

89452\_Auto\_Edited.docx

**Name of Journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 89452

**Manuscript Type:** META-ANALYSIS

**Hepatic arterial infusion chemotherapy plus angiogenesis inhibitors and PD-1/PD-L1 blockers for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma in real-world practice and meta-analysis**

TRIPLE therapy for HCC.

Yu-Zhe Cao, Guang-Lei Zheng, Tian-Qi Zhang, Hong-Yan Shao, Jia-Yu Pan, Zi-Lin Huang, Meng-Xuan Zuo

## **Abstract**

### **BACKGROUND**

#### **Background**

Hepatic arterial infusion chemotherapy (HAIC) has been proven to be an ideal choice for treating unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma (uHCC). HAIC-based treatment showed great potential for treating uHCC. However, large-scale studies on HAIC-based treatments and meta-analyses of first-line treatments for uHCC are lacking.

#### **AIM**

To investigate better first-line treatment options for uHCC and to assess the safety and efficacy of HAIC combined with angiogenesis inhibitors, programmed cell death of protein 1 (PD-1) and its ligand (PD-L1) blockers (triple therapy) under real-world conditions.

### **METHODS**

To investigate better first-line treatment options for uHCC and to assess the safety and efficacy of HAIC combined with angiogenesis inhibitors, programmed cell death of protein 1 (PD-1) and its ligand (PD-L1) blockers (triple therapy) under real-world conditions.

### **RESULTS**

A total of 13 randomized controlled trials were included. HAIC alone and in combination with sorafenib were found to be effective treatments (P scores for ORs: HAIC, 0.95; for HRs: HAIC + sorafenib, 0.04). After PSM, 176 HCC patients were included in the analysis. The triple therapy group ( $n = 88$ ) had a longer median overall survival than the AIPB group ( $n = 88$ ) (31.6 vs. 14.6 months,  $P < 0.001$ ) and a greater incidence of adverse events (94.3% vs. 75.4%,  $P < 0.001$ ).

### **CONCLUSION**

A total of 13 randomized controlled trials were included. HAIC alone and in combination with sorafenib were found to be effective treatments (P scores for ORs: HAIC, 0.95; for HRs: HAIC + sorafenib, 0.04). After PSM, 176 HCC patients were included in the analysis. The triple therapy group ( $n = 88$ ) had a longer median overall survival than the AIPB group ( $n = 88$ ) (31.6 vs. 14.6 months,  $P < 0.001$ ) and a greater incidence of adverse events (94.3% vs. 75.4%,  $P < 0.001$ ).

**Key Words:** unresectable <sup>4</sup>hepatocellular carcinoma; hepatic arterial infusion chemotherapy; angiogenesis inhibitors, programmed cell death protein 1, programmed death ligand 1.

Cao YZ, Zheng GL, Zhang TQ, Shao HY, Pan JY, Huang ZL, Zuo MX. Hepatic arterial infusion chemotherapy plus angiogenesis inhibitors and PD-1/PD-L1 blockers for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma in real-world practice and meta-analysis. *World J Gastroenterol* 2023; In press

**Core Tip:** The network meta-analysis showed the treatment based on hepatic arterial infusion chemotherapy (HAIC) had the best efficacy on unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma (uHCC). The retrospective, relatively large-scale study suggested HAIC combined with angiogenesis inhibitors and PD-1/PD-L1 blockers could improve the uHCC patients' prognosis. After propensity score matching, it demonstrated that triple therapy was able to prolong the uHCC patients' survival than angiogenesis inhibitors and PD-1/PD-L1 blockers.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Primary liver cancer is a malignant tumor of the digestive system that is common worldwide. China has a particularly high incidence of liver cancer, with approximately 410,000 new cases and 391,000 deaths annually; liver cancer is the second largest cause of cancer-related death in the country (1). Among primary liver cancers, hepatocellular

carcinoma (HCC) is the main pathological type. In the subclinical phase, patients tend to be asymptomatic. Therefore, at the time of diagnosis, most patients have already reached advanced stages of the disease. Therefore, fewer than 30% of patients are candidates for surgical resection (2, 3).

