Original Article Baseline absolute lymphocyte count as a prognostic indicator in advanced or metastatic breast cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Guangfa Xia, Ziran Zhang, Sili Jing, Wanyin Liu

Department of Breast Diseases, Jiaxing Maternity and Child Health Care Hospital, Affiliated Women and Children's Hospital of Jiaxing University, 2468 Central East Road, Jiaxing 314000, Zhejiang, P. R. China

Received February 12, 2024; Accepted August 19, 2024; Epub September 15, 2024; Published September 30, 2024

Abstract: This study used meta-analysis to examine the role of baseline absolute lymphocyte count (ALC) in the prognosis of advanced breast cancer (ABC) or metastatic breast cancer (MBC). A comprehensive search encompassing PubMed, The Cochrane Library, Embase, and Web of Science databases was undertaken to identify and screen literature based on predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Progression-free survival (PFS), time to treatment failure (TTF), post-progression survival (PPS), and overall survival (OS) were selected as outcome measures. A metaanalysis of 14 studies, involving 2,540 patients and employing Review Manager 5.3 and Stata 14.0, was conducted. Notably, 12 of these studies originated from Japan. The findings indicated that patients with ABC or MBC exhibiting high ALC had significantly improved PFS, TTF, PPS (hazard ratio [HR] = 0.53, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.45-0.62, P < 0.00001; HR = 0.57, 95% CI: 0.51-0.64, P < 0.00001), and OS (HR = 0.44, 95% CI: 0.33-0.58, P < 0.00001; HR = 0.68, 95% CI: 0.60-0.77, P < 0.00001) juxtaposed with low ALC individuals. These findings were corroborated by both univariate and multivariate analyses. Furthermore, subgroup analysis based on breast cancer subtype unveiled that high ALC was associated with prolonged PFS (HR = 0.35, 95% Cl: 0.21-0.56, P < 0.0001), TTF, and PPS (HR = 0.45, 95% CI: 0.29-0.71, P = 0.0006) in both human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER-2)-positive and -negative ABC or MBC patients. Additionally, high ALC correlated with prolonged OS in all BC subtypes (HR = 0.73, 95% CI: 0.61-0.88, P = 0.0008) and HER-2-negative ABC or MBC patients (HR = 0.65, 95% CI: 0.55-0.78, P < 0.00001). Subgroup analysis was conducted on chemotherapy regimens, with and without eribulin. Despite variations in chemotherapy regimens, patients with ABC or MBC and high ALC exhibited longer PFS and PPS (HR = 0.45, 95% CI: 0.30-0.67, P < 0.0001), PFS and TTF (HR = 0.39, 95% CI: 0.20-0.78, P = 0.008), and OS (HR = 0.71, 95% CI: 0.62-0.82, P < 0.00001; HR = 0.5, 95% CI: 0.35-0.70, P < 0.0001). The results of this meta-analysis suggest that baseline ALC, as an immune marker, can serve as an effective prognostic indicator for ABC or MBC.

Keywords: Advanced breast cancer, metastatic breast cancer, absolute lymphocyte count, eribulin, meta-analysis

Introduction

According to recent global cancer burden data, breast cancer (BC) has now surpassed lung cancer as the most common malignancy worldwide [1, 2]. Therefore, the development of early diagnostic techniques and effective treatments for BC is critical. Approximately 5%-10% of patients receive a diagnosis of advanced BC (ABC) or metastatic BC (MBC) at initial presentation [3], and 20%-30% of BC cases eventually develop metastasis or recurrence [4]. ABC, or MBC, is characterized by the proliferation of tumor cells from the original breast tissue to secondary sites such as the skin, lymph nodes, and vital organs, including the liver, lungs, or bones. Patients diagnosed with ABC or MBC generally face a poor prognosis and present challenges in terms of treatment options. Although recent advances in treatment have improved prognosis, the survival rates for these patients remain low, with 5-year and 10-year survival rates at 27% and 13%, respectively [5]. Several factors, including the BC subtype, presence of distant metastases, and treatment strategy, influence the prognosis of patients with ABC or MBC [6]. Treatment strategies and prognoses differ among patients due to heterogeneity in clinical characteristics and BC subtype. Despite a range of available treatment options, selecting the most appropriate strategy can be challenging, as patients with ABC or MBC might exhibit dissimilar responses to identical treatments. Thus, there is an urgent need to identify effective and easily accessible predictive markers to assess the prognosis of patients with ABC or MBC.

The immune system plays a crucial role in controlling malignant tumors, affecting both tumor progression and treatment response. An activated immune system may target and induce tumor cells death or, through inflammatory pathways, assist in creating a tumor microenvironment that supports tumor cell growth [7, 8]. Tumeh et al. demonstrated that the immune system significantly influences the prognosis of malignant tumors [9]. Pre-treatment systemic immune markers, such as absolute lymphocyte count (ALC), neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR), and platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio (PLR), have been identified as reliable predictors of tumor prognosis. ALC, in particular, is an absolute count that may provide a more accurate reflection of disease status and prognosis compared to NLR and PLR [10-12]. Jimbo et al. reported an association between decreased ALC and the progression of MBC [12]. Lymphocytes, including T cells, B cells, and natural killer cells, are crucial immune cells involved in both humoral and cellular anti-tumor immune responses [13-15]. ALC reflects the proliferation capacity of lymphocytes and plays an essential role in regulating immunity, targeted killing of tumor cells, and inhibiting tumor cell proliferation [8, 16].

Additionally, lymphocytes can migrate to tumor sites through humoral factors [17]. Both ALC and tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs) promote the antitumor immune response. Moreover, ALC influences the formation of TILs, thereby indirectly reflecting the immune microenvironment of tumor tissue [18]. Savas *et al.* reported that patients with BC exhibiting high levels of TILs had better prognosis [19]. Therefore, ALC may serve as a valuable immune marker for evaluating the prognosis of BC.

Recently, ALC has been recognized as an important immune marker for evaluating the prognosis of malignant tumors [20]. However, the clinical significance of baseline ALC in ABC or MBC has not been thoroughly investigated. This study aimed to categorize the immune status of ABC or MBC based on baseline ALC levels and determine the predictive value of these levels for survival outcomes through meta-analysis.

Materials and methods

Methods

This study adhered to the reporting specifications for meta-analysis of observational studies and followed the implementation steps outlined in the Cochrane guidelines [21, 22].

Search strategy

A comprehensive search for relevant articles from four databases was carried out, namely PubMed (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/), The Cochrane Library (https://www.cochranelibrary.com/), Embase (www.embase.com/), and Web of Science (https://www.webofknowledge. com/), spanning from the inception of the databases to June 2023. The search strategy employed in PubMed was based on the following search string: ((Breast Neoplasms[Mesh]) OR (((((Breast Tumors[Title/Abstract]) OR (Mammary Cancers[Title/Abstract])) OR (Breast Carcinomas[Title/Abstract])) OR (Breast Malignant Neoplasms[Title/Abstract])) OR (Breast cancer[Title/Abstract]))) AND (Absolute lymphocyte count[Title/Abstract]). The retrieval approach combined subject words and free words. Simultaneously, a meticulous manual retrieval approach was employed to meticulously trace and analyze the references included in the selected studies. This meta-analysis was registered in INPLASY (INPLASY202470038).

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria for this study were as follows: (1) publication in the English language; (2) cohort studies; (3) focus on the correlation between baseline ALC and ABC or MBC; (4) provision of outcome indicators such as hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence interval (CI).

Exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) reviews, case reports, animal studies, conference abstracts, and other studies that did not meet the specified requirements; (2) studies where data extraction was not possible; (3) studies containing repeated data; (4) studies in which no

specific cut-off point for baseline ALC threshold is mentioned.

