed in two patients compared to baseline To elucidate these  
192 findings, we conducted CD8 and PD-L1 immunohistochemical staining on liver metastasis biopsy  
193 specimens from one patient pre- and post-treatment (**Fig 3D-E**). The analysis revealed increased  
194 infiltration of T cells and improved immune microenvironment following treatment, aligning with our  
195 prior analytical findings.

196

### 197 **Additional immune signatures analysis in predicting tumor response**

198 We conducted gene expression analysis based on 12 predefined gene sets associated with  
199 immunotherapy and prognosis (**Figure 4A**). Notably, samples from the responder group exhibited  
200 higher expression of immune activation related genes compared to the non-responder group, include  
201 effector T cells (T-eff), T cell-Inflamed, IFN- $\gamma$ , cytotoxic, Cytolytic activity score (CYT), chemokines,  
202 angiogenesis (AG), APC co-stimulation (APC co-sti), inflammation promoting (Inflam-pro), T cell  
203 co-stimulation (T cell co-sti), parainflammation (parainflam) and tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TIL)  
204 (**Figure 4A**).

205

206 Further compared the related-signature score, we found the responders had higher APC and T cell  
207 co-stimulation signature scores compared with the non-responder group (**Figure 4B**). Moreover, the  
208 responders had higher T cell-Inflamed, inflammation promoting and parainflammation signature  
209 scores compared with the non-responder group (**Figure 4C**). Additionally, increased expression of  
210 effector T cell, cytotoxicity, IFN- $\gamma$  production, and cytolytic activity and TIL signature scores compared  
211 with the non-responder group (**Figure 4D**).

212

213 Further functional insights into differential gene expression between responder and non-responder  
214 groups were gained through gene ontology (GO) enrichment and Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and  
215 Genomes (KEGG) pathway analyses. GO analysis highlighted enrichment in cytokine and  
216 chemokine receptor activities, alongside increased T cell and leukocyte proliferation and activation  
217 levels in responders (**Supplementary Fig 1A**). Correspondingly, KEGG analysis underscored  
218 enrichment in pathways involving antigen processing and presentation, T cell receptor signaling,  
219 chemokine interactions, and cytokine signaling (**Supplementary Fig 1B**). Notably, these results  
220 indicated responders after combination of Gamma Knife SBRT and tislelizumab treatment will  
221 enhancing tumor antigen presentation and T cell mediated immune response in pMMR/MSS/MSI-L  
222 mCRC.

223

#### 224 **Analysis on differential expression genes before and after treatment in the responders.**

225 To unravel the mechanisms driving tumor regression in the responder cohort, we conducted  
226 comprehensive gene expression analysis before and after treatment, focusing on 7 gene groups  
227 known for their potential inhibitory effects on immunotherapy. Post-treatment analysis revealed  
228 significant reductions in exhausted T cells, Th2 cells, and Treg cells, indicative of a favorable shift  
229 away from a suppressive immune microenvironment (**Figure 5A**). Tumor resistance mechanisms,  
230 such as fibrosis and angiogenesis, play pivotal roles in limiting therapeutic efficacy(20,21). Initially,  
231 evaluation of immunotherapy-related gene groups in partial responders versus non-responders  
232 highlighted significantly higher angiogenesis scores in the former, albeit with no significantly  
233 difference (**Figure 5B**). Recognizing potential biases from pooling samples pre- and post-treatment,  
234 we conducted separate analyses within the responder group, expanding our gene set to include

235 fibrosis-related genes. The findings underscored substantial inhibition of both angiogenesis and  
236 fibrosis within the tumor microenvironment following SBRT, targeted therapy, and immunotherapy  
237 **(Figure 5C)**.

238

239 Further stratified analysis of non-responder samples before and after treatment revealed no  
240 significant alterations in the expression levels of immunosuppression-related or  
241 angiogenesis/fibrosis-related gene sets **(Supplementary Fig 2)**. These insights illuminate critical  
242 pathways through which combined therapies modulate the immune landscape and enhance  
243 treatment responses in pMMR/MSS/MSI-L mCRC.