According to several clinical trials, sorafenib and lenvatinib have been recommended by multiple authoritative guidelines as first-line treatment options for advanced HCC for some time (4-6). The results of the IMbrave150 trial ushered in a new era in HCC therapy, in which angiogenesis inhibitors were combined with programmed cell death protein 1/programmed cell death ligand 1 (PD-1/PD-L1) blockees (AIPB), which is now becoming the new standard first-line therapy (7). Researchers have conducted several clinical studies on various immune-related drugs, angiogenesis inhibitors, and various combination regimens for unresectable HCC (uHCC). The FOHAIC study also revealed that hepatic arterial perfusion chemotherapy (HAIC) using the FOLFOX regimen was more effective than sorafenib in patients with uHCC (8). Several studies have suggested that triple therapy has the potential to further improve the prognosis in patients with uHCC (9-12). As the results of multiple clinical studies have been published, several questions remain surrounding this type of therapy, such as which treatment approach has the best therapeutic effect on uHCC? How effective is triple therapy when used in large-scale real-world clinical applications?

In this study, we attempted to identify the optimal treatment for uHCC based on data from phase III randomized controlled trials (RCTs) through a network meta-analysis. We also investigated the safety and efficacy of triple therapy in patients with HCC from a Chinese population under real-world conditions. We then performed propensity score matching (PSM) to compare triple therapy to AIPB, which has been recommended as a first-line treatment for uHCC by some guidelines (13, 14). This study also confirmed the safety of triple therapy under real-world conditions.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **1. Literature search, data extraction, and network meta-analysis**

We performed an extensive literature search of the PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane Library databases for RCTs published from January 1, 2018, to January 1, 2020. The Supplementary Document details the search strategy and inclusion criteria. Two authors independently screened the trials for eligibility and extracted information from each one. The included RCTs were then assessed for risk of bias using the Cochrane risk of bias 2 tool, which showed low risk levels for all the included studies (Supplemental Figure S1).

## **2. Triple therapy real-world study**

Patients who were treated with triple therapy or AIPB as a first-line treatment for advanced HCC between January 2018 and April 2023 at the Department of Minimally Invasive Interventional Therapy, Sun Yat-sen University Cancer Center in Guangzhou, China, were screened for eligibility. HCC was diagnosed histologically or radiologically in accordance with the latest international guidelines(15). The inclusion criteria were as follows: 1) stage B (not applicable for surgery or progressed on locoregional therapy) or stage C HCC according to the Barcelona Clinic Liver Cancer (BCLC) staging system; 2) Child-Pugh score of A-C; 3) Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status (PS) of 0-2; 4) age  $\geq 18$  years; and 5) at least one available follow-up data point. The exclusion criteria were as follows: 1) history of receiving any systemic chemotherapy, angiogenesis inhibitors, or immunotherapy; 2) lack of medical imaging data; and 3) history of a second primary malignant tumor. The details are shown in the Supplementary Materials. This study was reviewed and approved by the Sun Yat-sen University Cancer Center Ethics Committee. Informed consent was waived due to the retrospective nature of the analysis.

