Cochrane Library

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

First-line treatment of advanced epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer (Review)

Greenhalgh J, Boland A, Bates V, Vecchio F, Dundar Y, Chaplin M, Green JA

Greenhalgh J, Boland A, Bates V, Vecchio F, Dundar Y, Chaplin M, Green JA.
First-line treatment of advanced epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer.
Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2021, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD010383.
DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD010383.pub3.

www.cochranelibrary.com

WILEY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Intervention Review]

First-line treatment of advanced epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer

Janette Greenhalgh[1], Angela Boland[1], Victoria Bates[1], Fabio Vecchio[1], Yenal Dundar[1,2], Marty Chaplin[3], John A Green[4]

[1]Liverpool Reviews and Implementation Group, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK. [2]Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service, Rockhampton, Australia. [3]Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK. [4]Institute of Translational Medicine, University of Liverpool, Bebington, UK

Contact address: John A Green, j.a.green@liverpool.ac.uk.

Editorial group: Cochrane Lung Cancer Group.
Publication status and date: New search for studies and content updated (no change to conclusions), published in Issue 3, 2021.

Citation: Greenhalgh J, Boland A, Bates V, Vecchio F, Dundar Y, Chaplin M, Green JA. First-line treatment of advanced epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2021, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD010383. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD010383.pub3.

ABSTRACT

Background

Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive (M+) non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) is an important subtype of lung cancer comprising 10% to 15% of non-squamous tumours. This subtype is more common in women than men, is less associated with smoking, but occurs at a younger age than sporadic tumours.

Objectives

To assess the clinical effectiveness of single-agent or combination EGFR therapies used in the first-line treatment of people with locally advanced or metastatic EGFR M+ NSCLC compared with other cytotoxic chemotherapy (CTX) agents used alone or in combination, or best supportive care (BSC). The primary outcomes were overall survival and progression-free survival. Secondary outcomes included response rate, symptom palliation, toxicity, and health-related quality of life.

Search methods

We conducted electronic searches of the Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) (2020, Issue 7), MEDLINE (1946 to 27th July 2020), Embase (1980 to 27th July 2020), and ISI Web of Science (1899 to 27th July 2020). We also searched the conference abstracts of the American Society for Clinical Oncology and the European Society for Medical Oncology (July 2020); Evidence Review Group submissions to the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; and the reference lists of retrieved articles.

Selection criteria

Parallel-group randomised controlled trials comparing EGFR-targeted agents (alone or in combination with cytotoxic agents or BSC) with cytotoxic chemotherapy (single or doublet) or BSC in chemotherapy-naive patients with locally advanced or metastatic (stage IIIB or IV) EGFR M+ NSCLC unsuitable for treatment with curative intent.

Data collection and analysis

Two review authors independently identified articles, extracted data, and carried out the 'Risk of bias' assessment. We conducted meta-analyses using a fixed-effect model unless there was substantial heterogeneity, in which case we also performed a random-effects analysis as a sensitivity analysis.

Main results

Twenty-two trials met the inclusion criteria. Ten of these exclusively recruited people with EGFR M+ NSCLC; the remainder recruited a mixed population and reported results for people with EGFR M+ NSCLC as subgroup analyses. The number of participants with EGFR M+ tumours totalled 3023, of whom approximately 2563 were of Asian origin.

Overall survival (OS) data showed inconsistent results between the included trials that compared EGFR-targeted treatments against cytotoxic chemotherapy or placebo.

Erlotinib was used in eight trials, gefitinib in nine trials, afatinib in two trials, cetuximab in two trials, and icotinib in one trial. The findings of FASTACT 2 suggested a clinical benefit for OS for participants treated with erlotinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy when compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy alone, as did the Han 2017 trial for gefitinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy, but both results were based on a small number of participants (n = 97 and 122, respectively).

For progression-free survival (PFS), a pooled analysis of four trials showed evidence of clinical benefit for erlotinib compared with cytotoxic chemotherapy (hazard ratio (HR) 0.31; 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.25 to 0.39 ; 583 participants ; high-certainty evidence). A pooled analysis of two trials of gefitinib versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin showed evidence of clinical benefit for PFS for gefitinib (HR 0.39; 95% CI 0.32 to 0.48 ; 491 participants high-certainty evidence), and a pooled analysis of two trials of gefitinib versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin with pemetrexed maintenance also showed evidence of clinical benefit for PFS for gefitinib (HR 0.59; 95% CI 0.46 to 0.74, 371 participants ; moderate-certainty evidence). Afatinib showed evidence of clinical benefit for PFS when compared with chemotherapy in a pooled analysis of two trials (HR 0.42; 95% CI 0.34 to 0.53, 709 participants high-certainty evidence). All but one small trial showed a corresponding improvement in response rate with tyrosine-kinase inhibitor (TKI) compared to chemotherapy.

