Liver toxicity as a limiting factor to the increasing use of immune checkpoint inhibitors
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Summary
Immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) improve clinical outcomes in patients suffering from different types of cancer. Liver toxicity is one of the immune-related adverse events associated with immunotherapy; although not common, its management is challenging as it is extremely heterogeneous in terms of presentation and severity. Differences in the development and evolution of ICI-related toxicity in healthy or cirrhotic livers have not yet been elucidated. Assessing causality is key to diagnosing ICI-induced liver toxicity; liver biopsies can assist not only in the differential diagnosis but also in assessing the severity of histological liver damage. The current classification of severity overestimates the grade of liver injury and needs to be revised to reflect the views of hepatologists. Spontaneous improvements in ICI-related liver toxicity have been reported, so corticosteroid therapy should probably be individualised not systematic. The re-introduction of ICIs in a patient with previous immune-mediated hepatitis may be possible, but the risk/benefit ratio should be considered, as the risk factors for hepatitis recurrence are currently unclear. The management of these patients, requiring a balance between efficacy, toxicity and specific treatments, necessitates multidisciplinary collaboration. The incidence of immune-related liver toxicity will continue to rise based on the increasing use of ICIs for most cancers, mandating improved understanding and management of this complication.
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Introduction
The introduction of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) has dramatically changed the landscape of cancer therapy and significantly improved survival in several cancer types, including metastatic melanoma and lung cancers. Inhibitory receptors on the T cell membrane preserve self-tolerance and prevent immune-driven diseases. Their sustained expression leads to T cell exhaustion, which can be observed in cancer and chronic infections. Cancer immunotherapy involves blocking these inhibitory receptors with monoclonal antibodies in order to reverse T cell exhaustion and restore T cell activity against tumour-specific antigens.1 The considerable efficacy of ICIs has been associated with the onset of more or less severe immune-related adverse events (irAEs), affecting several organs due to a loss of self-tolerance.2–4

While ICIs offer an excellent therapeutic option for patients with advanced cancer, the development of toxicities is a factor that limits the prolonged use of this potentially lifesaving treatment. The aim of this paper is to provide a comprehensive review of ICI-induced liver toxicity and highlight several clinically relevant issues that need to be addressed in the future (Table 1).

Immune checkpoint inhibitors: a recent and exponential increase in use
ICIs are becoming increasingly widely used in onco-haematology. Their safety profile, at least as monotherapy, is generally better than that of cytotoxic chemotherapies,5 and the quality of the antitumor response is generally more prolonged and lasting.6 Long-term follow-up – now more than 5 years – has indicated that if a complete response is obtained and sustained after 2 years of treatment, patients with metastatic melanoma can almost be considered cured.7

Since 2015, ICIs targeting programmed cell death 1 (PD-1) and its ligand (PD-L1) have displayed remarkable efficacy in the treatment of non-operable locally advanced or metastatic cancers of many types, including lung cancer, melanoma, kidney cancer, head and neck cancer, tumours with micro-satellite instability, Merkel cell carcinoma, epidermoid skin cancer, Hodkinson’s lymphoma, B cell primary mediastinal lymphoma and more recently hepatocellular carcinoma.8–10

It is likely that the use of ICIs will continue to grow in the coming years. Indeed, therapeutic strategies including ICI are improving and developing in the context of adjuvant or neoadjuvant treatments.8
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Finally, evidence is accumulating on the role of the anti-PD-1 and anti-cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein 4 (CTLA-4) antibody combination in patients with hard-to-treat tumours such as metastatic melanoma, kidney cancer, mesothelioma and lung cancer.9 Because of this increasing use, the cumulative number of irAEs is expected to rise exponentially,11 and the frequency of autoimmune events related to immunotherapy is likely to exceed the incidence of classic autoimmune diseases unrelated to immunotherapies.12

**General mechanism of action underlying ICI toxicity**

Several mechanisms have been explored to explain ICI-related toxicity. The first is direct immune toxicity. PD-1 and PD-L1 are expressed on cells in healthy tissue, suggesting that direct cytotoxicity after immunotherapy is possible, for example by means of complement activation.11,13 CTLA-4 is strongly expressed in the anterior pituitary gland and immune toxicity correlates with this finding as hypophysitis is principally seen with ipilimumab but not with PD-1 or PD-L1 inhibitors.14 In addition, myocardial PD-L1 is mainly localised on the endothelium and is critical in controlling immune-mediated ICI-induced cardiac injury.15 Secondly, B cells also play a role in the development of ICI-related toxicity, as early B cell changes can be observed in the blood of patients treated with ICIs who experience higher rates of grade ≥3 irAEs.16 Such early changes following immunotherapy may give rise to autoreactive B cells and through an immune-mediated reaction probably participate in generating irAEs.16

Thirdly, the gut microbiota seems to influence the onset of irAEs, and particularly colitis. Chaput et al. demonstrated that a specific composition of the baseline gut microbiota was associated with immune-related colitis.17 Most baseline colitis-associated phylotypes were related to Firmicutes (e.g. relatives of *Faecalibacterium prausnitzii* and *Gemmiger formicilis*), whereas none were assigned to Bacteroidetes.17 Fourthly, cross-reactivity between tumour cell antigens and normal tissue clinically translates as paraneoplastic syndromes in some cases.18 Pre-existing paraneoplastic syndromes have been shown to worsen in 50% of patients treated with anti-PD-1 or anti-PD-L1 immunotherapy.19 Finally, regulatory T (Treg) cell depletion has been suggested to play a role in the development of irAEs, as Treg cells are essential for maintaining peripheral tolerance.19 CTLA-4 is constitutively expressed on Treg cells while PD-1 expression is restricted to subpopulations. CTLA-4 blockade can affect Treg cell number and function; reduced Treg cell number and increased effector T cells to Treg cells ratio have been observed in patients treated with ipilimumab. Preclinical models of irAEs have shown a negative correlation between the Treg cell number and irAEs.20 The specific pathogenic mechanisms underlying hepatic irAEs are still unclear.

**What are the most relevant biomarkers to predict immune-related toxicity in clinical practice?**

Data suggest that detecting pre-existing antibodies could be useful to predict the risk of certain irAEs. It has been reported that patients with pre-existing thyroglobulin antibody in baseline serum are at a high risk of thyroid dysfunction during immunotherapy.21 Similarly, more patients developed irAEs if they had pre-existing autoantibodies and rheumatoid factor and were being treated with immunotherapy.22

**Key points**

- Liver toxicity is a rare complication of immune checkpoint inhibitors with a heterogeneous presentation and prognosis.
- It is more common and severe under combination therapy with anti-PD-1 and anti-CTLA-4 drugs.
- Diagnosis is initially based on excluding all classic causes of acute hepatitis.
- Liver histology is important to identify the characteristic histological features of ICI-induced toxicity and to assess the severity of liver tissue damage.
- Classification of the severity of liver toxicity needs to be revised to consider the clinical expertise of hepatologists.
- The administration of corticosteroids should be tailored to individuals and might not be systematic, even in patients with grade ≥3 hepatitis.
- We currently lack predictive clinical or biological factors for a recurrence of ICI-related hepatitis or other immune toxicities affecting other organs after ICI re-introduction.
- The management of liver toxicity due to immune checkpoint inhibitors requires multidisciplinary discussions.

As previously discussed, some changes to B cell lymphocytes may be predictive biomarkers of immune-related toxicity.16 The deep phenotyping of immune cells showed that immune toxicities elicited by CTLA-4 blockade in cancer patients were found to be associated with an early diversification of the T cell repertoire in peripheral lymphocytes.23 Changes to the neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR) in peripheral blood could be a powerful tool to predict the efficacy and toxicity of immunotherapy.24 Low NLR values at baseline were significantly associated with the development of irAEs.25 Thus, NLR may represent a simple biomarker that can easily be applied for the management of patients receiving immunotherapy in daily practice.

Interleukin (IL)-17 has been found to correlate significantly with the incidence of grade 3 diarrhoea/colitis when measured at baseline in patients receiving immunotherapy.26 IL6 was also found to be associated with the risk of immune toxicity.27 Another study found 11 cytokines that were significantly upregulated in patients with severe immune-related toxicities; they included the pro-inflammatory cytokines IL1α, IL2, and IFNa2.28 The sum of these data suggests that the profile of cytokines and their expression could be integrated in a score to help with the early detection of severe, potentially life-threatening immune-related toxicity.28

Patients of European descent with immune-related arthritis are more likely to carry the HLA-DRB1*04:05 phenotype29 and other studies have identified an association between HLA-DQB1*03:01 and immune-related colitis.30 The HLA phenotype in some populations could constitute a biomarker to predict immune-related toxicity, but although powerful, its efficiency in all patient populations remains a subject of debate.31 Despite these promising results (Table S1), potential biomarkers to predict toxicity and in particular liver toxicity in clinical practice are still needed.

**Incidence of liver toxicity due to immune checkpoint inhibitors**

Liver toxicity associated with immune checkpoint inhibitors is characterised by elevated liver parameter values, usually those of aspartate aminotransferase (AST) and alanine aminotransferase (ALT). Drug-induced liver toxicity is classified according to the
Liver toxicity depends on the type of immunotherapy, the dose administered, and baseline liver status. Overall, the incidence of liver toxicity is highest in patients who receive combination therapy than those under monotherapy, but it remains lower compared to other organ toxicities (Fig. 1). Moreover, elevations of AST and ALT were shown to be more frequent among patients treated for HCC with chronic hepatitis or cirrhosis compared with those treated for non-liver cancers such as melanoma or non-small cell lung cancer, although these elevations did not require patients to withdraw from clinical trials or stop therapy.12

Patients treated for non-liver cancers
Live toxicity can occur in patients receiving ICIs for non-hepatic malignancies. For example, in patients treated with anti-PD-1 monotherapy for advanced melanoma, elevated ALT levels of any grade were reported in 4% to 7% of patients, while a grade ≥3 elevation of ALT was reported in 1% of patients.33,34 In the same study, among patients treated with anti-CTLA-4 monotherapy, ALT elevations of any grade and of grade ≥3 were found in 4% and 2% of patients, respectively.31 The incidence of liver toxicity increases in patients who receive combination therapies. In patients treated with anti-PD-1 in combination with a tyrosine kinase inhibitor (TKI) for advanced renal cell cancer, ALT elevations of any grade were reported in 27% of patients while ALT grade ≥3 elevations were found in 13% of patients.32 Finally, in patients receiving a combination of anti-PD-1 and anti-CTLA-4 therapy for metastatic melanoma, ALT elevations of any grade and of grade ≥3 were reported in 37% and 16% of patients, respectively.35 (Fig. 2A and B).