244

#### 245 **Discussion:**

246 By successfully reaching its main endpoint, this phase II trial shows that for combined Gamma Knife  
247 SBRT with tislelizumab greatly increases progression-free survival (PFS) in pMMR/MSS/MSI-L  
248 mCRC, resistant to first and second-line therapies. For this patient population, the combo treatment  
249 has shown both safety and tolerability. By overcoming resistance to first treatment plans, our study  
250 presents a creative therapy approach for those unresponsive to conventional treatments that offers a  
251 suitable therapeutic option improving clinical outcomes.

252

253 Among the several cancers including nasopharyngeal carcinoma, esophageal cancer, liver cancer,  
254 and lung cancer, Tislelizumab, a new PD-1 inhibitor, has been shown especially therapeutic efficacy.  
255 Combining tislelizumab with chemotherapy has essentially extended PFS in patients across these  
256 cancers (22-25). While immunotherapy has proven beneficial for some patients, metastatic colorectal

257 cancer (mCRC) presents unique challenges. Particularly in patients with MSS/pMMR tumors, which  
258 are marked by low immunogenicity and great resistance to immunotherapy, tumor cells in mCRC  
259 often evade immune detection and destruction (26). By directly targeting and destroying tumor cells,  
260 Gamma Knife SBRT presents a potential solution by releasing a significant volume of tumor  
261 neoantigens, and improving tumor immunogenicity, so optimizing maximizing the efficacy of  
262 subsequent immunotherapy(27). Furthermore demonstrated to extend survival in non-small cell lung  
263 cancer (NSCLC) with patients with brain metastases is the combination of Gamma Knife SBRT and  
264 immunotherapy (28). Still underreported, though, is the possibility of Gamma Knife SBRT coupled  
265 with ICIs to improve the response in pMMR/MSS/MSI-L CRC.

266

267 In our clinical observations, a notable therapeutic effect was achieved in a patient treated with  
268 combined SBRT and immunotherapy. We hypothesize that the addition of tislelizumab following  
269 SBRT could extend progression-free survival (PFS) compared to either modality alone. Tumor  
270 microenvironment post-radiotherapy showed significant changes revealed by sequencing analysis of  
271 tumor samples 'both before and after combined treatment. More precisely, the microenvironment  
272 transitioned from an immunosuppressive, angiogenesis- and fibrosis-promoting state to an  
273 immune-enhanced, angiogenesis- and fibrosis-attenuated state. Comparatively to non-responders,  
274 responders expressed genes linked to antigen presentation, tumor inflammation, and  
275 immune-mediated tumor killing more strongly. Further showing the activation of several signaling  
276 pathways associated with tumor cell death, including NF- $\kappa$ B, TNF, and JAK-STAT pathways was  
277 enrichment analysis. Furthermore, immunotherapy targets such as PD-L1, showed an elevation,  
278 which supports the possibility of efficient later immunotherapy. These findings substantiate our

279 hypothesis that patients with MSS-type mCRC resistant to first-line treatment could benefit  
280 significantly from the combination of stereotactic radiotherapy and immunotherapy, with enhanced  
281 immunogenicity and a more favorable tumor microenvironment facilitating improved therapeutic  
282 outcomes.

283

284 This trial restrictions even if its outcomes show promise. First of all, our results could be biased as a  
285 single-arm study devoid of a control group. Second, the limited sample size and single-center design  
286 of the study lower its statistical power hence more robust conclusions depend on bigger studies.  
287 Furthermore, even though general survival (OS) was examined, the follow-up duration was  
288 insufficient to establish a reliable median OS. To address these limitations, a multi-center,  
289 randomized controlled trial with a larger cohort and extended follow-up period is essential. This will  
290 provide a more comprehensive evaluation of the efficacy and safety of combining Gamma Knife  
291 SBRT and tislelizumab as a later-line therapy in pMMR/MSS/MSI-L mCRC patients.

