Efficacy and safety of ruxolitinib in steroid-refractory graft-versus-host disease: A meta-analysis
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Ruxolitinib is an important treatment for steroid refractory graft-versus-host disease (SR-GVHD). Therefore, we reported the updated results of a systematic review and meta-analysis of ruxolitinib as treatment for SR-GVHD. In addition, we wanted to compare the efficacy and safety between children and adults with SR-GVHD. Overall response rate (ORR) after ruxolitinib treatment was chosen as the primary end point. Complete response rate (CRR), infection, myelosuppression, and overall survival (OS) were chosen as secondary end points. A total of 37 studies were included in this meta-analysis, and 1,580 patients were enrolled. ORR at any time after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.77 [95% confidence interval (CI): 0.68–0.84] and 0.78 (95% CI: 0.74–0.81), respectively, for SR-aGVHD and SR-cGVHD. CRR at any time after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.49 (95% CI: 0.40–0.57) and 0.15 (95% CI: 0.10–0.23), respectively, for SR-aGVHD and SR-cGVHD. The ORRs at any time after treatment was highest in mouth SR-cGVHD, followed by skin, gut, joints and fascia, liver, eyes, esophagus, and lung SR-cGVHD. The incidence rate of infections after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.61 (95% CI: 0.45–0.76) and 0.47 (95% CI: 0.31–0.63), respectively, for SR-aGVHD and SR-cGVHD. The incidence rates of overall (grades I–IV) and severe (grades III–IV) cytopenia were 53.2% (95% CI: 16.0%–90.4%) and 31.0% (95% CI: 0.0–100.0%), respectively, for SR-aGVHD, and were 28.8% (95% CI: 13.0%–44.6%) and 10.4% (95% CI: 0.0–27.9%), respectively, for SR-cGVHD. The probability rate of OS at 6 months after treatment was 63.9% (95% CI: 52.5%–75.2%) for SR-aGVHD. The probability rates of OS at 6 months, 1 year, and 2 years after treatment were 95% (95% CI: 79.5%–100.0%), 78.7% (95% CI: 67.2%–90.1%), and 75.3% (95% CI: 68.0%–82.7%), respectively, for SR-cGVHD. The ORR, CRR, infection events, and myelosuppression were all comparable between children and adults with SR-GVHD. In summary, this study suggests that ruxolitinib is an effective and safe treatment for SR-GVHD, and both children and adults with SR-GVHD could benefit from ruxolitinib treatment.
Introduction

Allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT) is one of the most important treatments for patients with hematological malignancies and non-malignant disease (1). However, graft-versus-host disease (GVHD) is still a common complication. It can severely influence the quality of life (2–5) and is an important cause of transplant-related mortality (6, 7). Corticosteroid is the first-line treatment for GVHD, but the response rate was approximate 50% (8), and a significant number of patients will experience steroid-refractory GVHD (SR-GVHD) (9). Thus far, there is no effective treatment for patients with SR-GVHD (10), and their survival rate is poor (11).

Ruxolitinib is a potent and selective oral inhibitor of Janus kinase (JAK) 1 and JAK2 and is an important treatment for myeloproliferative neoplasms (12). In addition, JAKs are well positioned to regulate GVHD. A variety of cytokines, which signal through the JAK/STAT pathways, play a critical role in regulation of the proliferation and activation on immune cell types that are important for GVHD pathogenesis (13). Recently, ruxolitinib is under investigation for the treatment of SR-GVHD, and it has been reported to be an important treatment for SR-GVHD (14–16). Ruxolitinib has been approved for the treatment of SR acute GVHD (aGVHD) and chronic GVHD (cGVHD) by the Unite States Food and Drug Administration in 2019 and 2021, respectively (17, 18).