Patients treated for hepatocellular carcinoma
Among patients who receive ICI therapy for HCC, the incidence of liver toxicity varies as a function of the type of drug and dose received. If we look at the overall population treated with the anti-PD-1 antibody nivolumab (CHECKMATE 040 trial), ALT elevations of any grade and of grade ≥3 were found in 15% and 6% of patients, respectively.37 In those receiving another anti-PD-1 antibody pembrolizumab (KEYNOTE-224 trial), ALT elevations of any grade were seen in 9% of patients, while those of grade ≥3 were observed in 4%.38 Use of the anti-CTLA-4 antibody tremelimumab was associated with ALT elevations of any grade and of grade ≥3 in 19% and 9% of patients, respectively. Nevertheless it is important to remember that immunotherapy was associated with ablation in this study.39 In patients treated with a combination of nivolumab + ipilimumab, the rise in ALT levels of any grade ranged from 8% to 16% as a function of the dose administered, while ALT grade ≥3 elevations ranged from 0% to 8%.40 These are preliminary data and ongoing trials are evaluating the efficacy and safety of anti-PD-1 and anti-CTLA-4 combination therapy. In our experience this combination is associated with more liver toxicity than that previously described in patients treated for other malignancies. In those receiving the combination of tremelimumab + durvalumab, elevated ALT levels of any grade were seen in 20% of patients, while grade ≥3 was seen in 5% of patients.41 Interestingly, the combination of anti-PDL-1 (atezolizumab) and a vascular endothelial growth factor (bevacizumab), as described in the IMbrave150 trial, was not

---

**Table 1. Open questions, which need to be addressed in order to improve the management of ICI-induced liver toxicity.**

| Open questions                                                                 | Impact of answers and future studies goal                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| What is the pathogenesis of immune-mediated hepatitis in normal liver and cirrhotic liver? | Identify predictors of toxicity and diagnostic markers                        |
| What are the best markers to evaluate the severity of ICI-induced liver toxicity? | Avoid overestimation of severity and identify the patients in need of corticosteroids |
| Do corticosteroids shorten the interval to liver test normalisation compared to spontaneous remission? | Decide on corticosteroid introduction and tapering                             |
| Does immunosuppression have an impact on ICI efficacy?                        | Modulate the dose of immunosuppressive therapy. Define relationship between immunosuppression and type of cancer |
| Is UDCA enough to treat ICI-induced cholangitis?                               | Avoid unnecessary corticosteroid therapy                                       |
| What are the criteria to safely re-introduce an ICI after an episode of immune-mediated hepatitis? | Identify biomarkers of activity resolution and risk factors for recurrence      |

ICI, immune checkpoint inhibitor; UDCA, ursodeoxycholic acid.

---

**Fig. 1. Distribution of irAEs for organ categories according to treatment in the main clinical trials of ICIs.** Patients were treated with anti-PD-1 + anti-CTLA-4,4,33,36 anti-CTLA-4,33,34,104,124 and anti-PD-1.33,34,124 The values quoted are mean irAE rates of clinical trials as a whole. CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein 4; Endoc, endocrine (hypo/hyper-thyroidism); GI, gastrointestinal (diarrhoea); ICI, immune checkpoint inhibitors; irAEs, immune-related adverse events; Liver (increased alanine aminotransferase); PD-1, programmed cell death 1; PD-L1, programmed cell death 1 ligand 1; Skin (rash).
associated with increased liver toxicity; ALT elevations of all grades and grade ≥3 were seen in 14% and 3.6% of patients, respectively9 (Fig. 2C and D).

Patients with pre-existing chronic liver disease
Before starting an ICI, a complete work-up should be performed to rule out misdiagnosed liver disease (Table S2).

Viral disease
Most of the clinical trials that have explored the safety and efficacy of ICI therapy for cancer excluded patients with HBV, HCV and HIV infections. Only studies testing immunotherapy for HCC included patients with viral hepatitis. Most patients with HBV hepatitis were receiving effective antiviral therapy with nucleos(t)ide analogues and had a viral load <100 IU/L at screening, and no HBV reactivation was observed.37,39,42 In contrast, a reduction in viral load was documented in some cases. Outside clinical trials, only 3 case reports have described HBV reactivation in patients not receiving HBV treatment, all of whom were treated successfully with antiviral therapy.43–45 During HCC clinical trials37–39,42,46 and in a few case reports,47,48 HCV RNA-positive patients displayed a reduction in viral load during immunotherapy. Therefore, patients with viral hepatitis are not at a higher risk of liver toxicity than those without viral hepatitis. All patients need to be screened for HBV and HCV infection before ICI administration, but the presence of HBV or HCV is not a contraindication to mono- or even combination therapy using ICIs. Serological tests for HBV should be carried out using a complete diagnostic panel (HBsAg, HBs antibody, HBe antibody, and HBV DNA, when appropriate). Patients with active HBV
infection (HBsAg positive) with both positive and negative viral load, independently of HBeAg status, should receive effective antiviral therapy with a nucleos(t)ide analogue in order to avoid viral reactivation. It is difficult to determine the duration of prophylaxis as ICI activity following withdrawal may be variable, but we agree with Lombardi et al. that it should be maintained for at least 6 months after the end of ICI treatment. For patients with a resolved HBV infection (anti-HBc positive) strict monitoring can be suggested. By contrast, patients with HCV infection do not require antiviral therapy but need to be monitored regularly for HCV replication. For patients with HIV, a recent review showed that there was no increase in hepatic side effects, so ICIs can also be considered a therapeutic option for these patients. Indeed, a few ongoing trials are now including HIV-infected patients.

Autoimmune disease

No data have been reported concerning patients with pre-existing autoimmune liver diseases treated with ICI. Some reports have focused on patients with previous autoimmune diseases, but the incidence of adverse events in this subgroup cannot be evaluated precisely because the studies are all retrospective. A study based on the REISAMIC registry (Institut Gustave Roussy, France) identified 45 patients with 54 known autoimmune or inflammatory diseases (AIDs) treated with an anti-PD-1: the most frequent AIDs were vitiligo, psoriasis, thyroiditis, Sjögren syndrome and rheumatoid arthritis. As expected, the study revealed that patients with a pre-existing AID had a significantly higher risk of irAEs (44%), but anti-PD-1 treatment in this group of patients was as effective as in AID-free patients. In another report on 41 patients with 44 pre-existing AIDs treated with ipilimumab, 12 (29%) experienced a flare-up of the AID and an additional irAE occurred in 12 patients (29%). The response rate was comparable to that seen in previous trials. A systematic review evaluated the outcomes of 123 patients with pre-existing AIDs and found that an exacerbation of the AID, the onset of de novo irAEs or both occurred in 75% of patients. Most of the adverse events were managed successfully with corticosteroids and only 16% of patients required an alternative immunosuppressive drug; the death rate due to an adverse event was 2.4%. These data were also confirmed by a French multicentre study that included 112 patients; 71% of them experienced AID flare-ups or de novo irAEs that were generally manageable without discontinuing ICI. Interestingly, ongoing immunosuppressive therapy at the initiation of ICI was associated with a poorer outcome. Therefore the presence of a pre-existing AID should not be considered as a contraindication to ICI therapy, but patients should be monitored closely as they are at high risk of a flare-up of the previously known autoimmune disease and/or of developing de novo irAEs. Whether these general findings can be transposed to patients with autoimmune liver diseases still needs to be clarified.

Liver transplant recipients

ICI therapy can be indicated after liver transplantation (LT) for the treatment of HCC recurrence or de novo malignancies. LT recipients were excluded from clinical trials based on the association of ICI with acute rejection and the risk of graft loss. A total of 11 patients who were treated with ICIs after LT were reported in the literature, among them 4 (36%) patients developed acute rejection with or without graft loss. Of note, this case series is extremely heterogeneous concerning the interval between LT and the introduction of immunotherapy, the immunosuppression protocol and the type of ICI used. In 5 (45%) patients, immunotherapy was administered to treat HCC recurrence after LT. In a recently published review of the literature, the incidence of acute rejection in LT recipients treated with ICIs was reported to be 39%. PDL-1 expression in the allograft seems to be correlated with rejection, although a panel of validated risk factors is lacking. However, safe employment of immunotherapy after LT has also been described. By contrast, patients with liver toxicity on ICIs are usually asymptomatic and the symptoms, when present, are particularly non-specific; they may present with fever, skin rash and, in rare cases, jaundice. Symptoms deriving from concomitant toxicity affecting another organ, such as colitis, hypophysitis or pneumonitis, may also occur. No male or female preponderance has been described and age does not appear to constitute a risk factor for the development of liver toxicity.