Data extraction and quality of the included studies

Independent screening of titles and abstracts was carried out by two researchers in accordance with the aforementioned inclusion and exclusion criteria. Following initial screening, the full texts were re-evaluated, and results were cross-checked. Discrepancies were discussed and resolved collaboratively to decide on inclusion. If an article lacked complete information, the authors of the original studies were contacted to obtain missing data. The reasons for inclusion and exclusion at each step were documented throughout the screening process. Data collected included various variables such as the first author's name, year of publication, country of publication, total patients sample size, BC subtype, chemotherapy regimen, ALC threshold, survival data, etc. In cases where individual articles did not report clear HR data, data extraction from survival curves was performed using Engauge Digitizers 4.1 software. Subsequently, HR and 95% CI values were calculated using Tierney tables [23].

Quality evaluation of the included studies

The quality of the included studies was assessed utilizing the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS) [24]. The evaluation considered three aspects: selection of the research population, comparability between groups, and outcome measurement. The scale was divided into three levels: low risk, unclear, and high risk. A higher score reflects superior study quality. Scores ranging from 0 to 3 indicate low quality, scores ranging from 4 to 6 indicate moderate quality, and scores ranging from 7 to 9 indicate high quality.

Statistical methods

Data analysis was conducted employing the inverse variance method utilizing both Review Manager (version 5.3; Cochrane) and Stata (version 14.0; StataCorp LP). The prognostic correlation between baseline ALC and patients with ABC or MBC was determined by pooling HR and 95% CI values from the respective studies. The significance level for the outcome index was set at α = 0.05. Heterogeneity between

studies was assessed utilizing Cochran's Q test and the I^2 test [25]. P > 0.10 or $I^2 < 50\%$ indicated low heterogeneity among the studies, and the fixed-effect model was utilized for data analysis. In addition, P < 0.10 or $I^2 > 50\%$ suggested significant heterogeneity among the studies, prompting the utilization of the random-effects model. Forest plots were employed to present the findings of the meta-analysis, and the stability of these findings was assessed via sensitivity analysis. Subgroup analysis was conducted to investigate factors affecting heterogeneity and to evaluate the impact of grouping factors on the results. Publication bias was assessed visually using funnel plots and formally evaluated through the Egger and Begg tests [26, 27]. $P \le 0.05$ indicated publication bias.

Results

Screening process for the studies

Following the retrieval strategy outlined in Methods section, 392 articles were initially identified. After removing literature that lacked data or failed to meet the data analysis requirements, 14 studies involving a total of 2,540 patients were included in the final analysis (**Figure 1**).

Basic information about the studies

All studies were designed as retrospective cohort studies, with 12 conducted in Japan. The baseline ALC thresholds applied in the studies were $1500/\mu$ L, $1258/\mu$ L, and $1000/\mu$ L. Baseline ALC is determined using laboratory data obtained before the initiation of treatment, ensuring that patients have not yet been affected by myelotoxicity from treatments, particularly chemotherapy. Therefore, baseline ALC may provide a more accurate representation of the immune status of the patient (**Table 1**).

Results of the meta-analyses

Following data extraction from the literature, four outcome indicators, namely, baseline ALC level and progression-free survival (PFS), time to treatment failure (TTF), post-progression survival (PPS), and overall survival (OS), were selected for analysis. Univariate and multivariate analyses were conducted to examine the relationships among these indicators.



factors. A heterogeneity test revealed no significant heterogeneity between the studies $(I^2 = 9\%; P = 0.36)$. Therefore, a fixed-effect model was utilized to combine all the effect sizes. These findings indicated that patients with ABC or MBC with high ALC had longer PFS. TTF, and PPS (HR = 0.44, 95% CI: 0.33 - 0.58, P < 0.00001) (Figure 2B). Sensitivity analysis was carried out by individually eliminating studies. The results showed that the combined effect size remained stable even when studies were arbitrarily eliminated, indicating result robustness.

Further subgroup analysis was performed based on the BC subtype. BC classification was based on the expression le-

Univariate analysis of PFS, TTF, and PPS

In total, nine studies reported the univariate analysis results of PFS, TTF, and PPS. These data were pooled and analyzed without considering confounding factors. Strong heterogeneity among the studies was revealed ($I^2 = 50\%$; P = 0.04): therefore, a random-effects model was utilized to combine the results. Alternatively, the exploration of the underlying causes of heterogeneity could be further explored. Sensitivity analysis was conducted on the results of the selected random-effects model, using a method of sequentially excluding studies to determine their impact on heterogeneity. It was found that the study by Koyama 2021 [28] had a significant influence on the heterogeneity. After excluding this study, heterogeneity was significantly reduced ($I^2 = 0\%$; P = 0.52). A fixedeffects model was then used to combine effect sizes, demonstrating that patients with high ALC had longer PFS, TTF, and PPS compared to those with low ALC (HR = 0.53, 95% CI: 0.45-0.62, *P* < 0.00001) (Figure 2A).

Multivariate and subgroup analyses of PFS, TTF, and PPS

A total of five studies were conducted with multivariate analysis on PFS, TTF, and PPS results, taken into consideration various confounding

vels of human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER-2), distinguishing between HER-2-positive and HER-2-negative subtypes. In patients with HER-2-positive BC, results from the three studies demonstrated that patients with ABC or MBC with high ALC experienced prolonged PFS (HR = 0.35, 95% CI: 0.21-0.56, P < 0.0001) compared to those with low ALC (Figure 2C). In patients with HER-2-negative BC, the two studies demonstrated that individuals with high ALC exhibited longer TTF and PPS (HR = 0.45, 95% CI: 0.29-0.71, P = 0.0006) compared to those with low ALC (Figure 2C). Subgroup analysis was also conducted based on chemotherapy regimens. In patients treated with eribulin (ERI), it is clear from the three studies that patients with ABC or MBC who had high ALC experienced longer PFS and PPS (HR = 0.45, 95% CI: 0.30-0.67, P < 0.0001) as opposed to those with low ALC (Figure 3A). Among patients not treated with ERI in the two studies, individuals with high ALC exhibited longer PFS and TTF (HR = 0.39, 95% CI: 0.20-0.78, P = 0.008) compared to those with low ALC (Figure 3A).

Univariate analysis of OS

Thirteen studies conducted a univariate analysis of OS and performed a pooled analysis without considering confounding factors. No con-

First author	Country	Sample size	Type of tumor	Threshold	Diagnosis	Treatment	Outcome	NOS
Araki_1 2018 [10]	Japan	51	HER-2+	1000/µL	ABC	ERI + PT/Nab-PTX + PT	PFS	7
Araki_2 2018 [10]	Japan	51	HER-2+	1500/µL	ABC	ERI + PT/Nab-PTX + PT	PFS	7
Che 2019 [48]	China	68	HER-2+	1000/µL	MBC	T + Chemotherapy	PFS and OS	8
EMILE 2021 [49]	France	114	HER-2-	1500/µL	MBC	CDK4/6i + ET	PFS and OS	7
Goto 2022 [33]	Japan	97	tBC	1500/µL	MBC	ERI	OS	8
Koyama 2021 [28]	Japan	120	HER-2-	1258/µL	MBC	ERI	PFS and OS	7
Miyagawa 2020 [50]	Japan	179	tBC	1500/µL	MBC	BP	PFS and OS	7
Miyoshi 2020 [47]	Japan	500	tBC	1500/µL	MBC	ERI/TPC	OS	7
Morisaki 2021 [51]	Japan	88	tBC	1500/µL	MBC	ERI	OS	7
Nakamoto_1 2021 [34]	Japan	114	HER-2-	1500/µL	ABC	BP	TTF and OS	7
Nakamoto_2 2021 [52]	Japan	94	HER-2-	1500/µL	ABC	ERI	PPS and OS	7
Sata 2020 [35]	Japan	243	tBC	1500/µL	MBC	ERI	PFS and OS	7
Sawa 2022 [36]	Japan	74	tBC	1500/µL	MBC	Anthracyclines/Taxanes or 5-FU/HER2-targeted therapy/Others	OS	6
Takahashi 2021 [53]	Japan	565	HER-2-	1500/µL	ABC and MBC	ERI	OS	6
Ueno 2020 [54]	Japan	125	tBC	1500/µL	MBC	ERI	PFS and OS	6
Watanabe_1 2020 [44]	Japan	108	HER-2-	1500/µL	ABC	ERI	OS	8
Watanabe_2 2020 [44]	Japan	108	HER-2-	1000/µL	ABC	ERI	OS	8