### **2.1 Treatment regimens**

Small-molecule tyrosine kinase inhibitors such as sorafenib, a type of angiogenesis inhibitor, were administered orally, and the doses were determined based on the manufacturers' instructions. Bevacizumab, another type of angiogenesis inhibitor, was administered intravenously at a dose of 15 mg/kg body weight every 3 wk. Atezolizumab, a type of PD-L1 blocker, was administered intravenously at a dose of

1,200 mg every 3 wk. PD-1 blockers, including pembrolizumab, camrelizumab, tislelizumab, and sintilimab, were administered intravenously at 200 mg every 3 wk. Toripalimab, another PD-1 blocker, was injected through an intravenous drip of 240 mg every 3 wk following the instructions. The HAIC regimen was based on FOLFOX and consisted of 85 mg/m<sup>2</sup> oxaliplatin, 200 mg/m<sup>2</sup> calcium folinate, and 2.5 g/m<sup>2</sup> 5-fluorouracil every 3 wk. HAIC was performed under the guidance of digital subtraction angiography (DSA) by interventional radiologists. The celiac axis, superior mesenteric artery, inferior phrenic artery and right renal artery were selectively catheterized for angiography. If angiography revealed that the HCC blood supply originated from different vessels, the main feeding artery was reserved for superselective catheterization, and an indwelling microcatheter was inserted into the HAIC while the other feeding vessels were embolized. During the study period, dose modifications and treatment interruptions were sometimes initiated according to drug-related toxicity grades, as recommended relative to the physiological condition of each patient. HAIC was performed for 4–6 rounds in the absence of disease progression. Patients received angiogenesis inhibitors and PD-1/PD-L1 blockers during and after HAIC treatment to consolidate the therapeutic effects in the long-term.

## **2.2. Assessment of clinical outcomes**

The patients involved in the study were followed up every 6–12 wk to assess treatment response. Radiological response was assessed according to the modified Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (mRECIST) criteria based on liver dynamic computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) data. The primary endpoint that was assessed was overall survival (OS), which was defined as the time from the start date of systemic chemotherapy or HAIC to death. PFS (the time from the start date of systemic chemotherapy or HAIC to the date of disease progression or death from any cause). The secondary endpoints that were determined included progression-free survival (PFS) and 6-, 12- and 24-month OS rates; objective response rate (ORR); and adverse events (AEs). The ORR was defined as the proportion of patients who achieved a complete response (CR) or partial response (PR), and the

disease control rate (DCR) was defined as the proportion of patients who achieved CR, PR, or stable disease (SD). Adverse events during treatment were identified using patient-reported symptom data, examination-based findings, and clinical laboratory test results. The National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE), version 5.0, was used to classify adverse events from any cause according to type and severity.

### 3. Statistical analysis

Unstratified hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and odds ratios (ORs) with the number of responders and sample sizes that compared the different treatment regimens for treating uHCC were retrieved and synthesized to determine the overall treatment effects. Potential heterogeneity among the studies was assessed using  $I^2$  statistics. Random effects models were used to calculate pooled ORR or HR in the presence of significant heterogeneity ( $I^2 > 50\%$ ); otherwise, the fixed effects model was used.

To account for the different distributions of covariates between the two groups, we performed PSM. Then, 1:1 matching was performed using nearest-neighbor matching based on the PS data. In this study, the caliper of the match was 0.03. OS, PFS and survival rates were calculated using the Kaplan–Meier method and were compared between the groups using the log-rank test. Cox regression was used to explore the potential risk factors associated with survival time. All real-world clinical data are expressed as the mean  $\pm$  standard deviation, median (range), or number (%), as appropriate. Continuous variables were compared using Student's t test (or the Mann–Whitney U test, if appropriate), and categorical variables were compared using the chi-square test (or Fisher's exact test, if appropriate).

Statistical analyses were conducted using R v4.2.2 (R Core Team, Vienna, Austria). <https://www.R-project.org/>). Two-sided P values  $< 0.05$  were considered to indicate statistical significance.

## RESULTS



## 1. Network meta-analysis on first-line treatment of uHCC

### 1.1 Literature Search and Screening Results

Our initial literature search resulted 1,735 articles. After deleting duplicate publications, 1,079 articles remained. After screening the titles and abstracts, 68 articles were excluded. Our full-text review resulted in the removal of an additional seven articles. Ultimately, 13 studies involving 7,817 patients were included in this network meta-analysis (6, 8, 16-25). The literature selection process is described in Supplemental Figure S2, and the characteristics of the included patient population are shown in Supplemental Table S1.