292

293 Ultimately, for patients with pMMR/MSS/MSI-L mCRC who were unresponsive to first-line therapy  
294 regimens, the combination of Gamma Knife SBRT with tislelizumab demonstrated a high disease  
295 control rate (DCR) and manageable safety profile. Significant post-radiotherapy improvements in the  
296 tumor's suppressive immune microenvironment, reduced fibrosis, normalized tumor vasculature, and  
297 activation of the PD-1/PD-L1 checkpoint pathway revealed by biomarker analyses so improving the  
298 efficacy of immunotherapy.

## 299 **Methods**

### 300 **Study design and participants**

301 This single-arm, phase II trial was conducted at the First Affiliated Hospital of Jinan University to  
302 assess the antitumor efficacy and safety of a combined regimen consisting of SBRT and tislelizumab  
303 in patients with pMMR/MSS/MSI-L-type metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC). The study is  
304 registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (identifier: ChicTR2200011777). Eligible patients, aged 18-75 years,  
305 had confirmed metastatic colorectal cancer. MSS and RAS mutation statuses were determined  
306 through gene sequencing, while clinical staging was based on imaging examinations and  
307 intraoperative findings. A total of 20 patients were enrolled in the study, with all providing written  
308 informed consent. Detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria are available in the **Supplementary**  
309 **Materials**.

310

### 311 **Procedures :**

312 As illustrated in **Figure 1A**, eligible patients received SBRT (administered 5-6 times per week, 3-5 Gy  
313 per session) combined with tislelizumab (200 mg on day 1) was incorporated into the treatment  
314 regimen. Each three-week cycle comprised a maximum of 12 cycles of induction therapy. Patients  
315 achieving complete response (CR), partial response (PR), or stable disease (SD) transitioned to  
316 tislelizumab maintenance therapy (200 mg on day 1) until documented disease progression, death,  
317 unacceptable toxicity, or patient withdrawal of consent. Treatment response was evaluated using CT  
318 or MRI after each treatment cycle. Adverse events were systematically monitored and graded  
319 according to the National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (version  
320 5.0).

321

322 The study enrolled 20 eligible patients on November 24, 2022 (Figure 1B). All patients received at  
323 least one dose of the prescribed regimen. As of the data cutoff date (July 24, 2024), six patients  
324 continued to receive maintenance therapy. The median follow-up duration was 15 months (range:  
325 3.4-20.0 months, IQR: 9.6-18.2 months). Due to disease-related complications, specimens could not  
326 be obtained from four patients, resulting in 16 patients being included in the per-protocol set (PPS).

327



328 **Outcomes :**

329 The primary endpoints of the study were objective response rate (ORR) and safety, encompassing  
330 adverse events and serious adverse events, assessed according to RECIST version 1.1. Secondary  
331 endpoints included disease control rate (DCR) and progression-free survival (PFS). ORR was  
332 defined as the proportion of patients who achieved a best objective response of complete response  
333 (CR) or partial response (PR) per RECIST criteria (version 1.1). DCR was defined as the proportion  
334 of patients who achieved CR, PR, or stable disease (SD) according to RECIST criteria (version 1.1).  
335 PFS was defined as the time from enrollment to the first documented disease progression per  
336 RECIST version 1.1 or to death from any cause, whichever occurred first.

337

338 **CD8 & PD-L1 expression level :**

339 Tumoral CD8 & PD-L1 expression was measured by immunohistochemistry (IHC) (22C3 pharmDx  
340 assays). The sections were scored for staining intensity according to the following scale: 0 (no  
341 staining), 1 (weak staining, light yellow), 2 (moderate staining, yellowish brown), and 3 (strong  
342 staining, brown), with 0 and 1 considered low expression, and 2 and 3 considered high expression.