Table 1. Characteristics of the included studies

HER-2, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2; tBC, total breast cancer; ABC, advanced breast cancer; MBC, metastatic breast cancer; ERI, eribulin; PT, pertuzumab and trastuzumab; Nab-PTX, nab-paclitaxel; CDK4/6i, cyclin-dependent-kinase 4-6 inhibitors; ET, endocrine therapy; TPC, treatment of physician's choice; BP, bevacizumab and paclitaxel; PFS, progression-free survival; OS, overall survival; TTF, time to treatment failure; PPS, post-progression survival. tBC was divided into two subtypes: (1) (HER-2)-positive BC and (2) (HER-2)-negative BC.

siderable heterogeneity was found among the studies ($I^2 = 19\%$; P = 0.24), allowing for the use of a fixed-effects model to combine the effect sizes. The findings indicated that patients with ABC or MBC with high ALC exhibited prolonged OS (HR = 0.57, 95% CI: 0.51-0.64, P < 0.00001) relative to those with low ALC (**Figure 4A**). Sensitivity analysis was conducted by systematically eliminating studies; the combined effect size remained unchanged, demonstrating result robustness.

Multivariate and subgroup analyses of OS

A total of 12 studies conducted a multivariate analysis of OS, adjusting for various confounding factors prior to data pooling. The heterogeneity test ($I^2 = 11\%$; P = 0.33) revealed no considerable heterogeneity among the studies. Therefore, the fixed-effect model was utilized to combine the effect size. The analysis revealed that patients with high ALC had longer OS (HR = 0.68, 95% CI: 0.60-0.77, P < 0.00001) (**Figure 4B**). Sensitivity analysis was carried out by systematic exclusion of studies. The pooled effect size consistently remained stable throughout study elimination, indicating the

robustness of the analysis. Five studies demonstrated longer OS for individuals with ABC or MBC with high ALC by subgroup analysis considering all BC subtypes (HR = 0.73, 95% CI: 0.61-0.88, P = 0.0008) (Figure 5A). For patients with HER-2-negative BC, six studies showed longer OS for individuals with ABC or MBC with high ALC (HR = 0.65, 95% CI: 0.55-0.78, P < 0.00001) (Figure 5A). Subgroup analysis was conducted based on chemotherapy regimens. Findings from the eight studies indicated that individuals with ABC or MBC who exhibited high ALC and were treated with ERI had experienced prolonged OS (HR = 0.71, 95% CI: 0.62-0.82, *P* < 0.0001) (**Figure 5B**). Similarly, in the four studies, individuals who did not receive ERI, exhibited correlation of high ALC to prolonged OS (HR = 0.5, 95% CI: 0.35-0.70, P < 0.0001) (Figure 5B).

Quality of the studies included for analysis

The NOS scores chart indicated that the overall quality of the studies was satisfactory (**Figure 6A** and **6B**). Scores for the included research ranged from 6 to 8. The scores of the included studies are illustrated in **Table 1**.

A				Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	
Araki 1 2018	-1.178	0.429	3.7%	0.31 [0.13, 0.71]		
Araki 2 2018	-0.989	0.388	4.5%	0.37 [0.17, 0.80]		
Che 2019	-0.673	0.151	29.6%	0.51 [0.38, 0.69]	-	
EMILE 2021	-0.538	0.213	14.9%	0.58 [0.38, 0.89]		
Koyama 2021	0.022	0.186		Not estimable		
Miyagawa 2020	-0.371	0.23	12.8%	0.69 [0.44, 1.08]		
Nakamoto 1 2021	-0.616	0.237	12.0%	0.54 [0.34, 0.86]		
Nakamoto 2 2021	-1.47	0.48	2.9%	0.23 [0.09, 0.59]		
Sata 2020	-0.534	0.303	7.4%	0.59 [0.32, 1.06]		
Ueno 2020	-0.598	0.235	12.2%	0.55 [0.35, 0.87]		
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.53 [0.45, 0.62]	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 7	.18, df = 8 (P = 0.52)	; $I^2 = 0^6$	%			100
Test for overall effect: Z	= 7.84 (P < 0.00001)				100
		· ·			Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
P						
В				Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Iog[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV Fixed 95% CI	IV Fixed 95% CI	
Araki 1 2018	-0 639	0.408	12.6%	0 53 [0 24 1 17]		
Araki 2 2018	-1 217	0.534	7.4%	0.30 [0.24, 1.17]		
Che 2019	-1 347	0.385	14 2%	0.26 [0.12, 0.55]		
Nakamoto 1 2021	-0.635	0.258	31.6%	0.53 [0.32, 0.88]		
Nakamoto 2 2021	-1.47	0.53	7.5%	0.00 [0.02, 0.00]		
Lieno 2020	-0.562	0.33	26.8%	0.57 [0.33, 0.99]		
0610 2020	-0.502	0.20	20.070	0.07 [0.00, 0.00]		
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.44 [0.33, 0.58]	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5	.49, df = 5 (P = 0.36)	; l ² = 9 ⁶	%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 5.67 (P < 0.00001)			0.01 0.1 1 10	100
	,				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
C						
C				Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
2.4.1 HER-2 positive						
Araki_1 2018	-0.639	0.408	17.2%	0.53 [0.24, 1.17]		
Araki 2 2018	-1.217	0.534	10.1%	0.30 [0.10, 0.84]		
Che 2019	-1.347	0.385	19.4%	0.26 [0.12, 0.55]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			46.7%	0.35 [0.21, 0.56]	◆	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	.71, df = 2 (P = 0.43)	$ 1^2 = 0^0$	%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 4.26 (P < 0.0001)					
242 HED 2 pagative						
Nelsemete 4 2024	0.025	0.050	40 40/	0 50 10 00 0 001		
Nakamoto_1 2021	-0.635	0.258	43.1%	0.53 [0.32, 0.88]		
Nakamoto_2 2021	-1.47	0.53	10.2%	0.23 [0.08, 0.65]	A	
	01 df = 1 (D = 0.10)	12 - 54	53.3%	0.45 [0.29, 0.71]	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2	101, df = 1 (P = 0.16)	; 1* = 50	J%			
rest for overall effect: 2	- 3.43 (P = 0.0006)					
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.40 [0.29, 0.56]	◆	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4	.31, df = 4 (P = 0.37)	; $I^2 = 7^{\circ}$	%			100
Test for overall effect: Z	= 5.42 (P < 0.00001)			U.U1 U.1 1 10	100
Test for subaroup differ	ences: Chi ² = 0.60. c	f = 1 (F	P = 0.44).	$^{2} = 0\%$	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	

Figure 2. A. Forest plots for the fixed-effect meta-analysis of the association between high ALC and PFS, TTF, and PPS by univariate analysis. B. Forest plots for the fixed-effect meta-analysis of the association between high ALC and PFS, TTF, and PPS by multivariate analysis. C. Forest plots for the fixed-effect meta-analysis of the association between high ALC and PFS, TTF, and PPS by BC subtype. HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; ALC, absolute lymphocyte count; PFS, progression-free survival; TTF, time to treatment failure; PPS, post-progression survival; BC, breast cancer.