### 1.2. Results of network-meta analysis

ORRs per RECIST1.1 and HRs were reported in all 13 studies and included 15 different interventions. There was no significant heterogeneity between the studies (ORR:  $I^2 = 5\%$ ; HR:  $I^2 = 7\%$ ), so the fixed-effects model was adopted. The P scores for ORR showed that the best ORR outcomes were obtained with HAIC compared to sorafenib (OR: 35.66; 95%CI: 9.94–249.91;  $P = 0.952$ , Table 1, Supplemental Figure S3, Supplemental Table S2). The P scores for HRs showed that the lowest hazard ratios (HRs) were obtained with HAIC plus sorafenib compared to those with sorafenib alone (hazard ratio (HR): 0.36; 95%CI: 0.25–0.52;  $P = 0.891$ ; Table 1, Supplemental Figure S4, Supplemental Table S3).

## 2. Retrospective study

### 2.1 Baseline characteristics of the patients

A total of 442 patients with uHCC were enrolled in the study; 324 patients underwent triple therapy, and 118 patients underwent AIPB. The median follow-up times were 14.6 months and  $16.8 \pm 10.3$  months in the triple therapy group and 8.25 months and  $11.7 \pm 10.2$  months in the AIPB group. The algorithm used for case enrollment is shown in Supplemental Figure S5. The average number of patients who received  $5.08 \pm 1.61$  rounds of HAIC in the triple therapy group. Based on our multivariable logistic regression model, baseline characteristics, including age, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status (ECOG PS), Child-Pugh class, maximum tumor diameter,

AFP level, tumor number, and vascular invasion and extrahepatic metastasis conditions, which were significantly different between the groups, were matched (Table 2). After PSM, 88 patients in the triple therapy group were matched to 88 patients in the AIPB group (Table 2). The median age in both groups was 55.0 years, and all the patients were evaluated as having an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) PS ranging from 0-1. Notably, some patients in the AIPB group were diagnosed at an earlier stage. In other words, the proportion of BCLC C patients in the AIPB cohort was lower. (87.5% vs. 92%)

## **2.2 Efficacy of different treatments**

The ORR was 62.9% ( $n = 204$ ) in the triple group and 29.7% ( $n = 35$ ) in the AIPB group in the primary database. After PSM, the ORR of the triple therapy group was still greater (55.7% vs. 35.2%,  $P = 0.032$ ) (Supplemental Table S5). CR was observed in 21 patients prior to PSM and in 6 patients following PSM in the triple therapy group (an example can be seen in Figure 1). According to the Kaplan–Meier analysis, the primary data showed longer median PFS (11.1 months vs. 6.0 months,  $P < 0.001$ ) and median OS (not reached vs. 11.8 months,  $P < 0.001$ ) with triple therapy. After PSM, the median PFSs were estimated to be 12.5 months and 7.8 months ( $P = 0.036$ ), and the median OSs were 31.6 months and 14.6 months (HR=2.42, 95%CI=1.49-3.92,  $P < 0.001$ ) in the triple therapy group and AIPB group, respectively (Figure 2). The 6-month, 12-month, and 24-month survival rates of the patients receiving triple therapy were 96.5%, 82.2% and 57.0%, respectively, while they were 73.5%, 54.3% and 37.7%, respectively, in the AIPB group.