Thus far, there are many clinical studies focused on ruxolitinib for SR-GVHD treatment, and Li et al. (19) had conducted a meta-analysis for ruxolitinib as the treatment for SR-GVHD in adults; however, only studies published before January 2019 were enrolled. Since 2019, many important research studies for ruxolitinib in SR-GVHD have been published (15, 16, 20–28). In addition, this meta-analysis did not include children, whereas several studies focused on ruxolitinib for treatment of SR-GVHD in children have been published since 2019 (29–32). No systematic review was designed to compare the efficacy of ruxolitinib for SR-GVHD treatment between children and adults.

Therefore, we reported the updated results of a systematic review and meta-analysis of ruxolitinib as treatment for SR-GVHD. In addition, we wanted to compare the efficacy and safety between children and adults with SR-GVHD.

Methods

Inclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) patients of any race, any sex, and all ages; (2) those diagnosed with SR-GVHD (i.e., aGVHD or cGVHD) after HSCT; and (3) those using ruxolitinib as the treatment for SR-GVHD. Reviews, duplicates, and conference abstracts were excluded. While assessing multiple reports from the same study, we selected the report containing more information or with a longer follow-up.

Search strategy

A literature search was conducted following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses statement (33). The PubMed and Embase databases were searched, with the search strategy following the Population (patients with steroid refractory GVHD), Intervention (ruxolitinib), Outcomes [overall response rate (ORR), complete response rate (CRR), infection, myelosuppression, and overall survival (OS)], and Study framework (retrospective, prospective non-randomized, and randomized trials) (34): [(Glucocorticoid-Refractory) OR (steroid refractory) OR (steroid-refractory) OR (steroid resistant) OR (steroid-resistant) OR (corticosteroid refractory) OR (corticosteroid-refractory)] AND [(acute graft versus host disease) OR aGVHD OR cGVHD OR (chronic graft versus host disease) OR (graft versus host reaction)] AND [(Ruxolitinib) OR (Janus Kinase Inhibitors) OR (JAK Kinases Inhibitors)] OR (jak kinases Inhibitors)

Data extraction and outcomes

All data were independently extracted by two reviewers (Wen-Xuan Huo and Yang Yang) to ensure accuracy. Information on the following was extracted: study characteristics (e.g., study framework, first author, publish year, and follow-up period), patients (e.g., number, age, gender, and disease characteristics), transplantation (e.g.,
CRR after ruxolitinib treatment

CRR at any time after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.49 (95% CI: 0.40–0.57) (Figure 4A). CRRs at any time were 0.48 (95% CI: 0.38–0.58) and 0.55 (95% CI: 0.46–0.64), respectively, in retrospective studies and prospective unrandomized studies (Figures S3A, B). CRRs at any time were comparable between adults and children (0.48 (95% CI: 0.42–0.54) vs. 0.41 (95% CI: 0.20–0.66), P = 0.601) (Table S1 and Figure 3B).

CRR at day 28 after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.39 (95% CI: 0.26–0.54) (Figure 4B). CRRs at day 28 were 0.32 (95% CI: 0.23–0.43) and 0.50 (95% CI: 0.19–0.81), respectively, in retrospective studies and prospective unrandomized studies (Figures S3C, D). In the RCT, CRR at day 28 was 0.34. CRRs at day 28 were 0.32 (95% CI: 0.24–0.41) and 0.21, respectively, for adults and children.

SR-cGVHD

ORR after ruxolitinib treatment

ORR at any time after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.78 (95% CI: 0.74–0.81) (Figure 2C). ORRs at any time were 0.77 (95% CI: 0.73–0.81) and 0.81, respectively, in retrospective studies and prospective unrandomized studies (Figure S2A). In adults, ORR at any time was 0.81 (95% CI: 0.76–0.85), which was comparable with that in children (0.89 (95% CI: 0.75–0.95), P = 0.222) (Table S1 and Figure 3C).

ORR at week 24 after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.61 (95% CI: 0.50–0.72) (Figure 2D). In retrospective studies, ORR at week 24 was 0.64 (95% CI: 0.51–0.75) (Figure S2B). In the RCT, ORR at week 24 was 0.50.