Publication bias

In the case of PFS, TTF, and PPS, the funnel plots exhibited visual symmetry in both univariate and multivariate analyses (Figure 3B and 3C). Additionally, the P-values obtained from Begg's and Egger's tests were 0.032 and 0.452, and 0.091 and 0.069, respectively. These results collectively indicate the absence of significant publication bias. However, for OS, funnel plot symmetry was not satisfactory in both univariate and multivariate analyses (Figure 3D and 3E). P-values from Begg's and Egger's tests were 0.012 and 0.024, and 0.002 and 0.018, respectively, suggesting publication bias.

Discussion

Declining immune function is closely linked to tumor immune escape, leading to recurrence and metastasis of malignant tumors [29]. Assessing immune status through ALC constitutes an important and convenient method. Low ALC is associated with an overall suppression of the immune system in cancer patients



Figure 3. A. Forest plots for the fixed-effect meta-analysis of the association between high ALC and PFS, TTF, and PPS by different chemotherapy regimens. B and C. Funnel plot for publication bias in the association between high ALC and PFS, TTF, and PPS by univariate and multivariate analyses. D and E. Funnel plot for publication bias in the association between high ALC and OS by univariate and multivariate analyses. Each study is represented by one circle. A vertical line represents the pooled effect estimate. HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; ALC, absolute lymphocyte count; PFS, progression-free survival; TTF, time to treatment failure; PPS, post-progression survival; OS, overall survival; LNHR, Logarithm of the Negative Hazard Ratio; seLN_HR, Standard Error of the Logarithm of the Negative Hazard Ratio.

and often linked to poor prognosis [30]. Reduction in ALC has been identified as an adverse prognostic factor in various cancer types [30-32]. ALC is related to the prognosis of ABC or MBC. Some studies have already demonstrated the potential of ALC as an immune marker for patients with ABC or MBC [33-36]. However, the specific mechanisms by which ALC in patients with ABC or MBC influences tumor cell growth, angiogenesis, and distant metastasis through the secretion of cytokines and chemokines remain under investigation [37]. As the studies analyzed here are individual clinical studies, we conducted a systema-

Prognostic role of baseline ALC in advanced or metastatic breast cancer

A				Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio
Study or Subaroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Che 2019	-0.705 0.	.195	7.6%	0.49 [0.34, 0.72]	
Goto 2022	-0.616 (0.28	3.7%	0.54 [0.31, 0.93]	
Kovama 2021	-0.397 0.	.196	7.5%	0.67 [0.46, 0.99]	
Miyagawa 2020	-0.4 0.	.108	24.7%	0.67 [0.54, 0.83]	+
Miyoshi 2020	-0.635 0	211	6.5%	0.53 [0.35, 0.80]	
Morisaki 2021	-0.683 (0.31	3.0%	0.51 [0.28, 0.93]	
Nakamoto 1 2021	-0.968 0	311	3.0%	0.38 [0.21, 0.70]	- <u>-</u>
Nakamoto 2 2021	-1.514 0	421	1.6%	0.22 [0.10, 0.50]	(
Sata 2020	-1 204 0	399	1.8%	0.30 [0.14, 0.66]	
Sawa 2022	-0.639 0	205	6.9%	0.53 [0.35, 0.79]	
Takahashi 2021	-0.465 0	124	18.8%	0.63 [0.49, 0.80]	-
Lleno 2020	-0.274 0	263	4 2%	0 76 [0 45 1 27]	-+
Watanaha 1 2020	-0.274 0.	0.23	5.5%	0.54 [0.35, 0.86]	
Watanabe_1 2020	-0.783 0	233	5.3%	0.46 [0.29, 0.72]	
	-0.700 0.	.200	0.070	0.40 [0.23, 0.72]	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.57 [0.51, 0.64]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	6.10. df = 13 (P = 0.24)); 2 =	19%		
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 10.41 (P < 0.00001))			0.01 0.1 1 10 100
		/			Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
В				Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio
B Study or Subaroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weiaht	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% Cl	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.33 [0.13, 0.81]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 FMILE 2021	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0	SE .463	<u>Weight</u> 2.0% 5.6%	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Kovama 2021	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0.	SE .463 .274 .215	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1, 14]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0	SE .463 .274 .215 .116	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0.	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto 1 2021	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.821 0.	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.858 0. -1.238 0.	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324 .454	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.821 0. -1.238 0.	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324 .454 .222	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0% 8.5%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Sawa 2022	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.821 0. -1.238 0. -0.518 0.	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324 .454 .222 .492	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0% 8.5% 1.7%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Sawa 2022 Takahashi 2021	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.821 0. -1.238 0. -0.518 0. -0.371 0.	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324 .454 .222 .492 0.14	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0% 8.5% 1.7% 21.4%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.74 [0.56 0.97]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Sawa 2022 Takahashi 2021 Lleno 2020	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.821 0. -1.138 0. -0.518 0. -0.371 0. -0.302 0.	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324 .454 .222 .492 0.14 .294	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0% 8.5% 1.7% 21.4% 4.8%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Sawa 2022 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe 1 2020	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.821 0. -1.138 0. -0.518 0. -0.371 0. -0.302 0. -0.302 0. -0.424 0.	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324 .454 .222 .492 0.14 .294 .301	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0% 8.5% 1.7% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Sawa 2022 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.828 0. -0.821 0. -1.238 0. -0.518 0. -0.371 0. -0.302 0. -0.424 0. -0.424 0.	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324 .454 .222 .492 0.14 .294 .301 .326	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0% 8.5% 1.7% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6% 3.9%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Sawa 2022 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.858 0. -0.811 0. -0.518 0. -0.371 0. -0.302 0. -0.662 0. -0.144 0. -0.687 0.	SE 4463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324 454 .222 .492 0.14 .294 .301 .326	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0% 8.5% 1.7% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6% 3.9%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Sawa 2022 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Total (95% CI)	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.858 0. -0.851 0. -0.518 0. -0.302 0. -0.302 0. -0.302 0. -0.4518 0. -0.302 0. -0.302 0. -0.4518 0. -0.302 0. -0.4518 0. -0.302 0. -0.454 0. -0.4547 0.	SE 4463 274 215 324 454 222 492 0.14 2294 301 326	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0% 8.5% 1.7% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6% 3.9% 100.0%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.68 [0.60, 0.77]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Sawa 2022 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.821 0. -1.138 0. -0.518 0. -0.302 0. -0.302 0. -0.667 0. 3.50, df = 12 (P = 0.33)	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324 .454 .222 0.14 .294 .301 .326); ² =	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0% 8.5% 1.7% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6% 3.9% 100.0% 11%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.68 [0.60, 0.77]	Hazard Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Sawa 2022 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2	log[Hazard Ratio] -1.118 0. -0.566 0. -0.292 0. -0.273 0. -0.858 0. -0.858 0. -0.821 0. -1.138 0. -0.518 0. -0.302 0. -0.302 0. -0.144 0. -0.687 0. 13.50, df = 12 (P = 0.33) Z Z = 5.96 (P < 0.00001)	SE .463 .274 .215 .116 .572 .324 .454 .222 0.14 .294 .301 .326); l ² =	Weight 2.0% 5.6% 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 4.0% 2.0% 8.5% 1.7% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6% 3.9% 100.0% 11%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.97 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.68 [0.60, 0.77]	Hazard Ratio

Figure 4. A. Forest plots for the fixed-effect meta-analysis of the association between high ALC and OS by univariate analysis. B. Forest plots for the fixed-effect meta-analysis of the association between high ALC and OS by multivariate analysis. HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; ALC, absolute lymphocyte count; OS, overall survival.