Univariate analysis revealed that four factors had effects on OS in the triple therapy group: larger tumor diameter, multiple foci, extrahepatic metastasis, Child–Pugh grade B and number of rounds of HAIC (Figure 3A). Cox multivariate regression analysis revealed that Child–Pugh grade B (HR: 1.74,  $P < 0.001$ ; Figure 3B) and multiple foci (HR: 2.17,  $P < 0.001$ ; Figure 3B) were risk factors for poor long-term survival, and  $> 4$  rounds of HAIC was a protective factor for survival (HR: 0.43,  $P < 0.001$ ; Figure 3B). Survival analysis also revealed that patients who received  $> 4$  rounds of HAIC (not

reached vs. 18.2 months;  $P < 0.001$ ; Supplemental Figure S6A) or who were diagnosed with a single disease focus (not reached vs. 24.6 months;  $P < 0.001$ ; Supplemental Figure S6B) had longer OS. Subgroup analysis of OS using forest plots revealed that triple therapy was more effective in most patients, especially for males, Child–Pugh A patients, patients aged  $< 60$  years, and patients diagnosed with multiple tumors or extrahepatic metastasis (Figure 3C).

### 2.3 Safety of different treatments

After After PSM, the incidence of adverse events (AEs) in the triple therapy group was greater than that in the AIPB group (94.3% vs. 75.4%,  $P < 0.001$ ). Although more Grade 3–4 AEs occurred in the triple therapy group, there was no significant difference in the incidence of Grade 3–4 AEs (56.8% vs. 43.2%,  $P = 0.097$ ), and there were no Grade 5 AEs (Table 3). The most common AE was abdominal pain in the triple therapy group, for which the incidence was 79.8% (259/324). When they started HAIC treatment, many patients had varying degrees of abdominal pain during the infusion of oxaliplatin. This was typically managed by slowing the speed of infusion or temporarily stopping it. In some cases of particularly severe and acute abdominal pain, anisodamine or lidocaine was administered through intravenous injection or an arterial catheter to relieve the pain. Two patients developed hepatic comas following HAIC but fully recovered during treatment. In addition, liver dysfunction, including increases in aminotransferases and/or bilirubin, was relatively common in both groups, not only because of drug-related side effects but also because of their own background of liver cirrhosis.

## DISCUSSION

Although the first-line treatment recommended by authoritative clinical guidelines for uHCC is AIPB, such as atezolizumab plus bevacizumab, these treatments have a number of limitations in clinical applications. The default anti-inflammatory or immunotolerant immune status of the liver may interfere with the drugs that act on it (26), which may lead to a relatively low ORR. The main cause of death among patients

with uHCC is liver tumor progression (27, 28). Although there are a number of different protocols for administering AIPB, the median patient survival time using this approach has remained less than 24 months (17, 19, 20, 29). In addition, the IMbrave150 studies suggested that the effects of AIPB treatment are likely to be severely diminished if patients are diagnosed with high-risk factors, such as tumor invasion of the main trunk of the portal vein (Vp4), bile duct invasion, or/ or tumor occupancy of  $\geq 50\%$  of the liver (17, 30).

Many uHCC patients in some areas, especially in China, are diagnosed with vascular invasion or/ or a high tumor burden. The most effective way to prolong survival is to control liver lesions. In terms of local hepatic treatment for uHCC, the most popular choice for most physicians is transcatheter arterial chemoembolization (TACE). Nonetheless, if the tumor burden is high, there is a very high probability of “TACE failure/refractoriness” (31-33). If patients are diagnosed with reduced or absent portal vein blood supplies caused by portal vein tumor thrombi or severe cirrhosis, the use of TACE will be limited. Several studies have revealed that HAIC is more effective than TACE for large HCCs (34). The FOHAIC study suggested that FOLFOX-HAIC had a significant effect on patients with uHCC and that HAIC could be used as an additional local hepatic treatment for uHCC (8). According to our meta-analysis, HAIC plus sorafenib or HAIC alone was able to prolong the survival time of patients with uHCC more than AIPB regimens. Unfortunately, there is a scarcity of prospective or retrospective studies with large sample sizes on triple therapy.