343 The score is divided into 4 levels according to the percentage of positive cells:  $0\% \leq \text{positive cell}$   
344  $\text{percentage} \leq 25\%$ , 1 point;  $25\% < \text{positive cell percentage} \leq 50\%$ , 2 points;  $50\% < \text{positive cell}$   
345  $\text{percentage} \leq 75\%$ , 3 points;  $75\% < \text{positive cell percentage} \leq 100\%$ , 4 points. IHC score = cell staining  
346 intensity score x positive cell percentage score. The PD-L1 combined positive score (CPS) was  
347 defined as the number of PD-L1 positive cells (tumor cells, lymphocytes, macrophages) as a  
348 proportion of the total number of tumor cells multiplied by 100. Positive PD-L1 expression was  
349 considered when the CPS was  $>1$ .

350

351 **Nanostring panel RNA sequencing :**

352 Due to disease-related limitations, specimens could not be obtained from four patients, resulting in a  
353 cohort of 16 patients for combined analysis. Tumor tissue samples were collected both before  
354 treatment (BT) and after treatment (AT). Gene expression of each sample was measured using the

355 NanoString nCounter platform (NanoString Technologies, Seattle, WA). The quantitative  
356 transcriptome data were obtained based on the 289-immuno-gene panel, which includes 289 genes  
357 related to the tumor, tumor microenvironment, and immune responses in cancer. The samples that  
358 passed the quality control (QC), which included Imaging QC, Binding Density QC, Positive Control  
359 Linearity QC, and Positive Normalization QC can be processed in further analysis. The raw count  
360 data of 289 genes were normalized using the R package NanoStringNorm according to the  
361 geometric mean of five housekeeping genes. The log<sub>2</sub> transformation was then performed on the  
362 normalized data. Differentially expressed genes were identified using the "DEseq2" package,  
363 employing criteria of log<sub>2</sub>[fold change] > 1 and false discovery rate < 0.05. Heatmaps depicting the  
364 expression patterns of these differentially expressed genes were generated using the  
365 "ComplexHeatmap" package.

366

### 367 **Immune cell profile analyses and Additional immune signatures analysis**

368 The determination of immune cell types and gene sets associated with immunotherapy response  
369 was informed by established literature sources (29,30). We transformed each attribute (immune  
370 signature or gene set) value (GSVA score)  $x_i$  into  $x_i'$  by the equation  $x_i' = \frac{x_i - x_{min}}{x_{max} - x_{min}}$ , where  $x_{min}$  and  $x_{max}$  represent the minimum and maximum of  
371 the ssGSEA scores for the gene set across all samples, respectively. The detailed gene signature list  
372 can be found in the **Supplementary Table**.

374

### 375 **Gene set enrichment and pathway analysis**

376 The Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) / Gene Ontology (GO) enrichment  
377 analysis was performed using the Clusterprofiler R package. The list of gene IDs was used as the  
378 input file. The Benjamini-Hochberg method was employed to adjust the p-values. The cut-off  
379 threshold of p-values was set to 0.05. The enrichment results were visualized by the ggplot2 R  
380 package. The enrichment statistic was set to classic.

381

## 382 **Statistical analyses**

383 Progression-free survival (PFS) and OS was estimated utilizing the Kaplan-Meier method. Statistical  
384 analyses were conducted using R (version 3.6.1). Differences between subgroups in terms of  
385 efficacy response were assessed using the nonparametric Wilcoxon rank-sum test (Mann-Whitney U  
386 test), while comparisons between pre- and post-treatment samples were analyzed with the Wilcoxon  
387 signed-rank test. Confidence intervals (CIs) for response rates were calculated employing the  
388 Clopper-Pearson method, with all reported P values being two-sided. A P value < 0.05 was  
389 considered statistically significant.