tic review and meta-analysis using rigorous inclusion and exclusion criteria to compile relevant literature and analyze data related to HR to assess the prognostic impact of baseline ALC in patients with ABC or MBC. The included studies, all published since 2018, highlight recent interests in utilizing baseline ALC as a potential prognostic marker for patients with ABC or MBC. Due to limitations in the number and content of the studies, the short-term outcome indicators selected included PFS, TTF, and PPS. Patients with ABC or MBC with high ALC had longer univariate PFS, TTF, and PPS than those with low ALC (HR = 0.53, 95% CI: 0.45-0.62). Consistent results were obtained from multivariate analysis after confounding factors were excluded (HR = 0.44, 95% CI: 0.33-0.58). Moreover, OS was considered a

А					Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio
	Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
	4.4.1 Total			-		
	Miyoshi 2020	-0.273	0.116	31.7%	0.76 [0.61, 0.96]	-
	Morisaki 2021	-0.858	0.572	1.3%	0.42 [0.14, 1.30]	
	Sata 2020	-0.518	0.222	8.7%	0.60 [0.39, 0.92]	
	Sawa 2022	-0.371	0.492	1.8%	0.69 [0.26, 1.81]	
	Ueno 2020	-0.062	0.294	4.9%	0.94 [0.53, 1.67]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			48.4%	0.73 [0.61, 0.88]	•
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2	.62, df = 4 (P = 0.62)	; $I^2 = 0\%$	6		
	Test for overall effect: Z	. = 3.35 (P = 0.0008)				
	1 1 2 HEP-2 pogative					
		-0.566	0 274	5 7%	0 57 [0 33 0 97]	
	Kovama 2021	-0.300	0.214	9.2%	0.75 [0.33, 0.37]	
	Nakamoto 1 2021	-0.232	0.324	4 1%	0.44 [0.23, 0.83]	
	Nakamoto 2 2021	-1 238	0.454	2.1%	0 29 [0 12 0 71]	
	Takahashi 2021	-0.302	0.14	21.8%	0.74 [0.56, 0.97]	
	Watanabe 1 2020	-0.144	0.301	4.7%	0.87 [0.48, 1.56]	
	Watanabe 2 2020	-0.687	0.326	4.0%	0.50 [0.27, 0.95]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			51.6%	0.65 [0.55, 0.78]	◆
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 7	.64, df = 6 (P = 0.27)	; l ² = 21	%		
	Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 4.65 (P < 0.00001)			
	Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.69 [0.61, 0.78]	▼
	Heterogeneity: Chir = 1	0.95, df = 11 (P = 0.4)	45); I* =	0%		0.01 0.1 1 10 100
	Test for overall effect. Z	= 5.67 (P < 0.00001)) If = 1 (D	- 0.41)	2 - 0%	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
	rescior suburbub uner	ences. Chi = 0.09. 0	1 - 1 1	- 0.411.1	- 0 /8	
-						
В					Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio
В	Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
В	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
_	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE 0.215	Weight 9.1%	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI 0.75 [0.49, 1.14]	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
В	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273	SE 0.215 0.116	Weight 9.1% 31.1%	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96]	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
- В	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021	<u>log[Hazard Ratio]</u> -0.292 -0.273 -0.858	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30]	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
– В	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454	9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71]	Hazard Ratio
В	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92]	Hazard Ratio
В	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302	0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97]	Hazard Ratio
В	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.062	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 4.2%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67]	Hazard Ratio
В	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.202	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.391	9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.57 [0.20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20,	Hazard Ratio
В	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2020 Subtotal (05% CI)	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326	9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6% 3.9%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.54 [0.52, 0.82]	Hazard Ratio
_	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Hetercroencity: Chi ² = 8	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 28. df = 8 (P = 0.41)	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326	9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6% 3.9% 86.8%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82]	Hazard Ratio
В_	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 7	-0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 -28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) -28, df = 8 (P < 0.00001	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326 ; l ² = 3%	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6% 3.9% 86.8% %	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82]	Hazard Ratio
	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: Z	-0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) : = 4.86 (P < 0.00001	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326 ; l ² = 3%)	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 3.9% 86.8% 6	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82]	Hazard Ratio
- -	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 4.3.2 Excluding ERI	-0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) : = 4.86 (P < 0.00001	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326 ; l ² = 3%)	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 3.9% 86.8% %	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82]	Hazard Ratio
- -	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 4.3.2 Excluding ERI Che 2019	-0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) : = 4.86 (P < 0.00001	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326 ; l ² = 3%) 0.463	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 3.9% 86.8% 2.0%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82] 0.33 [0.13, 0.81]	Hazard Ratio
В —	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 4.3.2 Excluding ERI Che 2019 EMILE 2021	-0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) : = 4.86 (P < 0.00001 -1.118 -0.566	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326 ; l ² = 3%) 0.463 0.274	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 86.8% 2.0% 5.6%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82] 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97]	Hazard Ratio
В —	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: Z 4.3.2 Excluding ERI Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021	-0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) ! = 4.86 (P < 0.00001 -1.118 -0.566 -0.821	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.326 ; l ² = 3%) 0.463 0.274 0.324	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6% 3.9% 86.8% 6	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82] 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83]	Hazard Ratio
В —	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: Z 4.3.2 Excluding ERI Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Sawa 2022	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) ! = 4.86 (P < 0.00001 -1.118 -0.566 -0.821 -0.371	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.326 ; l ² = 3%) 0.463 0.274 0.324 0.324 0.492	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 4.6% 39.8% 86.8% 6	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82] 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81]	Hazard Ratio
В —	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 4.3.2 Excluding ERI Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Sawa 2022 Subtotal (95% CI)	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) ! = 4.86 (P < 0.00001 -1.118 -0.566 -0.821 -0.371	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326 ; l ² = 3%) 0.463 0.274 0.324 0.492	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.6% 3.9% 86.8% 6 2.0% 5.6% 4.0% 1.7% 13.2%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.53, 1.67] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82] 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.50 [0.25, 0.70]	Hazard Ratio
в _	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 4.3.2 Excluding ERI Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Sawa 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) ! = 4.86 (P < 0.00001 -1.118 -0.566 -0.821 -0.371 .64, df = 3 (P = 0.65)	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326 ; l ² = 3%) 0.463 0.274 0.324 0.492 ; l ² = 0%	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.6% 3.9% 86.8% 6 2.0% 5.6% 4.0% 1.32%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82] 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.50 [0.35, 0.70]	Hazard Ratio
B	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 4.3.2 Excluding ERI Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Sawa 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2	-0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.144 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) : = 4.86 (P < 0.00001 -1.118 -0.566 -0.821 -0.371 .64, df = 3 (P = 0.65) : = 3.93 (P < 0.0001)	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326 ; l ² = 3%) 0.463 0.274 0.324 0.324 0.492 ; l ² = 0%	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.6% 3.9% 86.8% 6 2.0% 5.6% 1.7% 13.2%	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82] 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.50 [0.35, 0.70]	Hazard Ratio
В _	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 4.3.2 Excluding ERI Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Sawa 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Total (95% CI)	-0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.064 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) : = 4.86 (P < 0.00001) -1.118 -0.566 -0.821 -0.371 .64, df = 3 (P = 0.65) : = 3.93 (P < 0.0001)	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.294 0.301 0.326 ; l ² = 3%) 0.463 0.274 0.324 0.324 0.492 ; l ² = 0%	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 3.9% 86.8% 6 2.0% 1.3.2% 6	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82] 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.50 [0.35, 0.70] 0.68 [0.60, 0.771]	Hazard Ratio
B _	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 4.3.2 Excluding ERI Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Sawa 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	-0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.062 -0.164 -0.687 .28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) != 4.86 (P < 0.00001 -1.118 -0.566 -0.821 -0.371 .64, df = 3 (P = 0.65) != 3.93 (P < 0.0001) 3.50, df = 12 (P = 0.53)	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.222 0.321 0.326 ; l ² = 3%) 0.463 0.274 0.324 0.492 ; l ² = 0% i) ² = 0%	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 3.9% 86.8% 6 2.0% 1.32% 6	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82] 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.50 [0.35, 0.70] 0.68 [0.60, 0.77]	Hazard Ratio
B _	Study or Subgroup 4.3.1 Containing ERI Koyama 2021 Miyoshi 2020 Morisaki 2021 Nakamoto_2 2021 Sata 2020 Takahashi 2021 Ueno 2020 Watanabe_1 2020 Watanabe_2 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 4.3.2 Excluding ERI Che 2019 EMILE 2021 Nakamoto_1 2021 Sawa 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2	log[Hazard Ratio] -0.292 -0.273 -0.858 -1.238 -0.518 -0.302 -0.662 -0.144 -0.687 -28, df = 8 (P = 0.41) := 4.86 (P < 0.00001	SE 0.215 0.116 0.572 0.454 0.222 0.14 0.321 0.326 ; l ² = 3%) 0.463 0.274 0.324 0.324 0.492 ; l ² = 0% i)	Weight 9.1% 31.1% 1.3% 2.0% 8.5% 21.4% 4.8% 3.9% 86.8% 6 2.0% 1.3.2% 6	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 0.76 [0.61, 0.96] 0.42 [0.14, 1.30] 0.29 [0.12, 0.71] 0.60 [0.39, 0.92] 0.74 [0.56, 0.97] 0.94 [0.53, 1.67] 0.87 [0.48, 1.56] 0.50 [0.27, 0.95] 0.71 [0.62, 0.82] 0.33 [0.13, 0.81] 0.57 [0.33, 0.97] 0.44 [0.23, 0.83] 0.69 [0.26, 1.81] 0.50 [0.35, 0.70] 0.68 [0.60, 0.77]	Hazard Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI

