

Authors: [Z.-G. Ren](#)<sup>1</sup>, Y. Gao<sup>2</sup>, C. Wei<sup>2</sup>, X. Li<sup>3</sup>, S. Liu<sup>3</sup>, J. Zhang<sup>3</sup>, L. Wang<sup>2</sup>, Y.-L. Wu<sup>4</sup>; <sup>1</sup>Department of Hepatic Oncology, Liver Cancer Institute, Key Laboratory of Carcinogenesis and Cancer Invasion, Ministry of Education, Zhongshan Hospital, Fudan University, Shanghai, China, <sup>2</sup>Global Statistics and Data Science, BeiGene (Beijing) Co., Ltd., Beijing, China, <sup>3</sup>Clinical Development, BeiGene (Beijing) Co., Ltd., Beijing, China, <sup>4</sup>Guangdong Lung Cancer Institute, Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Translational Medicine in Lung Cancer, Guangdong Provincial People's Hospital & Guangdong Academy of Medical Sciences, Guangzhou, China

## Background

Immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) have changed the therapeutic landscape of many cancers but ICI efficacy varies greatly. Retrospective analyses showed ATB may have a negative impact on ICI efficacy. However, heterogeneous results induced by ATB observed across studies may be due to population diversity, different definitions of ATB use, limited sample size, etc.

## Methods

Data from 5 tisle monotherapy studies were analysed. Patients were dichotomized by timing of IV/oral ATB use;  $\pm 30$  days of Day 1 tisle treatment was 'ATB+', otherwise 'ATB-'. Propensity score weighting was employed to correct for bias from unbalanced baseline characteristics. Survival probability was estimated by the Kaplan–Meier method and compared by log-rank test. Cox model of overall survival (OS) was used to compute hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence interval (CI). Landmark analysis was conducted to explore the association of ATB use and OS across time to mitigate guarantee-time bias.

## Results

217/1183 (18%) patients received ATB. OS was significantly decreased in the ATB+ group vs the ATB- group (HR: 1.5; 95% CI: 1.3–1.9,  $p < 0.0001$ ). In the ATB+ group, OS was significantly decreased with prophylactic vs non-prophylactic ATB treatment (HR: 2.5; 95% CI: 1.5–4,  $p < 0.0001$ ). A significant association between ATB use and decreased OS was shown in patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (ESCC) (HR: 3.0; 95% CI: 1.3–7.2,  $p < 0.01$ ), hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) (HR: 1.8; 95% CI: 1.1–2.9,  $p < 0.01$ ) and urothelial carcinoma (UC) (HR: 2.3; 95% CI: 1.3–3.9,  $p < 0.001$ ). A worse trend in OS was observed for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) (HR: 1.6; 95% CI: 0.74–3.6,  $p = 0.26$ ). Landmark analysis identified the time intervals, as related to Day 1 of tisle treatment, when ATB use had a significant negative impact on OS per tumor type: Day -15–45 for ESCC, Day 19–45 for HCC, and Day -5–133 for UC. No significant time interval emerged in NSCLC.

## Conclusions

In this pooled analysis, a negative association was observed between ATB use during tisle treatment and OS in a pooled population and in ESCC, HCC and UC. Time intervals in which ATB use had a significant negative impact on OS were identified per indication. Prophylactic ATB use showed a poorer OS outcome vs non-prophylactic ATB use.

## Clinical trial identification

Pooled analysis of the following trials:

BGB-A317-001: NCT02407990

BGB-A317-102: CTR20160872

BGB-A317-203: NCT03209973

BGB-A317-204: CTR20170071

BGB-A317-208: NCT03419897