390

## 391 **Data availability**

392 The data generated in this study are available within the article and its **Supplementary Data**.  
393 Additional data or resources related to this article are available upon reasonable request from the  
394 corresponding authors.

395

## 396 **Acknowledgments**

397 This research was supported by the Clinical Frontier Technology Program of the First Affiliated  
398 Hospital of Jinan University (No. JNU1AF-CFTP-2022-a01223), the National Natural Science  
399 Foundation of China (82204436), Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province  
400 (2024A1515030010, 2022A1515011695), Science and Technology Projects in Guangzhou  
401 (2024A03J0825).

402

## 403 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

404 This trial was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki after approval by the  
405 Institutional Review Board of The First Affiliated Hospital of Jinan University (KY-2022-236). All  
406 patients provided written informed consent. The ClinicalTrials.gov identifier was:  
407 ChiCTR2200066117.

408

## 409 **Author Contributions**

410 Y Zhang, H Guan and S Liu: acquisition of data, analysis of experimental data and drafted  
411 the manuscript. H Li and Z Bian: Investigation, visualization and methodology. J He, Z Zhao  
412 and S Qiu: data curation, software and formal analysis. T Mo, X Zhang and Z Chen:  
413 technical expertise in manuscript editing. H Ding and X Zhao: assay optimization,  
414 acquisition, and analysis and interpretation of histology and pathology. L Wang, Y Pan and J  
415 Pan: funding acquisition, designed the study and writing-review and editing the draft.  
416