Figure 5. A. Forest plots from the fixed-effect meta-analysis of the association between high ALC and OS in different subtypes of BC. B. Forest plots from the fixed-effect meta-analysis of the association between high ALC and OS by different chemotherapy regimens. HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval, ALC, absolute lymphocyte count; OS, overall survival; BC, breast cancer.

long-term outcome indicator. Risks of death in patients with ABC or MBC with high ALC appeared lower. The results of both univariate and multivariate analyses were consistent (HR = 0.57, 95% Cl: 0.51-0.64; HR = 0.68, 95% Cl: 0.60-0.77), and meta-analysis found strong associations between baseline ALC and the

prognosis of individuals with ABC or MBC. Despite such findings, it is important to note that not all of the results reached statistical significance.

Subgroup analysis was conducted to investigate the effect of BC subtypes and chemother-

Prognostic role of baseline ALC in advanced or metastatic breast cancer



Figure 6. A. Risk of bias of the included studies. B. Risk of bias summary.

apy regimens on the prognosis of patients with ABC or MBC. HER-2, a member of the epidermal growth factor receptor family, plays a crucial role in cell differentiation, proliferation, and survival. Approximately 20%-30% of BC cases exhibit HER-2 overexpression, which is associated with aggressive tumors and poor prognosis [38, 39]. Subgroup analysis revealed that high ALC significantly correlated with improved survival in patients with ABC or MBC, regardless of tumor subtype (P < 0.05). ALC serves as an indirect indicator of the tumor immune microenvironment and has potential predictive value for drug sensitivity. Chemotherapy remains an important treatment option for patients with ABC or MBC, with the selection of chemotherapy regimen requiring the consideration of multiple factors such as BC subtype, metastasis site, and prior adjuvant therapy [40]. Some chemotherapeutic drugs can induce immunogenic death of tumor cells or activate immune effector mechanisms, leading to tumor cell-specific apoptosis [41, 42]. ERI, a tubulin polymerization inhibitor, has been approved for use in patients with ABC or MBC after failure of anthracycline and taxane therapy [43, 44]. ERI enhances antitumor immune responses by reducing the expression of programmed deathdeath-ligand 1 and forkhead box P3, and by increasing the expression of cluster of differentiation 8 [45]. In this meta-analysis, ten articles examined the use of single-drug or combined ERI chemotherapy regimens. In this meta-analysis, ten articles examined the use of singledrug or combined ERI chemotherapy regimens. showing that ERI-containing regimens could significantly extend PFS, PPS, and OS in patients with ABC or MBC who had high ALC (P < 0.05). However, the ALC threshold was not completely consistent between studies. Interestingly, Cortes and Miyoshi et al. found that ERI had a more significant impact on OS than PFS [46, 47]. The hypothesis proposed in this study suggests that a high baseline ALC indicates a favorable immune microenvironment. This may increase the immune regulatory potential, strengthen the antitumor immune response triggered by chemotherapeutic drugs, and ultimately contribute to improved patient prognosis in ABC or MBC. Therefore, baseline ALC can potentially serve as an indicator to evaluate drug sensitivity before initiating chemotherapy in patients with ABC or MBC, thereby predicting their therapeutic outcome.

Limitation of this study

The current study has several limitations. First, the search source was relatively limited as all 12 studies had been conducted in Japan. Moreover, the small sample size in these studies could potentially introduce the possibility of selection or bias. Second, only baseline ALC status was assessed in the included studies. Given the dynamic nature of the immune system, further evaluation is needed to fully understand the impact of dynamic changes in ALC on prognosis, especially given the direct effects of chemotherapy on ALC. A detailed analysis of peripheral blood lymphocyte subsets may provide additional predictive values. Furthermore, variations in BC subtypes, sites of distant metastasis, chemotherapy regimens, and follow-up durations among the studies might have impacted patient survival. Consequently, some degree of heterogeneity among the studies could potentially affect the stability of the meta-analysis results.

Conclusion

In summary, the outcomes of this study indicate that baseline ALC can serve as a reliable immune marker that can be monitored without additional invasive procedures. Baseline ALC can reflect the immune status and predict the prognosis of individuals with ABC or MBC. Therefore, baseline ALC monitoring should be an important part of clinical practices when evaluating the prognosis of individuals with ABC or MBC. These studies are retrospective and further larger prospective studies are required to verify the findings of this study.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Address correspondence to: Ziran Zhang, Department of Breast Diseases, Jiaxing Maternity and Child Health Care Hospital, Affiliated Women and Children's Hospital of Jiaxing University, 2468 Central East Road, Jiaxing 314000, Zhejiang, P. R. China. Tel: +86-198-44298722; ORCID: 0000-0002-7835-8788; E-mail: zi-ranzhang@zjxu.edu.cn

References

- [1] Pondé NF, Zardavas D and Piccart M. Progress in adjuvant systemic therapy for breast cancer. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 2019; 16: 27-44.
- [2] Wilkinson L and Gathani T. Understanding breast cancer as a global health concern. Br J Radiol 2022; 95: 20211033.
- [3] Cardoso F, Paluch-Shimon S, Senkus E, Curigliano G, Aapro MS, André F, Barrios CH, Bergh J, Bhattacharyya GS, Biganzoli L, Boyle F, Cardoso MJ, Carey LA, Cortés J, El Saghir NS, Elzayat M, Eniu A, Fallowfield L, Francis PA, Gelmon K, Gligorov J, Haidinger R, Harbeck N, Hu X, Kaufman B, Kaur R, Kiely BE, Kim SB, Lin NU, Mertz SA, Neciosup S, Offersen BV, Ohno S, Pagani O, Prat A, Penault-Llorca F, Rugo HS, Sledge GW, Thomssen C, Vorobiof DA, Wiseman T, Xu B, Norton L, Costa A and Winer EP. 5th ESO-ESMO international consensus guidelines for advanced breast cancer (ABC 5). Ann Oncol 2020; 31: 1623-1649.
- [4] Tsuji W, Teramukai S, Ueno M, Toi M and Inamoto T. Prognostic factors for survival after first recurrence in breast cancer: a retrospective analysis of 252 recurrent cases at a single institution. Breast Cancer 2014; 21: 86-95.
- [5] Eng LG, Dawood S, Sopik V, Haaland B, Tan PS, Bhoo-Pathy N, Warner E, Iqbal J, Narod SA and Dent R. Ten-year survival in women with primary stage IV breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2016; 160: 145-152.
- [6] Largillier R, Ferrero JM, Doyen J, Barriere J, Namer M, Mari V, Courdi A, Hannoun-Levi JM, Ettore F, Birtwisle-Peyrottes I, Balu-Maestro C, Marcy PY, Raoust I, Lallement M and Chamorey E. Prognostic factors in 1,038 women with

metastatic breast cancer. Ann Oncol 2008;19: 2012-2019.