CRR after ruxolitinib treatment

CRR at any time after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.15 (95% CI: 0.10–0.23) (Figure 4C). CRR at any time was 0.15 (95% CI: 0.09–0.23) and 0.21 (95% CI: 0.12–0.34), respectively, in retrospective studies and prospective unrandomized studies, respectively (Figures S4A, B). In adults, CRR at any time was 0.18 (95% CI: 0.10–0.30), which was compared with that in children (0.11 (95% CI: 0.04–0.26), P = 0.359) (Figure 3D).

CRR at week 24 after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.23 (95% CI: 0.11–0.42) (Figure 4D). In retrospective studies, CRR at week 24 was 0.29 (95% CI: 0.15–0.48) (Figure S4C). In the RCT, CRR at week 24 was 0.07.

Response according to the involved organs after ruxolitinib treatment

SR-aGVHD

The ORRs and CRRs at any time after treatment were showed in Table 7. The ORRs at any time after treatment were highest in skin SR-aGVHD, followed by gut, and liver SR-aGVHD.
SR-cGVHD
The ORRs at any time after treatment were highest in mouth SR-cGVHD, followed by skin and gut SR-cGVHD. The CRRs at any time after treatment was highest in mouth SR-cGVHD, followed by liver and skin SR-cGVHD (Table 7).

Infections after ruxolitinib treatment

SR-aGVHD
The incidence rate of infections after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.61 (95% CI: 0.45–0.76). The frequency rates of infection after ruxolitinib treatment were comparable between children [0.86 (95% CI: 0.64–0.95)] and adults [0.75 (95% CI: 0.66–0.82), \( P = 0.296 \)] (Figures 5A, B). The frequency rates of viral infections were 0.55 (95% CI: 0.49–0.61). The frequency rates of viral infection after ruxolitinib treatment were comparable between children [0.45 (95% CI: 0.31–0.60)] and adults [0.59 (95% CI: 0.59–0.71), \( P = 0.193 \)] (Figures 5C, D).

SR-cGVHD
The incidence rate of infection after ruxolitinib treatment was 0.47 (95% CI: 0.31–0.63) (Figure S5). The frequency rates of infection after ruxolitinib treatment were 0.37 (95% CI: 0.18–0.61) and 0.42, respectively, for adults and children. The frequency rates of viral infection were 0.29 (95% CI: 0.25–0.34) (Figure S6).

TABLE 1 Characteristics of 24 included studies (SR-aGVHD)*.