The interval elapsing between the initiation of therapy and the onset of liver toxicity varies considerably, and toxicity may even occur after treatment discontinuation. In patients treated with ipilimumab as adjuvant therapy for stage III melanoma, the median time to the onset of hepatic irAE was 8.9 weeks (ranging from 1.9 weeks to 145.4 weeks). It appears that patients treated with anti-CTLA-4 (with or without anti-PD-1) experience a shorter interval between immunotherapy initiation and hepatic irAE development compared to those receiving anti-PD-1 or anti-PD-L1, with a median interval of 3 (1–7) weeks vs. 14 (2–49) weeks (p = 0.019). This was confirmed in the study by Gauci et al. who showed a median time to the onset of hepatitis of 9.9 weeks (2.9–19.7); 9.9 (6.1–14.7) weeks for patients treated with anti-CTLA-4 and 14.1 (9.4–19.7) weeks for patients under anti-PD-1. More recently, a study from the VigiBase, the World Health Organization database for individual safety case reports, also found a significantly earlier onset of hepatitis in patients treated with anti-CTLA-4 antibodies (34 [25–46.5] days) compared to those receiving anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibodies (48 [27–118] days) (p = 0.04). In the paper by Rivero-Barciela, the interval between ICI treatment initiation and liver toxicity was shorter in patients on anti-CTLA-4 than in those receiving anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibodies, although the difference was not statistically significant. The combination of anti-CTLA-4 and anti-PD-1 was reported not to be associated.

Diagnosis of liver toxicity

Patient characteristics

Patients with liver toxicity on ICIs are usually asymptomatic and the symptoms, when present, are particularly non-specific; they may present with fever, skin rash and, in rare cases, jaundice. Symptoms deriving from concomitant toxicity affecting another organ, such as colitis, hypophysitis or pneumonitis, may also occur. No male or female preponderance has been described and age does not appear to constitute a risk factor for the development of liver toxicity.

The interval elapsing between the initiation of therapy and the onset of liver toxicity varies considerably, and toxicity may even occur after treatment discontinuation. In patients treated with ipilimumab as adjuvant therapy for stage III melanoma, the median time to the onset of hepatic irAE was 8.9 weeks (ranging from 1.9 weeks to 145.4 weeks). It appears that patients treated with anti-CTLA-4 (with or without anti-PD-1) experience a shorter interval between immunotherapy initiation and hepatic irAE development compared to those receiving anti-PD-1 or anti-PD-L1, with a median interval of 3 (1–7) weeks vs. 14 (2–49) weeks (p = 0.019). This was confirmed in the study by Gauci et al. who showed a median time to the onset of hepatitis of 9.9 weeks (2.9–19.7); 9.9 (6.1–14.7) weeks for patients treated with anti-CTLA-4 and 14.1 (9.4–19.7) weeks for patients under anti-PD-1. More recently, a study from the VigiBase, the World Health Organization database for individual safety case reports, also found a significantly earlier onset of hepatitis in patients treated with anti-CTLA-4 antibodies (34 [25–46.5] days) compared to those receiving anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibodies (48 [27–118] days) (p = 0.04). In the paper by Rivero-Barciela, the interval between ICI treatment initiation and liver toxicity was shorter in patients on anti-CTLA-4 than in those receiving anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibodies, although the difference was not statistically significant. The combination of anti-CTLA-4 and anti-PD-1 was reported not to be associated.
with an earlier onset of grade ≥3 liver toxicity in a study by Sznol et al., who reported a median interval of 8.4 (2.1–48) weeks, while it was significantly shorter (median 2.9 weeks) with the combination therapy in the study by Gauci et al.70

In most patients, the profile of liver injury is usually hepato- cellular, but cases of cholestatic presentation have been described.66,73,74 Seven patients with nivolumab-induced cholangitis with predominant ALP and GGT elevations have been reported. In these cases, no increase in IgG4 was found.75–79 The presence of non-specific anti-tissue antibodies was described in 30% to 50% of the patients but at a low titre (1:80), while IgG levels were usually normal.66,67 It should be pointed out that the immune-mediated hepatitis induced by ICI is an entity that is entirely different from autoimmune hepatitis (AIH). This was clearly shown in a recent study where patients with AIH were younger (median of 55 vs. 63 years, p = 0.02), presented more frequently with previous autoimmune disorders, and more frequently had cirrhosis, a lower platelet count, higher bilirubin levels and higher gamma globulin levels than patients with liver toxicity. Patients with a diagnosis of AIH were also more numerous in needing a second immunosuppressive drug and their liver test values took longer to normalise than those with liver toxicity.67 Moreover, liver histological features were also completely different between the 2 groups, as described below.

Cases of acute liver failure with hepatic encephalopathy remain rare.80–82 Of note are data from the Vigilyze-VigiBase, the World Health Organization pharmacological database, which reported a 0.4% incidence of fulminant hepatitis.83 In a multicentre study that included 3,545 patients, fulminant hepatitis was reported in 0.14% of them.84 Interestingly, in trials involving HCC, none of the patients receiving ICIs experienced severe acute liver failure.

Causality assessment
Because there are no specific biomarkers to distinguish liver toxicity induced by ICIs, it is essential to exclude all classic causes of hepatitis. All patients with grade ≥3 hepatitis should be evaluated by a hepatologist and undergo a comprehensive work-up to investigate different causes of acute hepatitis and misdiagnosed chronic hepatitis. (Table S3) The causality between the drug and the onset of hepatitis needs to be evaluated using a scale such as the Roussel-UCLAF Causality Assessment Methods (RUCAM) scale to assess the likelihood of an association between a drug and liver toxicity.84,85

Imaging
Imaging forms part of the diagnostic work-up for ICI-induced liver toxicity. The aim of imaging is to exclude the presence of hepatic metastases, vascular thrombosis, biliary obstruction and features of chronic liver disease.86 Despite the limited number of patients studied, unpecific abnormalities, such as steatosis, hepatomegaly, periportal oedema, gallbladder oedema and lymphadenopathy, have been described using ultrasound in patients treated with anti-PD-1 agents.87 These findings were reported in patients treated with an anti-CTLA-4 antibody.88 In rare cases, patients with a cholestatic profile may display macroscopic involvement of the bile ducts.89 Early biliary MRI plus elastometry data are also essential and currently lacking.

Histology
A liver biopsy may confirm a suspected diagnosis of immune-mediated hepatitis and can be used to evaluate the features

![Fig. 4. Liver biopsies of patients treated with anti-PD-L1 and with combination of anti-PD-1 and anti-CTLA-4. (A) Destructing cholangitis (HES ×400); (B) Granulomatous cholangitis HES ×300. CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein 4; PD-1, programmed cell death 1; PD-L1, programmed cell death 1 ligand 1.]
compared the histological features of patients with drug-induced liver injury (DILI), AIH and immune-mediated hepatitis due to ICI and found significant differences regarding the amounts of confluent necrosis (which were lower in patients with ICI-induced hepatitis), eosinophilic infiltration (higher in patients with DILI) and plasmacytosis (higher in patients with AIH). The shift of CD3+/CD20+ and CD4+/CD8+ ratios in favour of CD8+ cytotoxic T lymphocytes could be useful in the event of irAEs and helpful to discriminate them from other conditions such as AIH. Differences between ICI-induced liver toxicity and AIH are depicted in Table 2.

Whether immune-mediated hepatitis results in the development of fibrosis is still unknown. Kleiner and colleagues found some degree of fibrosis in 2 out of 5 patients treated with ICI: one patient displayed perisinusoidal and periportal fibrosis, and the other post-necrotic fibrosis (which sometimes follows acute hepatitis). In our series of 16 patients, we observed only one case where the patient was affected by grade 4, difficult-to-treat hepatitis and developed portal fibrosis. The course of this disease was followed by performing 3 serial liver biopsies.

No histological findings have been reported to date in patients with liver toxicity developing in a cirrhotic liver. In our very preliminary experience, we found similar histological features in cirrhotic liver as observed in non-cirrhotic liver.

Should a liver biopsy form part of the work-up? Indeed, histology can offer much information regarding the diagnosis of ICI-related hepatitis and the severity of liver tissue injury; together with clinical and biological features, a biopsy can guide the decision on whether or not to introduce corticosteroids. That said, at present, a liver biopsy should be reserved for patients with more severe liver toxicity (grade ≥3) or an uncertain diagnosis. While liver toxicity under ICI remains poorly understood, a biopsy may be useful to improve our knowledge and thus optimise management.

**Evaluation of severity**

Evaluating the severity of clinical liver toxicity is of primary importance as it will guide patient management. The method used to grade toxicity, applied during all clinical trials of ICI and used by oncologists in clinical practice, is the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) developed by the National Cancer Institute (Table S4).

However, this classification may not always be adequate to evaluate liver toxicity as it may overestimate the severity of the disease. This is particularly true when it is compared to the drug-induced liver injury network (DILIN) classification. For example, under the CTCAE classification, an elevation of transaminases to more than 20x the upper limit of normal without a rise in bilirubin levels or an impairment of coagulation is considered as grade 4 toxicity, which corresponds to a life-threatening event. From a hepatological standpoint, acute hepatitis is considered severe if the INR is ≥1.5, and fulminant if impaired coagulation is accompanied by hepatic encephalopathy. Histological findings do not always reflect the clinical severity of ICI-related toxicity when compared to other chronic liver diseases.

**Management**

According to the guidelines of the Society for Immunotherapy of Cancer (SITC) and the European Society of Medical Oncology (ESMO), liver toxicity should be treated by pausing immunotherapy and administering corticosteroids from grade 2 liver injury. The corticosteroid dose may rise in proportion to the grade of hepatitis up to a maximum of 2 mg/kg/day. Immunotherapy should be withdrawn temporarily in the case of grade 2 and 3, but permanently discontinued in the event of grade 4 hepatitis. This approach was confirmed by more recent guidelines from the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO). However, several teams have demonstrated that this approach is not supported by clinical evidence and liver test findings may rapidly improve when immunotherapy is stopped, without the addition of corticosteroids. This is particularly important in view of the increased infection risk in patients receiving ICI. Treatment with budesonide, a drug with 90% hepatic clearance and metabolism, has not been evaluated.

The time to resolution of non-hepatic irAEs in patients under corticosteroids is generally around 2 weeks. The time to resolution of hepatic irAEs varies considerably; it has been reported as ranging from 3 to 104 days in different case reports and series. Corticosteroids at doses higher than 60 mg/day appear to have no benefit regarding the time to the resolution of hepatitis when compared to 1 mg/kg/day or higher. Unexpectedly, Gauci et al. reported a longer time to resolution in patients who received corticosteroids than in those who did not (median 8.6 vs. 4.7 days), probably because the hepatitis was more severe in the former group.