- [7] Grivennikov SI, Greten FR and Karin M. Immunity, inflammation, and cancer. Cell 2010; 140: 883-899.
- [8] Mantovani A, Allavena P, Sica A and Balkwill F. Cancer-related inflammation. Nature 2008; 454: 436-444.
- [9] Tumeh PC, Harview CL, Yearley JH, Shintaku IP, Taylor EJ, Robert L, Chmielowski B, Spasic M, Henry G, Ciobanu V, West AN, Carmona M, Kivork C, Seja E, Cherry G, Gutierrez AJ, Grogan TR, Mateus C, Tomasic G, Glaspy JA, Emerson RO, Robins H, Pierce RH, Elashoff DA, Robert C and Ribas A. PD-1 blockade induces responses by inhibiting adaptive immune resistance. Nature 2014; 515: 568-571.
- [10] Araki K, Ito Y, Fukada I, Kobayashi K, Miyagawa Y, Imamura M, Kira A, Takatsuka Y, Egawa C, Suwa H, Ohno S and Miyoshi Y. Predictive impact of absolute lymphocyte counts for progression-free survival in human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-positive advanced breast cancer treated with pertuzumab and trastuzumab plus eribulin or nab-paclitaxel. BMC Cancer 2018; 18: 982.
- [11] Hong J, Chen X, Gao W, Zhu S, Wu J, Huang O, He J, Zhu L, Chen W, Li Y, Fei X, Lin L and Shen K. A high absolute lymphocyte count predicts a poor prognosis in HER-2- positive breast cancer patients treated with trastuzumab. Cancer Manag Res 2019; 11: 3371-3379.
- [12] Jimbo H, Horimoto Y, Ishizuka Y, Nogami N, Shikanai A, Saito M and Watanabe J. Absolute lymphocyte count decreases with disease progression and is a potential prognostic marker for metastatic breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2022; 196: 291-298.
- [13] Andre F, Dieci MV, Dubsky P, Sotiriou C, Curigliano G, Denkert C and Loi S. Molecular pathways: involvement of immune pathways in the therapeutic response and outcome in breast cancer. Clin Cancer Res 2013; 19: 28-33.
- [14] Ownby HE, Roi LD, Isenberg RR and Brennan MJ. Peripheral lymphocyte and eosinophil counts as indicators of prognosis in primary breast cancer. Cancer 1983; 52: 126-130.
- [15] van der Leun AM, Thommen DS and Schumacher TN. CD8(+) T cell states in human cancer: insights from single-cell analysis. Nat Rev Cancer 2020; 20: 218-232.
- [16] Gu Y, Jin Y, Ding J, Yujie W, Shi Q, Qu X, Zhao S, Li J and Lijuan C. Low absolute CD4(+) T cell counts in peripheral blood predict poor prognosis in patients with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma. Leuk Lymphoma 2020; 61: 1869-1876.
- [17] Slaney CY, Kershaw MH and Darcy PK. Trafficking of T cells into tumors. Cancer Res 2014; 74: 7168-7174.

- [18] Schreiber RD, Old LJ and Smyth MJ. Cancer immunoediting: integrating immunity's roles in cancer suppression and promotion. Science 2011; 331: 1565-1570.
- [19] Savas P, Salgado R, Denkert C, Sotiriou C, Darcy PK, Smyth MJ and Loi S. Clinical relevance of host immunity in breast cancer: from TILs to the clinic. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 2016; 13: 228-241.
- [20] Postow MA, Chasalow SD, Kuk D, Panageas KS, Cheng ML, Yuan J and Wolchok JD. Absolute lymphocyte count as a prognostic biomarker for overall survival in patients with advanced melanoma treated with ipilimumab. Melanoma Res 2020; 30: 71-75.
- [21] Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Chandler J, Welch VA, Higgins JP and Thomas J. Updated guidance for trusted systematic reviews: a new edition of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2019; 10: ED000142.
- [22] Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D, Moher D, Becker BJ, Sipe TA and Thacker SB. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology (MOOSE) group. JAMA 2000; 283: 2008-2012.
- [23] Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Ghersi D, Burdett S and Sydes MR. Practical methods for incorporating summary time-to-event data into meta-analysis. Trials 2007; 8: 16.
- [24] Wells G. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for Assessing the Quality of Non-Randomised Studies in Meta-Analyses. Symposium on Systematic Reviews: Beyond the Basics; 2014; 2014.
- [25] Higgins JP and Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med 2002; 21: 1539-1558.
- [26] Begg CB and Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. Biometrics 1994; 50: 1088-1101.
- [27] Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M and Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ 1997; 315: 629-634.
- [28] Koyama Y, Kawai S, Uenaka N, Okazaki M, Asaoka M, Teraoka S, Ueda AI, Miyahara K, Kawate T, Kaise H, Yamada K and Ishikawa T. Absolute lymphocyte count, platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio, and overall survival in eribulin-treated HER2negative metastatic breast cancer patients. Cancer Diagn Progn 2021; 1: 435-441.
- [29] Terry S, Savagner P, Ortiz-Cuaran S, Mahjoubi L, Saintigny P, Thiery JP and Chouaib S. New insights into the role of EMT in tumor immune escape. Mol Oncol 2017; 11: 824-846.
- [30] Ray-Coquard I, Cropet C, Van Glabbeke M, Sebban C, Le Cesne A, Judson I, Tredan O, Verweij

J, Biron P, Labidi I, Guastalla JP, Bachelot T, Perol D, Chabaud S, Hogendoorn PC, Cassier P, Dufresne A and Blay JY; European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Soft Tissue and Bone Sarcoma Group. Lymphopenia as a prognostic factor for overall survival in advanced carcinomas, sarcomas, and lymphomas. Cancer Res 2009; 69: 5383-5391.