| Studies         | Median age/year (range) | HLA matching (n) | SR-aGVHD grade (n) | Median time from SR-aGVHD diagnosis to the application of ruxolitinib/day (range) |
|-----------------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                 |                         | MRD mMRD MUD mMUD | I II III IV         |                                                                                  |
| Zeiser, 2020    | 52.5 (12–73)            | NA NA NA NA      | 2 50 68 30         | NA                                                                               |
| Modernmann, 2020| 58.5 (21–73)            | 3 0 9 6          | 0 0 9 9            | 87 (35–257)                                                                     |
| Lancman, 2018   | 58 (33–61)              | NA NA NA NA      | 1 3 NA NA          | NA                                                                               |
| Assouan, 2017   | 52 (26–65)              | 5 NA 5 NA        | NA NA 6 NA         | 14                                                                               |
| Wei, 2021       | 30 (11–56)              | 5 NA NA NA       | NA 9 8 6           | 5 (1–79)                                                                         |
| Leung, 2022     | 38 (19–63)              | NA NA NA NA      | 0 13 4 5           | NA                                                                               |
| Mosser, 2020    | 17 (1–67)               | 2 NA 19 NA       | 0 11 10 11         | 16 (5–113)                                                                       |
| Jagasia, 2020   | 58 (18–73)              | 18 11 27 10      | 0 23 34 14         | NA                                                                               |
| Bilinski, 2021  | 53.5 (22–66)            | 2 NA 2 NA        | NA NA NA 4         | NA                                                                               |
| Liu, 2021       | 29 (13–63)              | NA NA NA NA      | 0 7 22 11          | NA                                                                               |
| Lassoe, 2020    | 4.3 (0.4–14.5)          | NA NA NA NA      | 0 7 13 9           | 91 (17–518)                                                                      |
| Gonzalez, 2018  | 11 (3–18)               | NA NA NA NA      | 0 0 4 9            | 9                                                                                |
| Maldonado, 2017 | 51 (28–56)              | 1 NA NA NA       | NA NA 3 NA         | NA                                                                               |
| Maldonado, 2021 | 32 (26–48)              | NA NA NA NA      | NA NA 2 7          | NA                                                                               |
| Meng, 2019      | 23.5 (8–38)             | 12 NA NA NA      | 0 6 5 1            | NA                                                                               |
| Mozo, 2021      | 8.6 (0.8–18.1)          | 3 NA 3 NA        | NA NA 2 6          | NA                                                                               |
| Khandelwal, 2017| 8.5 (1.6–16.5)          | 1 NA 12 NA       | NA 2 9 2           | 147 (55–538)                                                                    |
| Zeiser, 2015    | 51 (21–75)              | 13 NA 15 NA      | NA NA NA NA        | NA                                                                               |
| Abedin, 2019    | 59 (46–70)              | 6 2 10 1 NA      | 3 13 3             | 21 (3–162)                                                                       |
| Dang, 2020      | 35 (19–55)              | 8 2 NA NA NA     | NA NA 9 NA         | NA                                                                               |
| Uygun, 2020     | NA 4 NA 17 NA          | NA 2 4 7         | 28 (7–231)          |                                                                                 |
| Gomez, 2019     | 51 (0–73)               | 33 NA 39 NA      | NA 3 20 NA         | NA                                                                               |
| Toama, 2020     | 55 (27–72)              | 7 NA 24 NA       | NA NA NA NA        | 17 (2–280)                                                                       |
| Zhao, 2020      | 29 (14–62)              | 5 55 4 NA        | NA NA 22 42        | 8 (3–89)                                                                         |

HLA, human leukocyte antigen; mMRD, mismatched related donor; MRD, matched related donor; mMUD, mismatched unrelated donor; MUD, matched unrelated donor; NA, not available; SR-aGVHD, steroid-refractory acute graft-versus-host disease.*Thirteen studies included both SR-aGVHD and SR-cGVHD analysis.
Myelosuppression after ruxolitinib treatment

SR-aGVHD

The incidence rates of overall (grades I–IV) and severe (grades III–IV) cytopenia were 53.2% (95% CI: 16.0%–90.4%) and 31.0% (95% CI: 0.0%–100.0%), respectively. The incidence rate of overall cytopenia was 37.3% (95% CI: 0.0%–82.1%) and 54.0%, respectively, for adults and children. The frequency rates of anemia, leukopenia, and thrombocytopenia were 45.6% (95% CI: 19.8%–71.5%), 44.2% (95% CI: 24.4%–64.0%), and 40.6% (95% CI: 21.4%–59.8%), respectively (Table 8).

SR-cGVHD

The incidence rates of overall and severe cytopenia were 28.8% (95% CI: 13.0%–44.6%) and 10.4% (95% CI: 0.0%–27.9%), respectively.
respectively. The frequency rates of anemia, leukopenia, and thrombocytopenia were 35.1% (95% CI: 13.2%–57.0%), 22.9% (95% CI: 6.2%–39.6%), and 19.2% (95% CI: 6.9%–31.6%), respectively (Table 8).

### OS

#### SR-aGVHD

The probability rate of OS at 6 months after treatment was 63.9% (95% CI: 52.5%–75.2%). The probability rates of OS at 6 months after treatment were 65.6% (95% CI: 49.1%–82.1%) and 59.5% (95% CI: 0.0%–100.0%), respectively, for retrospective studies and prospective unrandomized studies.

#### SR-cGVHD

The probability rates of OS at 6 months, 1 year, and 2 years after treatment were 95% (95% CI: 79.5%–100.0%), 78.7% (95% CI: 67.2%–90.1%), and 75.3% (95% CI: 68.0%–82.7%), respectively.