## 417 References

- 418 1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, *et al.* Global Cancer Statistics 2020:  
419 GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA: a cancer*  
420 *journal for clinicians* **2021**;71(3):209-49 doi 10.3322/caac.21660.
- 421 2. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Goding Sauer A, Fedewa SA, Butterly LF, Anderson JC, *et al.* Colorectal cancer statistics,  
422 2020. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians* **2020**;70(3):145-64 doi 10.3322/caac.21601.
- 423 3. Biller LH, Schrag D. Diagnosis and Treatment of Metastatic Colorectal Cancer: A Review. *Jama*  
424 **2021**;325(7):669-85 doi 10.1001/jama.2021.0106.
- 425 4. Diagnosis, Treatment Guidelines For Colorectal Cancer Working Group C. Chinese Society of Clinical Oncology  
426 (CSCO) diagnosis and treatment guidelines for colorectal cancer 2018 (English version). *Chinese journal of*  
427 *cancer research = Chung-kuo yen cheng yen chiu* **2019**;31(1):117-34 doi 10.21147/j.issn.1000-9604.2019.01.07.
- 428 5. Benson AB, Venook AP, Al-Hawary MM, Arain MA, Chen YJ, Ciombor KK, *et al.* Colon Cancer, Version 2.2021,  
429 NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. *Journal of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network : JNCCN*  
430 **2021**;19(3):329-59 doi 10.6004/jnccn.2021.0012.
- 431 6. Cox AD, Fesik SW, Kimmelman AC, Luo J, Der CJ. Drugging the undruggable RAS: Mission possible? *Nature*  
432 *reviews Drug discovery* **2014**;13(11):828-51 doi 10.1038/nrd4389.
- 433 7. Modest DP, Ricard I, Heinemann V, Hegewisch-Becker S, Schmiegel W, Porschen R, *et al.* Outcome according to  
434 KRAS-, NRAS- and BRAF-mutation as well as KRAS mutation variants: pooled analysis of five randomized trials in  
435 metastatic colorectal cancer by the AIO colorectal cancer study group. *Annals of oncology : official journal of*  
436 *the European Society for Medical Oncology* **2016**;27(9):1746-53 doi 10.1093/annonc/mdw261.
- 437 8. Asaoka Y, Ijichi H, Koike K. PD-1 Blockade in Tumors with Mismatch-Repair Deficiency. *The New England journal*  
438 *of medicine* **2015**;373(20):1979 doi 10.1056/NEJMc1510353.
- 439 9. Ganesh K, Stadler ZK, Cercek A, Mendelsohn RB, Shia J, Segal NH, *et al.* Immunotherapy in colorectal cancer:  
440 rationale, challenges and potential. *Nature reviews Gastroenterology & hepatology* **2019**;16(6):361-75 doi  
441 10.1038/s41575-019-0126-x.
- 442 10. Yi M, Zheng X, Niu M, Zhu S, Ge H, Wu K. Combination strategies with PD-1/PD-L1 blockade: current advances  
443 and future directions. *Molecular cancer* **2022**;21(1):28 doi 10.1186/s12943-021-01489-2.
- 444 11. Limagne E, Euvrard R, Thibaudin M, Rébé C, Derangère V, Chevriaux A, *et al.* Accumulation of MDSC and Th17  
445 Cells in Patients with Metastatic Colorectal Cancer Predicts the Efficacy of a FOLFOX-Bevacizumab Drug  
446 Treatment Regimen. *Cancer research* **2016**;76(18):5241-52 doi 10.1158/0008-5472.Can-15-3164.
- 447 12. Hamid MA, Pammer LM, Lentner TK, Doleschal B, Gruber R, Kocher F, *et al.* Immunotherapy for  
448 Microsatellite-Stable Metastatic Colorectal Cancer: Can we close the Gap between Potential and Practice?  
449 *Current oncology reports* **2024** doi 10.1007/s11912-024-01583-w.
- 450 13. Antoniotti C, Rossini D, Pietrantonio F, Catteau A, Salvatore L, Lonardi S, *et al.* Upfront FOLFOXIRI plus  
451 bevacizumab with or without atezolizumab in the treatment of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer  
452 (AtezoTRIBE): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, controlled, phase 2 trial. *The Lancet Oncology*  
453 **2022**;23(7):876-87 doi 10.1016/s1470-2045(22)00274-1.
- 454 14. Papiez L, Timmerman R, DesRosiers C, Randall M. Extracranial stereotactic radioablation: physical principles.  
455 *Acta oncologica (Stockholm, Sweden)* **2003**;42(8):882-94 doi 10.1080/02841860310013490.
- 456 15. Mac Manus M, Lamborn K, Khan W, Varghese A, Graef L, Knox S. Radiotherapy-associated neutropenia and  
457 thrombocytopenia: analysis of risk factors and development of a predictive model. *Blood* **1997**;89(7):2303-10.
- 458 16. Singh AK, Winslow TB, Kermany MH, Goritz V, Heit L, Miller A, *et al.* A Pilot Study of Stereotactic Body Radiation  
459 Therapy Combined with Cytoreductive Nephrectomy for Metastatic Renal Cell Carcinoma. *Clinical cancer*  
460 *research : an official journal of the American Association for Cancer Research* **2017**;23(17):5055-65 doi