- [31] Cézé N, Thibault G, Goujon G, Viguier J, Watier H, Dorval E and Lecomte T. Pre-treatment lymphopenia as a prognostic biomarker in colorectal cancer patients receiving chemotherapy. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol 2011; 68: 1305-1313.
- [32] Feng JF, Liu JS and Huang Y. Lymphopenia predicts poor prognosis in patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. Medicine (Baltimore) 2014; 93: e257.
- [33] Goto W, Kashiwagi S, Takada K, Asano Y, Morisaki T, Shibutani M, Tanaka H, Hirakawa K and Ohira M. Utility of follow-up with absolute lymphocyte count in patients undergoing eribulin treatment for early detection of progressive advanced or metastatic breast cancer. Anticancer Res 2022; 42: 939-946.
- [34] Nakamoto S, Ikeda M, Kubo S, Yamamoto M, Yamashita T and Notsu A. Systemic immunity markers associated with lymphocytes predict the survival benefit from paclitaxel plus bevacizumab in HER2 negative advanced breast cancer. Sci Rep 2021; 11: 6328.
- [35] Sata A, Fukui R, Miyagawa Y, Bun A, Ozawa H, Fujimoto Y, Higuchi T, Imamura M and Miyoshi Y. C-reactive protein and absolute lymphocyte count can predict overall survival of patients treated with eribulin. Anticancer Res 2020; 40: 4147-4156.
- [36] Sawa A, Bando H, Kamohara R, Takeuchi N, Terasaki A, Okazaki M, Iguchi-Manaka A and Hara H. Absolute lymphocyte count as an independent prognostic factor in metastatic breast cancer: a retrospective study. Oncology 2022; 100: 591-601.
- [37] Templeton AJ, McNamara MG, Šeruga B, Vera-Badillo FE, Aneja P, Ocaña A, Leibowitz-Amit R, Sonpavde G, Knox JJ, Tran B, Tannock IF and Amir E. Prognostic role of neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio in solid tumors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Natl Cancer Inst 2014; 106: dju124.
- [38] Luque-Cabal M, García-Teijido P, Fernández-Pérez Y, Sánchez-Lorenzo L and Palacio-Vázquez I. Mechanisms behind the resistance to trastuzumab in HER2-amplified breast cancer and strategies to overcome it. Clin Med Insights Oncol 2016; 10 Suppl 1: 21-30.
- [39] Pondé N, Brandão M, El-Hachem G, Werbrouck E and Piccart M. Treatment of advanced HER2positive breast cancer: 2018 and beyond. Cancer Treat Rev 2018; 67: 10-20.

- [40] Gradishar WJ, Anderson BO, Abraham J, Aft R, Agnese D, Allison KH, Blair SL, Burstein HJ, Dang C, Elias AD, Giordano SH, Goetz MP, Goldstein LJ, Isakoff SJ, Krishnamurthy J, Lyons J, Marcom PK, Matro J, Mayer IA, Moran MS, Mortimer J, O'Regan RM, Patel SA, Pierce LJ, Rugo HS, Sitapati A, Smith KL, Smith ML, Soliman H, Stringer-Reasor EM, Telli ML, Ward JH, Young JS, Burns JL and Kumar R. Breast cancer, version 3.2020, NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 2020; 18: 452-478.
- [41] Galluzzi L, Buqué A, Kepp O, Zitvogel L and Kroemer G. Immunogenic cell death in cancer and infectious disease. Nat Rev Immunol 2017; 17: 97-111.
- [42] Galluzzi L, Senovilla L, Zitvogel L and Kroemer G. The secret ally: immunostimulation by anticancer drugs. Nat Rev Drug Discov 2012; 11: 215-233.
- [43] Cardoso F, Senkus E, Costa A, Papadopoulos E, Aapro M, André F, Harbeck N, Aguilar Lopez B, Barrios CH, Bergh J, Biganzoli L, Boers-Doets CB, Cardoso MJ, Carey LA, Cortés J, Curigliano G, Diéras V, El Saghir NS, Eniu A, Fallowfield L, Francis PA, Gelmon K, Johnston SRD, Kaufman B, Koppikar S, Krop IE, Mayer M, Nakigudde G, Offersen BV, Ohno S, Pagani O, Paluch-Shimon S, Penault-Llorca F, Prat A, Rugo HS, Sledge GW, Spence D, Thomssen C, Vorobiof DA, Xu B, Norton L and Winer EP. 4th ESO-ESMO international consensus guidelines for advanced breast cancer (ABC 4)†. Ann Oncol 2018; 29: 1634-1657.
- [44] Watanabe J, Saito M, Horimoto Y and Nakamoto S. A maintained absolute lymphocyte count predicts the overall survival benefit from eribulin therapy, including eribulin re-administration, in HER2-negative advanced breast cancer patients: a single-institutional experience. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2020; 181: 211-220.
- [45] Goto W, Kashiwagi S, Asano Y, Takada K, Morisaki T, Fujita H, Takashima T, Ohsawa M, Hirakawa K and Ohira M. Eribulin promotes antitumor immune responses in patients with locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer. Anticancer Res 2018; 38: 2929-2938.
- [46] Cortes J, O'Shaughnessy J, Loesch D, Blum JL, Vahdat LT, Petrakova K, Chollet P, Manikas A, Diéras V, Delozier T, Vladimirov V, Cardoso F, Koh H, Bougnoux P, Dutcus CE, Seegobin S, Mir D, Meneses N, Wanders J and Twelves C; EMBRACE (Eisai Metastatic Breast Cancer Study Assessing Physician's Choice Versus E7389) investigators. Eribulin monotherapy versus treatment of physician's choice in patients with metastatic breast cancer (EM-BRACE): a phase 3 open-label randomised study. Lancet 2011; 377: 914-923.

- [47] Miyoshi Y, Yoshimura Y, Saito K, Muramoto K, Sugawara M, Alexis K, Nomoto K, Nakamura S, Saeki T, Watanabe J, Perez-Garcia JM and Cortes J. High absolute lymphocyte counts are associated with longer overall survival in patients with metastatic breast cancer treated with eribulin-but not with treatment of physician's choice-in the EMBRACE study. Breast Cancer 2020; 27: 706-715.
- [48] Che YQ, Zhang Y, Wang D, Liu HY, Shen D and Luo Y. Baseline lymphopenia: a predictor of poor outcomes in HER2 positive metastatic breast cancer treated with trastuzumab. Drug Des Devel Ther 2019; 13: 3727-3734.
- [49] Emile G, Penager S, Levy C, Johnson A, Allouache D, Lequesne J, Hrab I, Segura C, Morel A, Gunzer K, Faveyrial A, Cherifi F and Da Silva A. Baseline lymphopenia as prognostic factor in patients with metastatic breast cancer treated with palbociclib. Oncol Lett 2022; 23: 25.
- [50] Miyagawa Y, Yanai A, Yanagawa T, Inatome J, Egawa C, Nishimukai A, Takamoto K, Morimoto T, Kikawa Y, Suwa H, Taji T, Yamaguchi A, Okada Y, Sata A, Fukui R, Bun A, Ozawa H, Higuchi T, Fujimoto Y, Imamura M and Miyoshi Y. Baseline neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio and c-reactive protein predict efficacy of treatment with bevacizumab plus paclitaxel for locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer. Oncotarget 2020; 11: 86-98.

- [51] Morisaki T, Kashiwagi S, Asano Y, Goto W, Takada K, Ishihara S, Shibutani M, Tanaka H, Hirakawa K and Ohira M. Prediction of survival after eribulin chemotherapy for breast cancer by absolute lymphocyte counts and progression types. World J Surg Oncol 2021; 19: 324.
- [52] Nakamoto S, Ikeda M, Kubo S, Yamamoto M and Yamashita T. Dynamic changes in absolute lymphocyte counts during eribulin therapy are associated with survival benefit. Anticancer Res 2021; 41: 3109-3119.
- [53] Takahashi M, Inoue K, Mukai H, Yamanaka T, Egawa C, Miyoshi Y, Sakata Y, Muramoto K, Ikezawa H, Matsuoka T and Tsurutani J. Indices of peripheral leukocytes predict longer overall survival in breast cancer patients on eribulin in Japan. Breast Cancer 2021; 28: 945-955.
- [54] Ueno A, Maeda R, Kin T, Ito M, Kawasaki K and Ohtani S. Utility of the absolute lymphocyte count and neutrophil/lymphocyte ratio for predicting survival in patients with metastatic breast cancer on eribulin: a real-world observational study. Chemotherapy 2019; 64: 259-269.