### Discussion

Many studies have reported that ruxolitinib was effective treatment for patients with SR-GVHD, and we also observed that therapeutic response and survival seemed to be comparable between adults and children. To the best of our knowledge, this study is the most comprehensive systematic review to summarize
the published studies and demonstrated the efficacy and safety of ruxolitinib treatment for SR-GVHD.

For SR-aGVHD, the ORRs of ruxolitinib at any time and at day 28 were 0.77 and 0.73, respectively. Many other therapeutic modalities were also applied to control SR-aGVHD. Prior data reported that the ORRs of antithymocyte globulin (ATG, [11, 38, 39]), extracorporeal photopheresis (ECP, [40–44]), mycophenolate mofetil (MMF, [45–50]), etanercept (51–55), daclizumab (56), inolimomab (56), and denileukin diftitox (56) were 0.30–0.31, 0.66–0.75, 0.31–0.67, 0.46–0.68, 0.71, 0.54, and 0.56, respectively. In addition, the ORR at day 28 after treatment was 0.54–0.56 for ATG (57, 58), and the ORRs at 1 month after treatment were 0.69, 0.55, and 0.56, respectively, for daclizumab (56), inolimomab (56), and denileukin diftitox (56). Thus, it seems that ruxolitinib has a higher ORR compared with most of the other second-line treatments in SR-aGVHD.

In this study, the CRRs of ruxolitinib at any time and at day 28 were 0.49 and 0.39, respectively, in patients with SR-aGVHD. The available data about the CRRs of ATG (11, 38, 39), ECP (40–44, 59–61), MMF (45, 46, 48, 50), etanercept (51, 52, 54, 55), mesenchymal stem cell (MSC) (62), daclizumab (56), inolimomab (56), and denileukin diftitox (56) were 0.08–0.14, 0.52–0.75, 0–0.31, 0–0.31, 0.09–0.65, 0.42, 0.30, and 0.37, respectively. In addition, the CRR at day 28 after treatment was 0.20–0.36 for ATG (57, 58), and the
FIGURE 1
Selection scheme of studies. SR-GVHD, steroid-refractory graft-versus-host disease.

TABLE 5 The number of studies included in the subgroup analysis.

| Subgroup                        | Studies included, No. (%) |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
|                                 | SR-aGVHD<sup>1</sup>     | SR-cGVHD<sup>1</sup>     |
| **ORR**                         |                          |                          |
| At any time                     | n = 17                   | n = 16                   |
| Retrospective studies           | 15 (88.2)                | 15 (93.8)                |
| Prospective unrandomized studies| 2 (11.8)                 | 1 (6.2)                  |
| RCT                             | NA                       | NA                       |
| At day 28                       | n = 5                    | NA                       |
| Retrospective studies           | 2 (40.0)                 | NA                       |
| Prospective unrandomized studies| 2 (40.0)                 | NA                       |
| RCT                             | 1 (20.0)                 | NA                       |
| At week 24                      | NA                       | n = 7                    |
| Retrospective studies           | NA                       | 6 (85.7)                 |
| Prospective unrandomized studies| NA                       | NA                       |
| RCT                             | NA                       | 1 (14.3)                 |
| **CRR**                         |                          |                          |
| At any time                     | n = 21                   | n = 18                   |
| Retrospective studies           | 18 (85.7)                | 16 (88.9)                |
| Prospective unrandomized studies| 3 (14.3)                 | 2 (11.1)                 |
| RCT                             | NA                       | NA                       |
| At day 28                       | n = 7                    | NA                       |
| Retrospective studies           | 4 (57.1)                 | NA                       |
| Prospective unrandomized studies| 2 (28.6)                 | NA                       |
| RCT                             | 1 (14.3)                 | NA                       |
| At week 24                      | NA                       | n = 6                    |
| Retrospective studies           | NA                       | 5 (83.3)                 |
| Prospective unrandomized studies| NA                       | NA                       |
| RCT                             | NA                       | 1 (16.7)                 |
| **Involved Organ Response**     |                          |                          |
| ORR<sup>2</sup>                 | n = 9                    | n = 13                   |