- 461 10.1158/1078-0432.Ccr-16-2946.
- 462 17. Choi CW, Jeong MH, Park YS, Son CH, Lee HR, Koh EK. Combination Treatment of Stereotactic Body Radiation  
463 Therapy and Immature Dendritic Cell Vaccination for Augmentation of Local and Systemic Effects. *Cancer*  
464 *research and treatment* **2019**;51(2):464-73 doi 10.4143/crt.2018.186.
- 465 18. Morinaga N, Tanaka N, Shitara Y, Ishizaki M, Yoshida T, Kouga H, *et al.* Ten-Year Survival of a Patient Treated with  
466 Stereotactic Gamma Knife Radiosurgery for Brain Metastases from Colon Cancer with Ovarian and Lymph Node  
467 Metastases: A Case Report. *Case reports in gastroenterology* **2016**;10(1):199-206 doi 10.1159/000445976.
- 468 19. Liu S, Zhang Y, Lin Y, Wang P, Pan Y. Case report: The MSI-L/p-MMR metastatic rectal cancer patient who failed  
469 systemic therapy responds to anti-PD-1 immunotherapy after stereotactic body radiation-therapy. *Frontiers in*  
470 *immunology* **2022**;13:981527 doi 10.3389/fimmu.2022.981527.
- 471 20. Herzog BH, Baer JM, Borchering N, Kingston NL, Belle JI, Knolhoff BL, *et al.* Tumor-associated fibrosis impairs  
472 immune surveillance and response to immune checkpoint blockade in non-small cell lung cancer. *Science*  
473 *translational medicine* **2023**;15(699):eadh8005 doi 10.1126/scitranslmed.adh8005.
- 474 21. Kopecka J, Salaroglio IC, Perez-Ruiz E, Sarmiento-Ribeiro AB, Saponara S, De Las Rivas J, *et al.* Hypoxia as a driver  
475 of resistance to immunotherapy. *Drug resistance updates : reviews and commentaries in antimicrobial and*  
476 *anticancer chemotherapy* **2021**;59:100787 doi 10.1016/j.drug.2021.100787.
- 477 22. Yang Y, Pan J, Wang H, Zhao Y, Qu S, Chen N, *et al.* Tislelizumab plus chemotherapy as first-line treatment for  
478 recurrent or metastatic nasopharyngeal cancer: A multicenter phase 3 trial (RATIONALE-309). *Cancer cell*  
479 **2023**;41(6):1061-72.e4 doi 10.1016/j.ccell.2023.04.014.
- 480 23. Wang J, Lu S, Yu X, Hu Y, Sun Y, Wang Z, *et al.* Tislelizumab Plus Chemotherapy vs Chemotherapy Alone as  
481 First-line Treatment for Advanced Squamous Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer: A Phase 3 Randomized Clinical Trial.  
482 *JAMA oncology* **2021**;7(5):709-17 doi 10.1001/jamaoncol.2021.0366.
- 483 24. Shen L, Kato K, Kim SB, Ajani JA, Zhao K, He Z, *et al.* Tislelizumab Versus Chemotherapy as Second-Line  
484 Treatment for Advanced or Metastatic Esophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma (RATIONALE-302): A Randomized  
485 Phase III Study. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology*  
486 **2022**;40(26):3065-76 doi 10.1200/jco.21.01926.
- 487 25. Qin S, Kudo M, Meyer T, Bai Y, Guo Y, Meng Z, *et al.* Tislelizumab vs Sorafenib as First-Line Treatment for  
488 Unresectable Hepatocellular Carcinoma: A Phase 3 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA oncology*  
489 **2023**;9(12):1651-9 doi 10.1001/jamaoncol.2023.4003.
- 490 26. Zhao W, Jin L, Chen P, Li D, Gao W, Dong G. Colorectal cancer immunotherapy-Recent progress and future  
491 directions. *Cancer letters* **2022**;545:215816 doi 10.1016/j.canlet.2022.215816.
- 492 27. Kievit H, Muntinghe-Wagenaar MB, Hijmering-Kappelle LBM, Hiddinga BI, Ubbels JF, Wijsman R, *et al.* Safety  
493 and tolerability of stereotactic radiotherapy combined with durvalumab with or without tremelimumab in  
494 advanced non-small cell lung cancer, the phase I SICI trial. *Lung cancer (Amsterdam, Netherlands)*  
495 **2023**;178:96-102 doi 10.1016/j.lungcan.2023.02.004.
- 496 28. Cho A, Untersteiner H, Hirschmann D, Shaltout A, Göbl P, Dorfer C, *et al.* Gamma Knife Radiosurgery for Brain  
497 Metastases in Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Patients Treated with Immunotherapy or Targeted Therapy. *Cancers*  
498 **2020**;12(12) doi 10.3390/cancers12123668.
- 499 29. He Y, Jiang Z, Chen C, Wang X. Classification of triple-negative breast cancers based on Immunogenomic  
500 profiling. *Journal of experimental & clinical cancer research : CR* **2018**;37(1):327 doi  
501 10.1186/s13046-018-1002-1.
- 502 30. Zeng TM, Yang G, Lou C, Wei W, Tao CJ, Chen XY, *et al.* Clinical and biomarker analyses of sintilimab plus  
503 gemcitabine and cisplatin as first-line treatment for patients with advanced biliary tract cancer. *Nature*  
504 *communications* **2023**;14(1):1340 doi 10.1038/s41467-023-37030-w.