Patients with cirrhosis present a different scenario because their liver function may be impaired before ICI are initiated. A management algorithm for these patients has recently been proposed. Even in the setting of cirrhosis, corticosteroid therapy is not always recommended. Liver tests are usually abnormal in patients with cirrhosis before the introduction of ICIs, so the severity of toxicity and the decision regarding whether to introduce corticosteroids is based on the gradual rate of transaminase elevation or the presence of features of hepatic failure.

**Patients with hepatitis refractory to corticosteroids**

Some patients whose liver function tests worsen despite adequate corticosteroid therapy are considered refractory to this treatment. In these cases, a second immunosuppressive drug can be added, the most widely used being mycophenolate mofetil (MMF). Azathioprine has also been used with success. In a few clinical observations, the use of calcineurin inhibitors (cyclosporine and tacrolimus) has also been described as effective. The use of thymoglobulin combined with methylprednisolone and MMF for refractory hepatitis has been reported in 4 patients.

Infliximab therapy was used successfully in 2 patients, but it is not the best second-line immunosuppressive option in view of potential liver toxicity and increased risk of infection in the setting of prolonged corticosteroid therapy.

**Proposed management algorithm**

In 2018, we proposed a management protocol for patients who experience severe liver toxicity due to ICI administered for non-liver malignancies. Based on our experience and on the recent literature, this algorithm has since evolved and now integrates recommendations regarding the reintroduction of immunotherapy (Fig. 5 and Table S5).

The decision to start corticosteroids is based on: worsening of liver tests, histological confirmation of hepatic irAEs and severity, elevation of bilirubin ≥2.5 mg/dl and impaired coagulopathy proven by an INR ≥1.5, which is the cut-off defining the severity
of acute hepatitis. Corticosteroid therapy is clearly indicated in these patients. Ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA) may be added in those with biological features of cholestasis. In patients whose liver tests do not improve under corticosteroids despite increasing doses, MMF should be introduced. In patients not responding to MMF, tacrolimus with a trough level of between 5–7 ng/ml can be used. In exceptional cases of hepatic encephalopathy, plasmapheresis or anti-thymoglobulin can be discussed during multidisciplinary meetings and in expert centres. Patients with a predominant cholestasis, with minimal/no elevation in

**Fig. 5. Proposal for the management of patients who experience ICI-related grade ≥3 hepatitis.** *Steroid tapering proposal see Table S2. **Wait until MMF and steroid discontinuation. Resume anti-PD-1 or anti-PD-L1 alone; permanently discontinue anti-CTLA-4; if UDCA administered resume ICI under UDCA. CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein 4; ICI, immune checkpoint inhibitor; LFTs, liver function tests; MMF, mycophenolate mofetil; PD-1, programmed cell death 1; PD-L1, programmed cell death 1 ligand 1; UDCA, ursodeoxycholic acid.

- Cytolysis and/or cholestasis grade ≥3
- Rule out common causes of acute hepatitis/tumour infiltration/biliary obstruction
- Monitor liver tests every 2-3 days
- Liver tests worsening within 7 days + histological confirmation of immune-mediated hepatitis and/or bilirubin ≥2.5 mg/dl or INR ≥1.5
- Monitor liver tests every 2-3 days for 15 days
- 1. Start steroids 0.5 mg/kg/d or 1 mg/kg/d if severe
   2. Add UDCA 500 mg bid if cholestasis
   - IMPROVEMENT
     - YES: Taper over 6-8 weeks*
     - NO: Resume ICI when LFTs grade 1 or normal**
   - IMPROVEMENT
     - YES: Taper over 10-12 weeks*
     - NO: Resume ICI when LFTs normal**
   - Add MMF 1 g bid
   - IMPROVEMENT
     - YES: Taper over 10-12 weeks*
     - NO: Resume ICI when LFTs normal**
   - Stop MMF
     - Add tacrolimus (trough level 5-7 ng/ml)
   - IMPROVEMENT
     - YES: Permanently discontinue ICI
   - NO: Discuss ATG/plasmapheresis in expert liver centre

---

**Table S2.** Steroid tapering proposal

| Day | Dose |
|-----|------|
| 1   | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 2   | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 3   | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 4   | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 5   | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 6   | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 7   | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 8   | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 9   | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 10  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 11  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 12  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 13  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 14  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 15  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 16  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 17  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 18  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 19  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 20  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 21  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 22  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 23  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 24  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 25  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 26  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 27  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 28  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 29  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |
| 30  | 0.5 mg/kg/d |

---
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transaminases and without increased bilirubin, should be treated with UDCA alone as first-line treatment. Corticosteroids should be added if liver tests worsen or do not improve. We believe that the management of ICI-induced liver toxicity should be guided by multidisciplinary discussions involving different specialists such as oncologists, hepatologists, immunologists, radiologists and pathologists.\(^{114}\)

**Impact of corticosteroids on the response to immunotherapy**

It appears that using systemic corticosteroids or a second-line immunosuppressive drug did not significantly impact overall survival (OS) during several clinical trials.\(^{115}\) It has been reported quite recently that patients who experienced severe irAEs (grade ≥3) may even have an improved overall response rate and longer median time to progression compared to those without grade ≥3 irAEs, despite the use of corticosteroids.\(^{116}\)

The development of irAEs was associated with a clinical benefit in patients with gastric cancer,\(^{117}\) non-small cell lung cancer,\(^{118}\) and melanoma\(^{119}\) who were receiving nivolumab as monotherapy, but corticosteroids had no impact, although their use was not an end-point in these studies. Meanwhile, poor outcomes have been reported in patients receiving steroids (equivalent of ≥10 mg/day of prednisone) during nivolumab treatment for non-small cell lung cancer.\(^{120}\)

Studies are necessary to address this specific issue.

**Reintroduction of immunotherapy after liver toxicity**

According to ESMO guidelines, it is possible to re-introduce ICIs following immune-mediated hepatitis; their use is left at the physician’s discretion for grade 3 hepatitis but banned in grade 4 hepatitis. Several examples of re-challenge have been reported in the literature, with hepatitis recurrence rates ranging from 0 to 60%, differentially distributed as a function of the type of molecule used.\(^{106,107,70,13,116}\) However, when we pooled all the cases reported in the literature regarding a re-challenge with ICIs after liver toxicity, we found that among 58 retreated patients, 11 (19%) experienced a recurrence of liver toxicity. When we looked solely at patients who had experienced initial toxicity of grade ≥3 (a total of 29 patients) the recurrence rate rose to 40% (Table 3).

Three important questions regarding the resumption of immunotherapy remain: the type of ICI that can be administered, the interval elapsing between the resolution of hepatitis and the reintroduction of ICI, and the benefits of immunosuppressive prophylaxis.

Which ICI should be reintroduced is obviously critical. A re-challenge with the combination of anti-PD-1 and anti-CTLA-4 antibodies after hepatitis or another irAE carries a high risk of recurrent toxicity.\(^{122}\) The reintroduction of an anti-CTLA-4 antibody in a patient with previous immune-mediated hepatitis under anti-PD-1 treatment was seen to be associated with the development of fulminant hepatitis, although this thankfully improved with the use of plasmapheresis.\(^{82}\) However, re-challenge with an anti-PD-1 antibody in 4 patients out of 21 with previous liver toxicity under anti-CTLA-4 and anti-PD-1 combination therapy did not cause a recurrence of hepatitis.\(^{74}\)

Because the data on reintroduction are limited, some interesting findings can be discussed in the context of sequential therapies. Interestingly, grade ≥3 ALT and AST elevations were shown to be more frequent in patients who received nivolumab first and then ipilimumab, compared to patients who received ipilimumab followed by nivolumab.\(^{123}\) Similarly, a more frequent onset of irAEs in patients treated with ipilimumab after nivolumab has been reported.\(^{124}\) Serra-Bellver et al. hypothesised that

---

### Table 2. Comparison of characteristics between ICI-induced liver toxicity and autoimmune hepatitis.

|                     | ICI-induced liver toxicity | Autoimmune hepatitis |
|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| **Presentation**    | Heterogeneous             | Heterogeneous        |
| **Gender prevalence** | None                      | Female               |
| **Clinical symptoms** | Non-specific              | Non-specific         |
|                    | Possibly asymptomatic     |                      |
| **Biology**         |                          |                      |
|   AST/ALT elevation | Present                   | Present              |
|   GGTL/ALP elevation| Present                   | Present              |
|   Bilirubin elevation| Rare                      | Possible             |
| **Immunology**      |                          |                      |
|   Anti-nuclear antibodies | Possibly positive (about 50% of patients), speckled | Positive, high titre, homogeneous pattern |
|   Anti-smooth muscles antibodies | Positive (non-anti-F actin) | Positive, high titre, anti-F actin |
|   Anti-LKM 1 antibodies | Negative                  | Positive              |
|   IgG                | Usually normal            | Elevated             |
| **Histology**       |                          |                      |
|   Plasmocytes        | Absent or rare            | Frequent             |
|   Lobular inflammation| Present                   | Present              |
|   Portal tract inflammation| Present                  | Present              |
|   Confluent necrosis | Rare                      | Present              |
|   Granuloma          | Often present in patients on anti-CTLA-4 | Absent |
|   Cholangitis        | Present – cholangitis form| Rarely present (look for PBC, PSC overlap) |
|   Chronic hepatitis/cirrhosis | Absent                 | Frequently present |
|   CD4+/CD20+         | Rare                      | Present              |
|   CD8+              | Present                   | Rare                 |
| **Therapy**         |                          |                      |
|   Corticosteroids    | Not always needed         | Needed               |
|   Long-term therapy  | No                        | Yes                  |
|   Corticosteroid discontinuation | Yes                | Possible in selected patients |
| **Risk of recurrence: rare** |                      | Risk of recurrence: high |