(Continued)
| Subgroup                          | SR-aGVHD\(^1\) | SR-cGVHD\(^1\) |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Skin                             | 8 (88.9)       | 13 (100.0)     |
| Gut                              | 9 (100.0)      | 11 (84.6)      |
| Liver                            | 8 (88.9)       | 9 (69.2)       |
| Mouth                            | NA             | 8 (61.5)       |
| Eye                              | NA             | 10 (76.9)      |
| Lung                             | NA             | 12 (92.3)      |
| Joints and fascia                | NA             | 8 (61.5)       |
| Esophagus                        | NA             | 1 (7.7)        |

CRR, complete response rate; NA, not available; ORR, overall response rate; OS, overall survival; RCT, randomized controlled trials; SR-aGVHD, steroid-refractory acute graft-versus-host disease; SR-cGVHD, steroid-refractory chronic graft-versus-host disease.

\(^1\)Twelve studies included both in the SR-aGVHD and SR-cGVHD analysis.

\(^2\)Twenty-one studies involved multiple organs in the analysis of ORRs.

\(^3\)Eighteen studies involved multiple organs in the analysis of CRRs.

\(^4\)Seventeen studies included both in the analysis of overall (grades I–IV) and severe (grades III–IV) cytopenia.

\(^5\)Fifteen studies included both in the analysis of overall (grades I–IV) and severe (grades III–IV) anemia.

\(^6\)Sixteen studies included both in the analysis of overall (grades I–IV) and severe (grades III–IV) leukopenia.

\(^7\)Seventeen studies included both in the analysis of overall (grades I–IV) and severe (grades III–IV) thrombocytopenia.

\(^8\)Fifteen studies involved in the analysis of multiple types of infection.

\(^9\)Three studies included both in the analysis of 6-month, 1-year, and 2-year OS in SR-cGVHD. The bold values represent the total number of studies included in the analysis.
FIGURE 2
Forest plots of ORRs at any time (A) and day 28 (B) after ruxolitinib treatment in SR-aGVHD and the ORRs at any time (C) and week 24 (D) after ruxolitinib treatment in SR-cGVHD.

TABLE 6 The summary table of comparisons between adults and children.

| Subgroup       | Adults                                      | Children                                      | P-value |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------|
|                | Cumulative incidence | 95% CI                                     | Cumulative incidence | 95% CI |
|                |                             |                                               |                             |
| SR-aGVHD       |                              |                                               |                             |
| ORR            |                              |                                               |                             |
| At any time    | 0.75                         | 0.62–0.84                                    | 0.75                         | 0.51–0.90 | 0.960 |
| CRR            |                              |                                               |                             |
| At any time    | 0.48                         | 0.42–0.54                                    | 0.41                         | 0.20–0.66 | 0.601 |
| At day 28      | 0.32                         | 0.24–0.41                                    | 0.21                         | NA       | NA    |
| Infection      | 0.75                         | 0.66–0.82                                    | 0.86                         | 0.64–0.95 | 0.296 |
| Viral infection| 0.59                         | 0.59–0.71                                    | 0.45                         | 0.31–0.60 | 0.193 |
| Cytopenia      |                              |                                               |                             |
| Grades I-IV    | 37.3                         | 0.0–82.1                                     | 53.8                         | NA       | NA    |
| Anemia         |                              |                                               |                             |
| Grades I-IV    | 24.7                         | 0.0–55.3                                     | 25.0                         | NA       | NA    |
| Grades III-IV  | 26.0                         | 7.0–45.0                                     | 25.0                         | NA       | NA    |
| Leukopenia     |                              |                                               |                             |
| Grades I-IV    | 34.3                         | 0.6–68.1                                     | 26.0                         | 0.0–100.0 | 0.645 |
| Grades III-IV  | 28.0                         | 14.8–41.2                                    | 26.0                         | 0.0–100.0 | 0.904 |
| Thrombocytopenia|                             |                                               |                             |
| Grades I-IV    | 23.7                         | 0.0–56.7                                     | 19.8                         | 0.0–41.8 | 0.722 |
| Grades III-IV  | 31.0                         | 0.0–73.2                                     | 30.5                         | 0.0–100.0 | 0.975 |
| SR-cGVHD       |                              |                                               |                             |
| ORR            |                              |                                               |                             |
| At any time    | 0.81                         | 0.76–0.85                                    | 0.89                         | 0.75–0.95 | 0.222 |