505 **Figure legends**

**A**




**B**



506

507 **Figure 1. Clinical trial flow chart. A) Flowchart of therapeutic regimen. B) Flow diagram of participants in the**


508 study.



509


510 **Figure 2. Clinical trial results.** A) Swimmer plots of patients. B) Kaplan–Meier curves of OS for the  
 511 per-protocol set (N = 20). C) Kaplan–Meier curves of PFS for the per-protocol set (N = 20). D) Kaplan–Meier  
 512 curves of PFS for didn't receive immunotherapy set (control group) (N= 23) and per-protocol set (test group)  
 513 (N=20). E) Radiological response from patient. F) Waterfall plot of best percent change from baseline in patient  
 514 target lesion (N= 20). G) Waterfall plot of best percent change from baseline in patient off-target lesion (N= 12).






515

516 **Figure 3. Differential expressed genes analysis.** **A)** Specimens collection flowchart. **B)** Transcriptome  
517 analysis on differential expression genes before and after treatment between responders (PR) (n = 9) and  
518 non-responders (Non-PR) (n = 7), DESeq2 was provided to perform differential expression testing. **C)** The  
519 abundance of predefined 12 immune cells composition before and after treatment between responders (PR) (n  
520 = 9) and non-responders (Non-PR) (n = 7), Wilcoxon test was used to determine the statistical significance  
521 between subgroups. **D)** Radiological response from patient. **E)** Representative CD8 & PD-L1 IHC staining of  
522 before and after treatment specimens of patient.




523

524 **Figure 4. Additional immune signatures analysis.** A) The expression of 12 gene sets previously reported to  
 525 be associated with response to immunotherapy and prognosis between responders (PR) (n = 18) and  
 526 non-responders (Non-PR) (n = 14). BCD) 11 gene sets of prognostic value were differentially expressed  
 527 between responders (PR) (n = 18) and non-responders (Non-PR) (n = 14), box plots are indicated in terms of  
 528 minima, maxima, centre, bounds of box and whiskers (interquartile range value), and percentile in the style of  
 529 Tukey, Wilcoxon test was used to determine the statistical significance between subgroups.



530

531 **Figure 5. Comparison of responders before and after treatment** **A)** The expression of 7 gene sets  
 532 previously reported to be associated with response to immunosuppressive between before treatment (n = 9)  
 533 and after treatment (n = 9) in the responders (PR). **B)** The expression of Angiogenesis sets between  
 534 responders (PR) (n = 18) and non-responders (Non-PR) (n = 14). **C)** The expression of Angiogenesis &  
 535 Fibroblasts sets between before treatment (n = 9) and after treatment (n = 9) in the responders. Box plots are  
 536 indicated in terms of minima, maxima, centre, bounds of box and whiskers (interquartile range value), and  
 537 percentile in the style of Tukey, Wilcoxon test was used to determine the statistical significance between  
 538 subgroups.




539

540 **Supplementary Figure1. GO enrichment and KEGG pathways analysis of differential expression genes.**

541 **A)** GO enrichment analysis were performed to identify the biological process, cellular component and

542 molecular function of differential expression genes. **B)** H KEGG enrichment analysis of differential expression

543 genes.



544

545

Supplementary Figure2. Comparison of non-responders before and after treatment.