Our retrospective data revealed that triple therapy was effective and safe. The ORR, PFS, and OS of patients receiving triple therapy (ORR: 33.2% per mRECIST; PFS: 6.9 months; OS: 19.2 months) outperformed those of patients receiving most AIPB regimens. For example, this was true for atezolizumab plus bevacizumab (ORR: 33.2% per mRECIST; PFS: 6.9 months; OS: 19.2 months) in the IMbrave150 trial; pembrolizumab plus lenvatinib (ORR: 40.8% per mRECIST; PFS: 8.2 months; OS: 21.2 months) in the LEAP002 trial; and camrelizumab plus rivoceranib (ORR: 33.1% per mRECIST; PFS: 5.6 months; OS: 22.1 months) in the CARES 310 study (7, 17, 19, 29). The

survival benefit observed in this study may be due to the synergistic antitumor effects of these chemical agents. Transarterial chemotherapy can induce immunogenic cell death by releasing tumor-related antigens and supporting the evolution of tumor-specific CD8+ T cells, which may synergize with angiogenesis inhibitors to enhance the effect of PD-1/PD-L1 blockers (35-37). Increased concentrations of drugs in the liver can cause liver lesions to shrink directly and slow the deterioration of liver function caused by disease progression. According to our survival analysis, the patients in the AIPB subgroup had shorter survival times than those in the other trials on AIPB regimens, likely due to their poor baseline conditions prior to treatment. More than half of the patients ( $n = 58$ ) in the AIBP group were diagnosed with major vein tumor thrombus, and the mean maximum tumor diameter was more than 9 cm, suggesting that the patients in this group had high tumor burdens. The mOS of similar patients in the IMbrave150 study was only 7.8 months, which is consistent with the results of our study (30).

We also attempted to identify which factors could influence the effect of triple therapy and found that  $> 4$  rounds of HAIC were a protective factor. Four rounds of HAIC represent a regimen similar to the median number of HAIC rounds reported in several other studies (8, 38-40). The number of HAIC rounds performed was strongly affected by each patient's response to triple therapy because if tumors progress after the first few HAIC cycles, the HAIC cycles will be discontinued. Multiple liver lesions have also been recognized as risk factors because the presence of multiple lesions often implies the presence of multiple feeding vessels. Therefore, even if attempts are made to embolize other arteries until there is only a single blood supply, there is a high probability that some small arteries may be missed. To ensure that all lesions can be treated by HAIC, a microcatheter should be placed in a larger blood vessel branch, which implies that more normal liver tissue is likely to be damaged by the administered drugs, potentially harming liver function.

Overall, the incidence of adverse reactions to triple therapy was greater than that reported in the AIPB group. The combination of HAIC and systematic treatments was

able to increase the incidence of AEs; another reasonable explanation is that most AIBP patients were treated and followed up as outpatients so that some AEs, especially some slight AEs, were ignored. Notably, abnormal liver function was the common AE in the triple therapy group. However, unlike many other local treatments, the effects of HAIC on liver function appear to be largely short-term, with few apparent adverse effects on long-term survival. However, we believe that the limitation of triple therapy in the Child–Pugh B population with poor hepatic functional reserve may result from irreversible liver injury secondary to chemotherapy. Another common AE, thrombocytopenia, is caused not only by myelosuppression due to chemotherapy but also by hypersplenism secondary to cirrhosis. A substantial proportion of the patients recovered from thrombocytopenia following splenic embolization.

A substantial amount of information was lost due to the limitations of this retrospective study. Our sample included only patients from China, so the study was inevitably affected by some degree of sampling bias. It remains unclear exactly which biomarkers can be used to judge patients' prognoses. Studies at the cellular or molecular level could not be carried out due to a lack of tumor biopsy samples. To prove the efficacy and safety of triple therapy, additional large-scale prospective RCTs on this topic are warranted.

## **CONCLUSION**

This meta-analysis suggested that HAIC-based treatment regimens were able to effectively improve the prognosis in patients with uHCC. Our findings confirmed that even though the triple therapy protocol increased the incidence and severity of AEs, it yielded a higher ORR and longer PFS and OS than AIBP.