(Continued)
CRRs at 1 month after treatment were 0.37, 0.31, and 0.37, respectively, for daclizumab, inolimomab, and denileukin diftitox (56). Thus, the CRR of ruxolitinib did not seem to be more superior to other second-line treatments, which can be further improved.

For SR-cGVHD, the ORR of ruxolitinib at any time was 0.78. On the basis of data from previous systematic reviews, the ORRs of rituximab (63, 64), MMF (64), imatinib (64), MSC (64), methotrexate (64), ECP (43, 64), pentostatin (64), sirolimus (64),
and thalidomide (64) were 0.66–0.68, 0.65, 0.58, 0.65, 0.70, 0.64–0.68, 0.54, 0.79, and 0.50, respectively. Ruxolitinib showed a higher ORR compared with most of the other second-line treatments in patients with SR-cGVHD.

Four studies reported that ruxolitinib could be used in the treatment for children with SR-GVHD (29–32); however, few studies compared the clinical outcomes of ruxolitinib between children and adults with SR-GVHD. In this study, we first observed that ORR, CRR, infection events, and myelosuppression were all comparable between adult and children, which suggested that ruxolitinib treatment was effective and safe for children with SR-GVHD.

In recently real-world studies, the ORR and CRR of basiliximab at day 28 were 0.66–0.79 and 0.52–0.61, respectively in patients with SR-aGVHD (65, 66). Compared with this study, the efficacy of basiliximab seemed to be compared with ruxolitinib. However, in

TABLE 7 Response at any time according to the involved organs after ruxolitinib treatment.

| Subgroup | ORR | CRR |
|----------|-----|-----|
| **SR-aGVHD** | | |
| Skin | 78.3 | 63.2–93.3 | 68.6 | 37.2–99.9 |
| Gut | 78.9 | 66.6–91.2 | 57.9 | 37.8–78.1 |
| Liver | 60.4 | 37.2–83.5 | 49.1 | 32.8–65.5 |
| **SR-cGVHD** | | |
| Skin | 73.2 | 58.7–87.7 | 30.1 | 18.2–42.0 |
| Gut | 69.2 | 50.9–87.5 | 25.7 | 24.8–49.8 |
| Liver | 65.7 | 45.0–86.3 | 32.7 | 15.8–49.6 |
| Mouth | 76.5 | 61.9–91.5 | 34.0 | 24.7–43.3 |
| Eyes | 61.1 | 38.7–83.5 | 16.7 | 24.4–31.0 |
| Lung | 47.3 | 29.8–64.9 | 11.1 | 1.2–21.0 |
| Joints and fascia | 67.4 | 46.4–88.3 | 11.9 | 0.0–23.8 |
| Esophagus | 50.0 | NA | 0.0 | NA |

CI, confidence interval; CRR, complete response rate; NA, not available; ORR, overall response rate; SR-aGVHD, steroid-refractory acute graft-versus-host disease; SR-cGVHD, steroid-refractory chronic graft-versus-host disease.
FIGURE 5
Forest plots of frequency rates of infections (A) and the subgroup analysis of adults and children (B) after ruxolitinib treatment in SR-aGVHD; Forest plots of frequency rates of viral infections (C) and the subgroup analysis of adults and children (D) after ruxolitinib treatment in SR-aGVHD.