ALP, alkaline phosphatase; AIH, autoimmune hepatitis; Anti-LKM, anti-liver kidney microsome antibodies; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein 4; GGT, gamma-glutamyltransferase; ICI, immune checkpoint inhibitor; PBC, primary biliary cholangitis; PSC, primary sclerosing cholangitis.
this was caused by the prolonged activity of the anti-PD-1 drug during the introduction of the anti-CTLA-4 antibody.\textsuperscript{125} Although the half-life of nivolumab is 17–25 days, PD-1 remains on circulating T cells at a mean plateau of 72% for at least 59 days, and PD-1 blockade persists even when serum concentrations of nivolumab are undetectable.\textsuperscript{126} This means that because of the prolonged activity of anti-PD-1 antibodies, if a patient is subsequently receiving anti-CTLA-4 monotherapy, it is as if he or she was on combination therapy. According to the guidelines, a resumption of ICIs can be discussed when liver test values return to grade <1. The aim is to restart immunotherapy with a low risk of ICI-related toxicity. Data on the timing of reintroduction are scarce. The interval elapsing between the final dose of anti-CTLA4 + anti-PD-1 and the resumption of anti-PD-1 was slightly longer in patients without toxicities than in those with toxicities (median 62 vs. 56 days, \( p = 0.03 \)).\textsuperscript{110} In a study that evaluated resuming the same ICI, the interval between anti-PD-1 or anti-PD-L1 administration and the first irAE was shorter among patients who experienced a recurrence than in those with no recurrence (9 vs. 15 days, \( p = 0.04 \)).\textsuperscript{112} Although these observations do not specifically refer to the liver, this finding should be kept in mind when discussing the reintroduction of ICIs.

Whether prophylactic therapy can prevent a recurrence of hepatitis is a matter of debate. Surprisingly, in the series studied by Pollack et al., patients who were on corticosteroids at the resumption of anti-PD-1, following the development of an irAE under anti-PD-1 and anti-CTLA-4 combination therapy, experienced a higher rate of toxicity than those who had discontinued corticosteroids (55% vs. 31%, \( p = 0.03 \)).\textsuperscript{110}

In 2 patients who experienced grade 3 hepatitis under nivolumab and responded to treatment with corticosteroids and UDCA, nivolumab was resumed successfully under budesonide and UDCA prophylaxis.\textsuperscript{127} This finding needs to be confirmed.

Future development of immunotherapy: combination therapies

Treatments for solid tumours have dramatically improved in recent years through the use of ICIs. However, ICIs only benefit a subgroup of patients with an objective response rate (ORR) of 15% to 25%, or less in some refractory tumours such as pancreatic or prostate cancers. Furthermore, abnormal tumour vascularisation in the microenvironment exerts negative effects on the efficacy of anticancer therapies (including immunotherapies) via different immunosuppressive molecular and cellular mechanisms. Therefore, strategies to induce vascular normalisation (i.e. combining ICIs and antiangiogenic agents) may enhance the benefits of immunotherapy and constitute the rationale for most ongoing trials (Table S6) (adapted from Jain et al.\textsuperscript{128}). Consequently, these benefits may be weighed against the added toxicity of ICIs and of antiangiogenic agents. Moreover, it is still unknown whether the combination of antiangiogenic agent-related toxicity and ICI-related irAEs may reflect a greater benefit in terms of efficacy than that reported for irAEs alone (i.e. increased OS and progression-free survival [PFS] for endocrinal and dermatological irAEs, for low grade irAEs and in case of PD-1 inhibitor use).\textsuperscript{129} The toxicity of concurrent ICIs and antiangiogenic monoclonal antibodies (pembrolizumab/nivolumab and bevacizumab) seems to be relatively low, although the data are limited. In contrast, the incidence of severe treatment-related adverse events (trAEs) tended to rise in line with the dose of bevacizumab when combined with ipilimumab, while the incidence of some special interest irAEs (i.e. dermatological or gastrointestinal side effects) was not increased.

A meta-analysis that included 1,958 patients from 13 studies recently reported the efficacy and safety of combining ICIs and antiangiogenic agents in the treatment of advanced HCC.\textsuperscript{130} The ORR, disease control rate (DCR) and PFS of combined treatment cohorts were significantly improved vs. those of anti-PD-1/PD-L1 cohorts (ORR \( p = 0.016 \); DCR \( p < 0.001 \); PFS \( p < 0.001 \)). In addition, comparable incidence rates of trAEs were seen in the ICI monotherapy and combined treatment cohorts (74.4% vs. 84.3%) but with an increased incidence of grade \( \geq 3 \) trAEs in the latter (18% vs. 32.7%; \( p = 0.014 \)). Finally, patients with PD-L1-positive HCC had a significantly increased ORR when treated with nivolumab (odds ratio 2.32; 95% CI 1.43–3.77; \( p < 0.05 \)).\textsuperscript{130} More recently, in a global, open-label, phase III trial in patients with cirrhosis and unresectable HCC, atezolizumab combined with bevacizumab resulted in better OS and PFS outcomes than sorafenib.\textsuperscript{13} In this trial, the incidence of upper gastrointestinal bleeding observed in the combined treatment arm was 7% vs. 4.5% in the sorafenib arm. In addition, serious adverse events occurred more frequently with atezolizumab-bevacizumab (38%) than with sorafenib alone (30.8%). Concerning the liver, adverse events and more specifically grade \( \geq 3 \) AST/ALT and bilirubin elevations were quite similar between treatment arms. Such an increase in trAEs has also...
been observed during other trials using atezolizumab combined with bevacizumab.\textsuperscript{131,132} However, the addition of bevacizumab to atezolizumab did not significantly increase the incidence of irAEs and no unexpected patterns of toxicity were reported with this combination therapy.\textsuperscript{133} The toxicity results regarding combination anti-PD-1 and TKI therapy were conflicting and some severe trAEs appeared to be largely linked to the TKI rather than being true acquired irAEs. Overall, the incidence of severe trAEs appeared to be slightly higher inICI + TKI arms than in ICI + monoclonal antibody arms.

**Conclusion and future**

ICI-induced liver toxicity is a rare complication of cancer immunotherapy which is extremely heterogeneous in its presentation and severity. Although knowledge of this complication is improving, several questions remain unanswered. Specific diagnostic tools are still required, the classification of toxicity grades must be rethought from a hepatological standpoint and management remains challenging, as it needs to balance the resolution of toxicity with the use of lifesaving treatment; the systematic use of corticosteroids seems to be a simplistic solution that is not always necessary. The use of ICI therapy, increasingly in combination with other therapies, is becoming more widespread. Liver toxicity is not a limiting factor for ICI use, however, it should be considered and better understood. Finding the minimum dose of ICIs with the best efficacy should be considered in the future design of trials to reduce the incidence and severity of hepatic irAEs. Further studies are required to elucidate the pathophysiological mechanisms and risk factors underlying toxicity, as well as to validate predictors of resolution and recurrence (in case immunotherapy is resumed).

**Abbreviations**

AHI, autoimmune hepatitis; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AIP, alkaline phosphatase; AMA, anti-mitochondrial antibodies; ANA, anti-nuclear antibodies; anti-LKM, anti-liver-kidney microsomal antibodies; anti-LC1, anti-liver cytosol type-1 antibodies; ASMA, anti-smooth muscles antibodies; anti-SLA, anti-soluble liver antigen antibodies; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein 4; DCR, disease control rate; DILI, drug-induced liver injury; GGT, gamma-glutamyltransferase; HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma; ICI, immune checkpoint inhibitor; INR, international normalised ratio; irAE, immune-related adverse event; MMF, mycophenolate mofetil; ORR, objective response rate; OS, overall survival; PD-1, programmed cell death 1; PD-L1-2, programmed cell death ligands 1–2; PFS, progression-free survival; TKI, tyrosine kinase inhibitor; trAE, treatment-related adverse event; UDCA, ursodeoxycholic acid; ULN, upper limit of normal.

**Conflict of interest**

EDM: nothing to disclose; JMM: Principal/sub-Investigator of Clinical Trials for: Abbvie, Agios, Amgen, Argen-x, Astex, AstraZeneca, Daiichi Sankyo, Debiopharm, Eisai, Eoxelitis, Forma, Genentech, Janssen, Kyowa, Lilly, Lyxarc, Lytix Biopharma, Medimmune, Roche, Sanofi, Xencor. PERSONAL FEES (Monies paid to you for services rendered, generally honoraria, royalties or fees for consulting, lectures, speakers bureaus, expert testimony, employment, ad-boards, etc.): Celgene, Bristol-Myers Squibb, AstraZeneca, Janssen. NON-FINANCIAL SUPPORT (Drugs, equipment supplied by the entity, travel paid by the entity, writing assistance, administrative support, etc.): AstraZeneca, Roche, Novartis, Gilead, Celgene, Bristol-Myers Squibb; OR: PERSONAL FEES (Monies paid to you for services rendered, generally honoraria, royalties or fees for consulting, lectures, speakers bureaus, expert testimony, employment, ad-boards, etc.) and Principal/sub-Investigator of Clinical Trials for: Cytxte, Bayer, Eisai, Roche, BMS; CG: nothing to disclose; DS: nothing to disclose.

Please refer to the accompanying ICMJE disclosure forms for further details.

**Authors’ contributions**

EDM: performed the systematic review of the literature, drafted and revised the manuscript; JMM: performed the systematic review of the literature and drafted the manuscript; OR: performed the systemic review of the literature, drafted and revised the manuscript; CG: provide histological images, revised the manuscript; DS: supervised, drafted and revised the manuscript.

**Supplementary data**

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhepr.2020.100170.

References

**Author names in bold designate shared co-first authorship**

[1] Okoye IS, Houghton M, Tyrrell L, Barakat K, Elahi S. Coinhibitory receptor expression and immune checkpoint blockade: maintaining a balance in CD8(+ ) T cell responses to chronic viral infections and cancer. Front Immunol 2017;8:1215.