## **ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS**

### ***Research background***

+ADw-html+AD4APA-p+AD4-Unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma had been difficult to be treated in the past, hepatic arterial chemotherapy infusion chemotherapy

(HAIC) as well as angiogenesis inhibitors plus PD1/PDL1 blockers (AIPB) were proved to prolong the uHCC patients' survival, respectively. Meanwhile, some phase II single arm suggested that the combination of HAIC and AIPB (triple therapy) was effective in treating uHCC. But which treatment is the best choice was still confused. The study was designed to answer the question.

### ***Research motivation***

The best first-line treatment for uHCC was unclear and there was lack of studies to compare the efficacy and safety between triple therapy and AIPB. There were so many choices that clinical staff may be confused when they need to treat uHCC patients. If we can find the relatively better regimen, it is helpful for the standardization of the uHCC treatment to improve the patients' prognosis.

### ***Research objectives***

The study aimed to identify the HAIC and HAIC-based treatments as the best choice for uHCC. Based on the result, we explored the efficacy and safety of one of HAIC-based treatment, triple therapy in the real-world condition compared to AIPB. The results of the study could be the evidence to guide clinical reasonable treatment and prospective clinical study.

### ***Research methods***

We have tried to perform a network meta-analysis to find the first choice to uHCC and identified the efficacy and safety of triple therapy compared to AIPB through a retrospective cohort study.

### ***Research results***

The network meta-analysis including 13 phase randomized controlled trials showed hepatic arterial infusion chemotherapy (HAIC) and HAIC-based treatments were likely to be the first choice to treat unresectable

hepatocellular carcinoma (uHCC). HAIC plus camrelizumab plus angiogenesis inhibitors and PD-1/PD-L1 blockers (triple therapy) had better progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) than angiogenesis inhibitors and PD-1/PD-L1 blockers (AIPB) without HAIC for uHCC. Even though the incidence of adverse events in the triple therapy group was higher than the AIPB group, the safety of triple therapy was still acceptable.

### ***Research conclusions***

HAIC-based treatments were better than other regimens for treating uHCC. Triple therapy was more effective than AIPB in the Chinese uHCC population. All of the above results proved the significance of local treatments in the uHCC treating.

### ***Research perspectives***

There is absolutely a need for studies at the cellular or molecular level and additional large-scale prospective RCTs on this topic.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We are thankful for the support of the patients in this study. We are grateful to Dr. Fei Cao and Ms. Xiao-Ting Bei for their assistance with the clinical management of the patients. We thank LetPub and AJE for its linguistic assistance during the preparation of this manuscript.



# 6%

SIMILARITY INDEX

### PRIMARY SOURCES

- 1

[www.mdpi.com](http://www.mdpi.com)  
Internet

135 words — 3%
- 2

Peng Zhu, Wei Liao, Wan-Guang Zhang, Lin Chen et al. "A Prospective Study Using Propensity Score Matching to Compare Long-term Survival Outcomes After Robotic-assisted, Laparoscopic or Open Liver Resection for Patients with BCLC Stage 0-A Hepatocellular Carcinoma", *Annals of Surgery*, 2022  
Crossref

65 words — 1%
- 3

Wenfeng Liu, Bing Quan, Shenxin Lu, Bei Tang, Miao Li, Rongxin Chen, Zhenggang Ren, Xin Yin. "First-Line Systemic Treatment Strategies for Unresectable Hepatocellular Carcinoma: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials", *Frontiers in Oncology*, 2021  
Crossref

51 words — 1%
- 4

[www.frontiersin.org](http://www.frontiersin.org)  
Internet

25 words — 1%

EXCLUDE QUOTES ☒ ON

EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY ☒ ON

EXCLUDE SOURCES

EXCLUDE MATCHES

< 1%

< 10 WORDS