TABLE 8 Myelosuppression after ruxolitinib treatment.

| Subgroup | Total | Adults | Children |
|----------|-------|--------|----------|
| **SR-aGVHD** | | | |
| Cytopenia | | | |
| Grades I–IV | 53.2 | 16.0–90.4 | 37.3 | 0.0–82.1 | 53.8 | NA |
| Grades III–IV | 31.0 | 0.0–100.0 | 16.5 | 0.0–100.0 | NA | NA |
| Anemia | | | |
| Grades I–IV | 45.6 | 19.8–71.5 | 24.7 | 0.0–55.3 | 25.0 | NA |
| Grades III–IV | 37.3 | 18.4–56.3 | 26.0 | 7.0–45.0 | 25.0 | NA |
| Leukopenia | | | |
| Grades I–IV | 44.2 | 24.4–64.0 | 34.3 | 0.6–68.1 | 26.0 | 0.0–100.0 |
| Grades III–IV | 36.8 | 20.7–52.9 | 28.0 | 14.8–41.2 | 26.0 | 0.0–100.0 |
| Thrombocytopenia | | | |
| Grades I–IV | 40.6 | 21.4–59.8 | 23.7 | 0.0–56.7 | 19.8 | 0.0–41.8 |
| Grades III–IV | 42.4 | 25.0–59.7 | 31.0 | 0.0–73.2 | 30.5 | 0.0–100.0 |
| **SR-cGVHD** | | | |
| Cytopenia | | | |
| Grades I–IV | 28.8 | 13.0–44.6 | 28.3 | 4.8–51.7 | NA | NA |
| Grades III–IV | 10.4 | 0.0–27.9 | 21.0 | 0.0–100.0 | NA | NA |
| Anemia | | | |
| Grades I–IV | 35.1 | 13.2–57.0 | 20.7 | 0.0–57.9 | 8.3 | NA |
| Grades III–IV | 11.2 | 2.1–20.3 | 5.0 | 0.0–15.6 | 0.0 | NA |
| Leukopenia | | | |
| Grades I–IV | 22.9 | 6.2–39.6 | 11.5 | 2.6–20.4 | 8.3 | NA |
| Grades III–IV | 8.9 | 4.7–13.1 | 9.8 | 2.3–17.3 | 0.0 | NA |
| Thrombocytopenia | | | |
| Grades I–IV | 19.2 | 6.9–31.6 | 7.0 | 0.0–17.6 | 8.3 | NA |
| Grades III–IV | 10.2 | 3.6–16.8 | 3.8 | 0.0–8.3 | 0.0 | NA |

CI, confidence interval; NA, not available; SR-aGVHD, steroid-refractory acute graft-versus-host disease; SR-cGVHD, steroid-refractory chronic graft-versus-host disease.
the only successful RCT (REACH2 study) for SR-aGVHD, nine second-line treatments except interleukin-2 receptor antagonists were included as the best available treatments. Thus, comparing the safety and efi

cacy between ruxolitinib and basiliximab in SR-aGVHD seems to be an interesting clinical issue.

This study has several limitations. First, we observed that the ORR for ruxolitinib seemed to be superior to other drugs in SR-aGVHD and SR-cGVHD. However, differences existed in the patient selection or publication bias may influence the comparison between ruxolitinib and other drugs. Considering that most studies about SR-GVHD were single-arm–designed, we admitted that the comparison of ruxolitinib and other second-line therapies might be insufficient, and it is premature to conclude that ruxolitinib was superior to other drugs based on the results of our meta-analysis. REACH 2 and REACH 3 trials had observed that ruxolitinib was superior to most of the other second-line drugs in RCTs, and real-world analysis could help to further compare the efficacy and safety between ruxolitinib and other drugs in future. Second, the reducing accuracy of our result might due to heterogeneity of different studies in our analysis. Third, the sample of children was still relatively small, and the comparisons of efficacy and safety between adults and children were insufficient, which should be further identified in future.

Conclusion

In summary, this study suggests that ruxolitinib is an effective and safe treatment for SR-GVHD, and both children and adults with SR-GVHD could benefit from ruxolitinib treatment.
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