[2] Champiat S, Lambotte O, Barreau E, Belkhir R, Berdelou A, Carbonnel F, et al. Management of immune checkpoint blockade dysimmune toxicities: a collaborative position paper. Ann Oncol 2016;27:559–574.

[3] Michot JMM, Bignonwald C, Champiat S, Collins M, Carbonnel F, Postel-Vinay S, et al. Immune-related adverse events with immune checkpoint blockade: a comprehensive review. Eur J Cancer 2016;54:139–148.

[4] Postow MA, Sidlow R, Hellmann MD. Immune-related adverse events associated with immune checkpoint blockade. N Engl J Med 2018;378:158–168.

[5] Borghaei H, Paz-Ares L, Horn L, Spigel DR, Steins M, Ready NE, et al. Nivolumab versus docetaxel in advanced nonsquamous non-small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med 2015;373:1627–1639.

[6] Gauci ML, Lanoy E, Champiat S, Caramella C, Ammari S, Aspeslagh S, et al. Long-term survival in patients responding to anti-PD-1/PD-L1 therapy and disease outcome upon treatment discontinuation. Clin Cancer Res 2019;25:946–956.

[7] Larkin J, Chiarion-Sileni V, Gonzalez R, Grob JJ, Rutkowski P, Lao CD, et al. Five-year survival with combined nivolumab and ipilimumab in advanced melanoma. N Engl J Med 2019;381:1535–1546.

[8] Martins F, Sofiya L, Sykiotis GP, Lamine F, Maillard M, Fraga M, et al. Adverse effects of immune-checkpoint inhibitors: epidemiology, management and surveillance. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 2019;16:563–580.

[9] Finn RS, Qin S, Ikeda M, Galle PR, Dureux M, Kim TY, et al. Atezolizumab plus bevacizumab in unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma. N Engl J Med 2020;382:1894–1905.

[10] Kansara RR, Speziali C. Immunotherapy in hematologic malignancies. Curr Oncol 2020;27:S124–S131.

[11] Ramos-Casals M, Brahmer JR, Callahan MK, Flores-Chávez A, Keegan N, Houghton M, Tyrrell L, Barakat K, Elahi S. Coinhibitory receptor expression and immune checkpoint blockade: maintaining a balance in CD8(+ ) T cell responses to chronic viral infections and cancer. Front Immunol 2017;8:1215.

[12] Ramos-Casals M, Maria A, Suárez-Almazor ME, Lambotte O, Fisher BA, Khamashta MA, et al. Immune-related adverse events of checkpoint blockade inhibitors. Data from the International ImmunoCancer Registry (ICIR). Clin Exp Rheumatol 2019;37(Suppl 118):114–127.

[13] Yshii LM, Hohlfeld R, Liblau RS. Inflammatory CNS disease caused by checkpoint inhibitors. Management and surveillance. Nat Rev Neurol 2016;12:760–763.

[14] Yshii LM, Hohlfeld R, Liblau RS. Inflammatory CNS disease caused by checkpoint inhibitors. Management and surveillance. Nat Rev Neurol 2016;12:760–763.

[15] Grabie N, Gotsman I, DaCosta R, Pang H, Stavrakis G, Butte MJ, et al. Endothelial programmed death-1 ligand 1 (PD-L1) regulates CD8+ T-cell-mediated injury in the heart. Circulation 2007;116:2062–2071.
[16] Das R, Bar N, Ferreira M, Newman AM, Zhang L, Bailur JK, et al. Early B cell changes predict autoimmunity following combination immunotherapy. J Clin Invest 2018;128:715–720.

[17] Chaput N, Lepage P, Couturaz C, Soulairac E, Le Roux K, Monot C, et al. Baseline gut microbiota predicts clinical response and colitis in metastatic melanoma patients treated with ipilimumab. Ann Oncol 2017;28:1368–1379.

[18] Manson G, Maria ATJ, Poizzeau F, Danlos FX, Kostine M,_Brosseau S, et al. Worsening and newly diagnosed paraneoplastic syndromes following anti-PD-1 or anti-PD-L1 immunotherapies, a descriptive study. J Immunother Cancer 2019;7:337.

[19] Yang H, Yao Z, Zhou X, Zhang W, Zhang X, Zhang F. Immune-related adverse events of checkpoint inhibitors: insights into immunological dysregulation. Clin Immunol 2020;213:108377.

[20] Kuchar P, Saini S, Prabhakar BS. Cancer immunotherapy with check point inhibitor can cause autoimmune adverse events due to loss of Treg homeostasis. Semin Cancer Biol 2020;64:29–35.

[21] Kimbara S, Fujiwara Y, Iwama S, Ohashi K, Kuchiba A, Arima H, et al. Association of antithyroglobulin antibodies with the development of thyroid dysfunction induced by nivolumab. Cancer Sci 2018;109:3583–3590.

[22] Tsuchiya S, Sugawara S, Sugisaka J, Ono H, Kawashima Y, Aiba T, et al. Profiling preexisting antibodies in patients treated with anti-PD-1 therapy for advanced non-small cell lung cancer. JAMA Oncol 2019;5:376–383.

[23] Oh DY, Cham J, Zhang L, Gong F, Kwek SS, Klinger M, et al. Immune toxicities elicited by CTLA-4 blockade in cancer patients are associated with early diversification of the T-cell repertoire. Cancer Res 2017;77:1322–1330.

[24] Park W, Mezquita L, Okabe N, Chae YK, Kwon D, Saravia D, et al. Association of the prognostic model iSEND with PD-1/L1 mono-therapy outcome in non-small-cell lung cancer. Br J Cancer 2020;122:340–347.

[25] EASL Clinical Practice Guidelines: Drug-induced liver injury. J Hepatol 2017;28:1368–1379.

[26] Kuchar P, Saini S, Prabhakar BS. Cancer immunotherapy with check point inhibitor can cause autoimmune adverse events due to loss of Treg homeostasis. Semin Cancer Biol 2020;64:29–35.

[27] Lim SY, Das R, Saini S, Gide TN, Menzies AM, Guminski A, Carlino MS, et al. Peripheral blood markers identify risk of immune-related toxicity in advanced non-small cell lung cancer treated with immune-checkpoint inhibitors. Oncologist 2019;24:1128–1136.

[28] Tarhini AA, Zahoor H, Lin Y, Malhotra U, Sander C, Butter Pavan A, Calvetti L, Dal Maso A, Attili I, Del Bianco P, Pasello G, et al. Pembrolizumab in combination with chemotherapy in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer treated with anti-CTLA4 blockade. J Transl Med 2018;16:94.

[29] Cowey CL, et al. Nivolumab plus ipilimumab in advanced melanoma. N Engl J Med 2017;377:1345–1356.

[30] EASL Clinical Practice Guidelines: Drug-induced liver injury. J Hepatol 2017;66:545–551.

[31] EASL Clinical Practice Guidelines: Drug-induced liver injury. J Hepatol 2017;28:1368–1379.

[32] Brown ZJ, Heinrich B, Steinberg SM, Yu SJ, Greten TF. Safety in treatment of hepato cellular carcinoma (HCC): phase I/II study of durvalumab and tremelimumab in patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC): phase I safety and efficacy analyses. J Clin Oncol 2017;35:4073.

[33] Lake AC. Hepatitis B Reactivation in a long-term nonprogressor due to nivolumab therapy. AIDS 2017;31:2115–2118.

[34] Koksal AS, Tuba E, Beminier AT, Baciakiewicz B, Uslan MI, Parlak E. HBV-related acute hepatitis due to immune checkpoint inhibitors in a patient with malignant melanoma. Ann Oncol 2017;28:3103–3104.

[35] Pandey A, Ezemenari S, Liaukovich M, Richard I, Boris A. A rare case of pembrolizumab-induced reactivation of hepatitis B. Case Rep Oncol Med 2018;2018:958313.

[36] Sangro B, Gomez-Martin C, de la Mata M, Ibrahimaiqaei M, Garralda E, Barreca P, et al. A clinical trial of CTLA-4 blockade with tremelimumab in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma and chronic Hepatitis C. J Hepatology 2013;59:81–88.

[37] Lake AC. Hepatitis B Reactivation in a long-term nonprogressor due to nivolumab therapy. AIDS 2017;31:2115–2118.

[38] Davar D, Wilson M, Pruckner C, Kirkwood JM. PD-1 blockade in advanced melanoma in patients with hepatitis C and/or HIV. Case Rep Oncol Med 2015;2015:737389.

[39] Lombardi A, Mondelli M. Review article: immune checkpoint inhibitors and the liver, from therapeutic efficacy to side effects. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2019;50:872–884.

[40] Cook MR, Kim C. Safety and efficacy of immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy in patients with HIV infection and advanced-stage cancer: a systematic review. JAMA Oncol 2015;5:1049–1054.

[41] Danlos F-X, Voisin A-L, Dyevre V, Michot J-M, Routier E, Taillede L, et al. Safety and efficacy of anti-programmed death 1 antibodies in patients with cancer and pre-existing autoimmunity or inflammatory disease. Eur J Cancer 2018;91:21–29.

[42] Kähler KC, Eigentler TK, Gesierich A, Heinzerling L, Loquai C, Meier F, et al. Ipilimumab administration for advanced melanoma in patients with pre-existing antibodies in patients treated with anti-PD-1 antibody. J Immunother Cancer 2014;2:33.

[43] Pandey A, Ezemenari S, Liaukovich M, Richard I, Boris A. A rare case of pembrolizumab-induced reactivation of hepatitis B. Case Rep Oncol Med 2018;2018:958313.

[44] Sangro B, Gomez-Martin C, de la Mata M, Ibrahimaiqaei M, Garralda E, Barreca P, et al. A clinical trial of CTLA-4 blockade with tremelimumab in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma and chronic Hepatitis C. J Hepatology 2013;59:81–88.

[45] Minter S, Willner I, Shirai K. Ipilimumab-induced hepatitis C viral suppression. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:307–308.

