Comparative efficacy and safety of tislelizumab versus other anti–PD-1 therapies in first-line treatment of gastric or gastroesophageal junction cancer: a network meta-analysis

**Authors:** Maria Alsina Maqueda<sup>1</sup>, Jaffer A. Ajani<sup>2</sup>, Markus Moehler<sup>3</sup>, Keun-Wook Lee<sup>4</sup>, Wenxi Tang<sup>5</sup>, Jason Steenkamp<sup>6</sup>, Emily Prentiss<sup>6</sup>, Kaijun Wang<sup>5</sup>, Ashley Bonner<sup>6</sup>, Lin Zhan<sup>5</sup>

Affiliations: <sup>1</sup>Hospital Universitario de Navarra, Spain; <sup>2</sup>The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, TX, USA; <sup>3</sup>Johannes Gutenberg-University Clinic, Germany; <sup>4</sup>Seoul National University College of Medicine, Seoul National University Bundang Hospital, South Korea; <sup>5</sup>BeiGene USA, Inc., Emeryville, CA, USA; <sup>6</sup>EVERSANA, Burlington, ON, Canada

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** To compare the efficacy and safety of tislelizumab (TIS) plus chemotherapy (CT) with other anti–PD-1 therapies—nivolumab (NIV) and pembrolizumab (PEM)—plus CT in the first-line (1L) treatment of unresectable, locally advanced, or metastatic gastric cancer (GC) or gastroesophageal junction cancer (GEJC) using network meta-analysis (NMA).

**Methods:** A systematic literature review identified five relevant trials: ATTRACTION-4 (part 2) and CheckMate 649 for NIV+CT; KEYNOTE-062 and KEYNOTE-859 for PEM+CT; and RATIONALE-305 for TIS+CT. Bayesian fixed-effect NMAs were conducted using extracted trial data, with placebo+CT as the common comparator. Outcomes assessed included overall survival (OS), progression-free survival (PFS), and grade ≥3 treatment-related adverse events (TRAEs). Markov chain Monte Carlo methods were applied to estimate hazard ratios (HRs) or odds ratios (ORs) and 95% credible intervals (CrIs). Subgroup analyses were performed for PD-L1 expression levels (≥5% and ≥1%).

**Results:** The included trials were sufficiently similar in baseline characteristics, design, and eligibility criteria to enable network formation. TIS+CT demonstrated comparable efficacy to both NIV+CT and PEM+CT in terms of OS and PFS across all patients and PD-L1 subgroups ( $\geq$ 1% and  $\geq$ 5%). For safety, TIS+CT was associated with a statistically significant reduction in grade  $\geq$ 3 TRAEs compared to NIV+CT and a numerical advantage compared to PEM+CT (Table).

**Conclusions:** TIS+CT provides similar efficacy to established anti–PD-1 therapies with a potentially improved safety profile in the 1L treatment of GC/GEJC. These findings may support its consideration as an alternative treatment option.

Table. Results for key efficacy and safety outcomes		
	TIS+CT vs NIV+CT HR/OR (95% CrI)	TIS+CT vs PEM+CT HR/OR (95% CrI)
	0.98	1.00
OS	(0.83, 1.16)	(0.85, 1.19)
OS	1.03	1.01
PD-L1 ≥1%	(0.85, 1.25)	(0.84, 1.20)
OS	1.01	1.01
PD-L1 ≥5%	(0.79, 1.30)	(0.79, 1.30)
	1.02	1.00
PFS	(0.85, 1.22)	(0.83, 1.19)
	0.69	0.86
TRAEs	(0.51, 0.93)	(0.64, 1.17)