[46] Davar D, Wilson M, Pruckner C, Kirkwood JM. PD-1 blockade in advanced melanoma in patients with hepatitis C and/or HIV. Case Rep Oncol Med 2015;2015:737389.

[47] Lombardi A, Mondelli M. Review article: immune checkpoint inhibitors and the liver, from therapeutic efficacy to side effects. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2019;50:872–884.

[48] Cook MR, Kim C. Safety and efficacy of immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy in patients with HIV infection and advanced-stage cancer: a systematic review. JAMA Oncol 2015;5:1049–1054.

[49] Danlos F-X, Voisin A-L, Dyevre V, Michot J-M, Routier E, Taillede L, et al. Safety and efficacy of anti-programmed death 1 antibodies in patients with cancer and pre-existing autoimmunity or inflammatory disease. Eur J Cancer 2018;91:21–29.

[50] Kähler KC, Eigentler TK, Gesierich A, Heinzerling L, Loquai C, Meier F, et al. Ipilimumab administration for advanced melanoma in patients with pre-existing antibodies in patients treated with anti-PD-1 antibody. J Immunother Cancer 2014;2:33.

[51] Minter S, Willner I, Shirai K. Ipilimumab-induced hepatitis C viral suppression. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:307–308.

[52] Davar D, Wilson M, Pruckner C, Kirkwood JM. PD-1 blockade in advanced melanoma in patients with hepatitis C and/or HIV. Case Rep Oncol Med 2015;2015:737389.

[53] Lombardi A, Mondelli M. Review article: immune checkpoint inhibitors and the liver, from therapeutic efficacy to side effects. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2019;50:872–884.

[54] Cook MR, Kim C. Safety and efficacy of immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy in patients with HIV infection and advanced-stage cancer: a systematic review. JAMA Oncol 2015;5:1049–1054.

[55] Danlos F-X, Voisin A-L, Dyevre V, Michot J-M, Routier E, Taillede L, et al. Safety and efficacy of anti-programmed death 1 antibodies in patients with cancer and pre-existing autoimmunity or inflammatory disease. Eur J Cancer 2018;91:21–29.

[56] Kähler KC, Eigentler TK, Gesierich A, Heinzerling L, Loquai C, Meier F, et al. Ipilimumab administration for advanced melanoma in patients with pre-existing antibodies in patients treated with anti-PD-1 antibody. J Immunother Cancer 2014;2:33.

[57] Minter S, Willner I, Shirai K. Ipilimumab-induced hepatitis C viral suppression. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:307–308.

[58] Davar D, Wilson M, Pruckner C, Kirkwood JM. PD-1 blockade in advanced melanoma in patients with hepatitis C and/or HIV. Case Rep Oncol Med 2015;2015:737389.

[59] Lombardi A, Mondelli M. Review article: immune checkpoint inhibitors and the liver, from therapeutic efficacy to side effects. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2019;50:872–884.

[60] Cook MR, Kim C. Safety and efficacy of immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy in patients with HIV infection and advanced-stage cancer: a systematic review. JAMA Oncol 2015;5:1049–1054.
De Martin E, Michot J-M, Papouin B, Champiat S, Mateus C, Lambotte O, Kuraoka N, Hara K, Terai S, Yatabe Y, Horio Y. Peroral cholangioscopy of Kashima J, Okuma Y, Shimizuguchi R, Chiba K. Bile duct obstruction in a Cheung V Sznol M, Ferrucci PF, Hogg D, Atkins MB, Wolter P, Guidoboni M, et al. Kleiner DE, Berman D. Pathologic changes in ipilimumab-related hepatitis. Huffman BM, Kottschade LA, Kamath PS, Markovic SN. Hepatotoxicity Nordness MF, Hamel S, Godfrey CM, Shi C, Johnson DB, Goff LW, et al. Bhave P, Buckle A, Sandhu S, Sood S. Mortality due to immunotherapy Sarmen S, Tara S. Acute liver failure from anti-PD-1 antibody nivolumab. DeLeon T, Salomao MA, Aqel BA, Sonbol MB, Yokoda RT, Ali AH, et al. Munker S, De Toni EN. Use of checkpoint inhibitors in liver transplant recipients. United European Gastroenterol J 2018;6:970–973. Biondani P, De Martin E, Samuel D. Safety of an anti-PD-1 immune Cunningham B, Jaffee E, Brown P, Bond J,车 E, et al. Immune-related hepatitis related to checkpoint inhibitors: clinical and prognostic factors. Liver Int 2020. Huffman BM, Kottschade LA, Kamath PS, Markovic SN. Hepatotoxicity after immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy in melanoma: natural progression and management. Am J Clin Oncol 2018;41:760–765. Eggermont AMM, Chiarion-Sileni V, Grob JJ, Dummet R, Wolchok JD, Schmidt H, et al. Prolonged survival in stage III melanoma with ipilimumab adjuvant therapy. N Engl J Med 2016;375:1845–1855. Guacci M-L, Baroudjian B, Zeboulon C, Pages C, Poté N, Roux O, et al. Immune-related hepatitis with immunotherapy: are corticosteroids always needed? J Hepatol 2018;69:548–550. Vozy A, De Martin E, Johnson DB, Lebrun-Vignes B, Moslehi JJ, Saleem J-E. Increased reporting of fatal hepatitis associated with immune checkpoint inhibitors. Eur J Cancer 2019;123:112–115. Sznl M, Ferrucc Pf, Hogg D, Atkins MB, Wolter P, Guidoboni M, et al. Pooled analysis safety profile of nivolumab and ipilimumab combination therapy in patients with advanced melanoma. J Clin Oncol 2018;36:371–385. Kleiner DE, Berman D. Pathologic changes in ipilimumab-related hepatitis in patients with metastatic melanoma. Dig Dis Sci 2012;57:2233–2240. Cheung V, Gupta T, Payne M, Middleton MR, Collier JD, Simmons A, et al. Immunotherapy-related hepatitis: real-world experience from a tertiary centre. Frontline Gastroenterol 2019;10:364–371. Gelsomino F, Vitale G. D’Erizzo A, Bertuzzi C, Andreone P, Ardizzone A. Nivolumab-induced cholangitic liver disease: a novel form of serious liver injury. Ann Oncol 2017;28:671–672. Izumi H, Kodani M, Kurai J, Takeda K, Okazaki R, Yamane K, et al. Nivolumab-induced cholangitis in patients with non-small cell lung cancer: case series and a review of literature. Mol Clin Oncol 2019;11:439–446. Kashima J, Okuma Y, Shimizuguchi R, Chiba K. Bile duct obstruction in a patient treated with nivolumab as second-line chemotherapy for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: a case report. Cancer Immunol Immunother 2018;67:61–65. Kuraoka N, Hara K, Terai S, Yatake Y, Horio Y. Peroral cholangioscopy of nivolumab-related (induced) ulcerative cholangitis in a patient with non-small cell lung cancer. Endoscopy 2018;50:E259–E261. Kawakami H, Tanazki J, Tanaka K, Haratani K, Hayashi H, Takeda M, et al. Imaging and clinicopathological features of nivolumab-related cholangitis in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. Invest New Drugs 2018;36:529–535. Sarmen S, Tara S. Acute liver failure from anti-PD-1 antibody nivolumab in a patient with metastatic lung squamous cell carcinoma. Auston Oncol 2016;1:1006. Bhave P, Buckle A, Sandhu S, Sood S. Mortality due to immunotherapy related hepatitis. J Hepatol 2018;69:976–978. Riveiro-Barciela M, Muñoz-Couselo E, Fernandez-Sojo J, Diaz-Meja N, Parra-López R, Buti M. Acute liver failure due to immune-mediated hepatitis successfully treated with plasma exchange: new settings call for new treatment strategies? J Hepatol 2019;70:564–566. Wang DY, Salem J-E, Cohen JV, Chandra S, Menzer C, Ye F, et al. Fatal toxic effects associated with immune checkpoint inhibitors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Oncol 2018:4:1721–1728. Danan G, Benichou C. Causality assessment of adverse reactions to drugs–I. A novel method based on the conclusions of international consensus meetings: application to drug-induced liver injuries. J Clin Epidemiol 1993;46:1323–1330. Benichou C, Danan G, Flahault A. Causality assessment of adverse reactions to drugs–II. An original model for validation of drug causality assessment methods: case reports with positive rechallenge. J Clin Epidemiol 1993;46:1331–1340. Alessandri F, Tirumani SH, Krajewski KM, Shinagare AB, Jagannath JP, Ramajaya NH, et al. Imaging of hepatic toxicity of systemic therapy in a tertiary cancer centre: chemotherapy, haematopoietic stem cell transplantation, molecular targeted therapies, and immune checkpoint inhibitors. Clin Radiol 2017;72:521–533. Mekki A, Dercle L, Lichtenstein P, Marabelle A, Michot J-M, Lambotte O, et al. Detection of immune-related adverse events by medical imaging in patients treated with anti-programmed cell death 1. Eur J Cancer 2018;56:91–104. Kim KW, Ramajaya NH, Krajewski KM, Jagannath JP, Tirumani SH, Srivastava A, et al. Ipilimumab-associated hepatitis: imaging and clinicopathologic findings. Invest New Drugs 2013;31:1071–1077. Johnella M, Misraidj J, Pratt AG, Agoston AT, Lauwers GY, Srivastava A, et al. Ipilimumab-associated hepatitis: clinicopathologic characterization in a series of 11 cases. Am J Surg Pathol 2015;39:1075–1084. Papouin B, Mussini C, De Martin E, Guettier C. Hepatic and digestive adverse events of immune checkpoint inhibitors (anti-CTLA-4 and, anti-PD-1/PD-L1): a clinico-pathological review. Ann Pathol 2018;38:338–351. Everett J, Srivastava A, Misraidj J. Fibrin ring granulomas in checkpoint inhibitor-induced hepatitis. Am J Surg Pathol 2017;41:134–147. Nadeau BA, Fecher LA, Owens SR, Razumilava N. Liver toxicity with cancer checkpoint inhibitor therapy. Semin Liver Dis 2018;38:366–378. Simonelli M, Di Tommaso L, Baretto M, Santoro A. Pathological characterization of nivolumab-related liver injury in a patient with glioblastoma. Immunotherapy 2016;8:1363–1369. Zen Y, Yeh MM. Hepatotoxicity of immune checkpoint inhibitors: a histology study of seven cases in comparison with autoimmune hepatitis and idiopathic drug-induced liver injury. Mod Pathol 2018;31:965–973. LoPiccolo J, Brener MI, Oshima K, Lipson EJ, Hamilton JP. Nodular regenerative hyperplasia associated with immune checkpoint blockade. Hepatology 2018;68:2431–2433. Zen Y, Yeh MM. Checkpoint inhibitor-induced liver injury: a novel form of liver disease emerging in the era of cancer immunotherapy. Semin Diag Pathol 2018;36:434–440. Fontana BJ, Watkins PB, Bonkovsky HL, Chalasani N, Davern T, Serrano J, et al. Drug-Induced Liver Injury Network (DILIN) prospective study: rationale, design and conduct. Drug Saf 2009;32:55–68. EASL Clinical Practical Guidelines on the management of acute (fulminant) liver failure. J Hepatol 2017;66:1047–1081. Puzanov I, Diab A, Abdallah K, Bingham 3rd CO, Brogdon C, Dadu R, et al. Managing toxicities associated with immune checkpoint inhibitors: consensus recommendations from the Society for Immunotherapy of Cancer (SITC) toxicity management working group. J Immunother Cancer 2017;5:95. Haanen JBA, Carbonell F, Robert C, Kerr KM, Peters S, Larink J, et al. Management of toxicities from immunotherapy: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol 2017;28:iv119–iv142. Brahmer JR, Lacchetti C, Schneider BJ, Atkins MB, Brasill KJ, Caterino JM, et al. Management of immune-related adverse events in patients treated with immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy: American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline. J Clin Oncol 2018;36:1714–1768. Del Castillo M, Romero FA, Argüello E, Kyi C, Postow MA, Redelman-Sidi G. The spectrum of serious infections among patients receiving immune checkpoint blockade for the treatment of melanoma. Clin Infect Dis 2016;63:1490–1493.
Review

[103] Hodi FS, O’Day SJ, McDermott DF, Weber RW, Sosman JA, Haanen JB, et al. Improved survival with ipilimumab in patients with metastatic melanoma. N Engl J Med 2010;363:711–723.

[104] Cheng R, Cooper A, Kench J, Watson G, Bye W, McNeil C, et al. Ipilimumab-induced toxicities and the gastroenterologist. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2015;30:657–666.

[105] Tanaka R, Fujisawa Y, Saei I, Maruyama H, Ito S, Hasegawa N, et al. Severe hepatitis arising from ipilimumab administration, following melanoma treatment with nivolumab. Jpn J Clin Oncol 2017;47:175–178.

[106] Iwamoto K, Ichitsuka Y, Tanaka R, Sekine I, Fujimoto M. Azathioprine combination therapy for steroid-refractory hepatic immune system-related adverse events. Eur J Dermatol 2017;27:301–303.

[107] Spänkuch I, Gassenmaier M, Tampouri I, Noor S, Forschner A, Garbe C, et al. Severe hepatotoxicity with triple immunosuppressants therapy. BMJ 2020;370:201–205.

[108] McGuire HM, Shklovskaya E, Edwards J, Trevillian PR, McCAughan GW, Bertolino P, et al. Anti-PD-1-induced high-grade hepatitis associated with corticosteroid-resistant T cells: a case report. Cancer Immunol Immunother 2018;67:563–573.

[109] Sangro B, Chan SL, Meyer T, Reig M, El-Khoueiry A, Galle PR. Diagnosis and management of toxicities of immune checkpoint inhibitors in hepatocellular carcinoma. J Hepatol 2020;72:320–341.

[110] Pollack MH, Betof A, Dearden H, Rapazzo K, Valentine I, Brohl AS, et al. Safety of resuming anti-PD-1 in patients with immune-related adverse events (irAEs) during combined anti-CTLA-4 and anti-PD-1 in metastatic melanoma. Ann Oncol 2018;29:250–255.

[111] Kopecký J, Kubecek O, Geryk T, Podhola M, Ziaran M, Priester P, et al. Hepatic injury induced by a single dose of nivolumab - a case report and literature review. Klin Onkol 2019;32:133–138.

[112] Chmiel KD, Suan D, Liddle C, Nankivell B, Ibrahim R, Bautista C, et al. The 2016-2019 ImmunoTOX assessment board report of collaborative management of immune-related adverse events, need for systemic immunosuppression, and effects on survival and time to treatment failure in patients with melanoma treated with ipilimumab at Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center. J Clin Oncol 2015;33:3193–3198.

[113] Ahmad T, Pandey R, Shah B, Black J. Resolution of ipilimumab induced severe hepatotoxicity with triple immunosuppressants therapy. BMJ Case Rep 2015;2015.

[114] Michot JM, Lappara A, Le Page J, Simonaggio A, Collins M, De Martin E, et al. The 2016-2019 ImmunoTOX assessment board report of collaborative management of immune-related adverse events, an observational clinical study. Eur J Cancer 2020;130:39–50.

[115] Horvat TZ, Adel NG, Dang T-G, Montaz P, Postow MA, Callahan MK, et al. Immune-related adverse events, need for systemic immunosuppression, and effects on survival and time to treatment failure in patients with melanoma treated with ipilimumab at Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center. J Clin Oncol 2015;33:3193–3198.

[116] Fuji T, Colen RR, Bilen MA, Hess KR, Hajjar J, Suarez-Almazor ME, et al. Incidence of immune-related adverse events and its association with treatment outcomes: the MD Anderson Cancer Center experience. Invest New Drugs 2018;36:638–646.

[117] Masuda K, Shoji H, Nagashima K, Yamamoto S, Ishikawa M, Imazeki H, et al. Correlation between immune-related adverse events and prognosis in patients with gastric cancer treated with nivolumab. BMC Cancer 2019;19:974.

[118] Ricciuti B, Dahlberg SE, Adeni A, Sholl LM, Nishino M, Awad MM. Immune checkpoint inhibitor outcomes for patients with non-small-cell lung cancer receiving baseline corticosteroids for palliative versus non-palliative indications. J Clin Oncol 2019;37:1927–1934.

[119] Suo A, Chan Y, Beaulieu C, Kong S, Cheung WY, Monzon JG, et al. Anti-PD1-Induced immune-related adverse events and survival outcomes in advanced melanoma. Oncologist 2020;25:438–446.

[120] Scott SC, Pennell NA. Early use of systemic corticosteroids in patients with advanced NSCLC treated with nivolumab. J Thorac Oncol 2018;13:1711–1715.

[121] Simonaggio A, Michot JM, Voisin AL, Le Pavec J, Collins M, Lalart A, et al. Evaluation of readministration of immune checkpoint inhibitors after immune-related adverse events in patients with cancer. JAMA Oncol 2019;5:1310–1317.

[122] Spain L, Walls G, Messiou C, Turalig S, Gore M, Larkin J. Efficacy and toxicity of rechallenge with combination immune checkpoint blockade in metastatic melanoma: a case series. Cancer Immunol Immunother 2017;66:113–117.

[123] Weber JS, Gibney G, Sullivan RJ, Sosman JA, Slimgluff CJ, Lawrence DP, et al. Sequential administration of nivolumab and ipilimumab with a planned switch in patients with advanced melanoma (CheckMate 064): an open-label, randomised, phase 2 trial. Lancet Oncol 2016;17:943–955.

[124] Bowyer S, Prithviraj P, Lorigan P, Larkin J, McArthur G, Atkinson V, et al. Efficacy and toxicity of treatment with the anti-CTLA-4 antibody ipilimumab in patients with metastatic melanoma after prior anti-PD-1 therapy. Br J Cancer 2016;114:1084–1089.

[125] Serra-Bellver P, Valpione S, Lorigan P. Sequential immunotherapy regimens-expect the unexpected. Lancet Oncol 2016;17:854–855.

[126] Brahmer JR, Drake CG, Wollner I, Powderly JD, Picus J, Sharman WH, et al. Phase I study of single-agent anti-programmed death-1 (MDX-1106) in refractory solid tumors: safety, clinical activity, pharmacodynamics, and immunologic correlates. J Clin Oncol 2010;28:3167–3175.

[127] Ziemer M, Kougoulioni E, Beyer S, Simon JC, Berg T. Managing immune checkpoint-inhibitor-induced severe autoimmune-like hepatitis by liver-directed topical steroids. J Hepatol 2017;66:657–659.

[128] Jain RK. Normalizing tumor microenvironment to treat cancer: bench to bedside to biomarkers. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:2205–2218.

[129] Zhou X, Yao Z, Yang H, Liang N, Zhang X, Zhang F. Are immune-related adverse events associated with the efficacy of immune checkpoint inhibitors in patients with cancer? A systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Med 2020;18:87.

[130] Feng Z, Rong P, Wang W. Meta-analysis of the efficacy and safety of PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors administered alone or in combination with anti-VEGF agents in advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. Gut 2020;69:1904–1906.

[131] Wallin JJ, Bendell JC, Funke K, Szoln M, Korski K, Jones S, et al. Atezolizumab in combination with bevacizumab enhances antigen-specific T-cell migration in metastatic renal cell carcinoma. Nat Commun 2016;7:12624.

[132] McDermott DF, Huseni MA, Atkins MB, Motzer RJ, Rini BI, Escudier B, et al. Clinical activity and molecular correlates of response to atezolizumab alone or in combination with bevacizumab versus sunitinib in renal cell carcinoma. Nat Med 2018;24:749–757.

[133] Gao L, Yang X, Yi C, Zhu H. Adverse events of concurrent immune checkpoint inhibitors and antiangiogenic agents: a systematic review. Front Pharmacol 2019;10:1173.