Commonly reported grade 3/4 adverse events associated with afatinib, erlotinib, gefitinib and icotinib monotherapy were rash and diarrhoea. Myelosuppression was consistently worse in the chemotherapy arms; fatigue and anorexia were also associated with some chemotherapies.

Seven trials reported on health-related quality of life and symptom improvement using different methodologies. For each of erlotinib, gefitinib, and afatinib, two trials showed improvement in one or more indices for the TKI compared to chemotherapy.

The quality of evidence was high for the comparisons of erlotinib and gefitinib with cytotoxic chemotherapy and for the comparison of afatinib with cytotoxic chemotherapy.

Authors' conclusions

Erlotinib, gefitinib, afatinib and icotinib are all active agents in EGFR M+ NSCLC patients, and demonstrate an increased tumour response rate and prolonged PFS compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy. We found a beneficial effect of the TKI compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy in adverse effect and health-related quality of life. We found limited evidence for increased OS for the TKI when compared with standard chemotherapy, but the majority of the included trials allowed participants to switch treatments on disease progression, which will have a confounding effect on any OS analysis. Single agent-TKI remains the standard of care and the benefit of combining a TKI and chemotherapy remains uncertain as the evidence is based on small patient numbers. Cytotoxic chemotherapy is less effective in EGFR M+ NSCLC than erlotinib, gefitinib, afatinib or icotinib and is associated with greater toxicity. There are no data supporting the use of monoclonal antibody therapy. Icotinib is not available outside China.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

First-line treatment of advanced non-small cell lung cancer identified as being EGFR mutation positive

Background

Lung cancer is the most common cancer in the world. It has often spread by the time it is diagnosed. Therefore, surgery is usually not possible and drug treatment, typically chemotherapy, is needed. The commonest type of lung cancer is non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Around 10% to 15% of people with NSCLC will have a specific kind of cancer known as epidermal growth factor receptor positive (EGFR M +), in which there are changes in the cancer cells to the genes controlling tumour growth. In this review, we looked at new treatments that can target EGFR M+ NSCLC to find out how well they work.

Objectives

The purpose of this review was to find out whether people given treatments targeted at EGFR M+ NSCLC live longer and have a better health-related quality of life than people having standard chemotherapy.

Trial characteristics

We found 22 trials that looked at five different EGFR-targeted drugs and compared them with standard chemotherapy treatment: erlotinib, gefitinib, afatinib, icotinib and the antibody cetuximab. We included trials reporting results up to 27 July 2020.

Results

Our results showed that people given erlotinib, gefitinib,afatinib or icotinib have a longer time before the cancer progresses and experience fewer side effects than those people given standard chemotherapy. However, we could not be sure whether people given erlotinib, afatinib or icotinib live any longer than those given standard chemotherapy.

Conclusion

Erlotinib, gefitinib, afatinib and icotinib delay further spread of EGFR M+ lung cancer and improve health-related quality of life. Giving cetuximab with chemotherapy is no better at controlling this type of cancer or extending life than chemotherapy alone.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Summary of findings 1. Erlotinib vs control

First-line treatment of advanced epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive (M+) non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): erlotinib comparisons

Patient or population: EGFR M+ patients with NSCLC

Settings: oncology

Intervention: erlotinib

Comparison: control (cytotoxic chemotherapy)

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	Erlotinib				
Overall survival	56 per 100	54 per 100 (46 to 63)	HR 0.95 (0.75, 1.22)	429 (3 studies)	High	All trials were open-label but included blinded independent review.
Progression-free survival	73 per 100	33 per 100 (28 to 40)	HR 0.31 (0.25, 0.39)	583 (4 studies)	High	All trials were open-label but included blinded independent review.

*The basis for the assumed risk is calculated as the event rate in the treatment group
The corresponding risk is calculated as the assumed risk x the risk ratio (RR) of the intervention where RR = (1 - exp(HR x ln(1 - assumed risk)))/assumed risk
CI: confidence interval; **RR:** risk ratio; **HR:** hazard ratio

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.

Summary of findings 2. Gefitinib vs paclitaxel + carboplatin

First-line treatment of advanced epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive (M+) non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): gefitinib comparisons

Patient or population: EGFR M+ patients with NSCLC

Settings: oncology

Intervention: gefitinib

Comparison: paclitaxel + carboplatin

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Paclitaxel + carboplatin	Gefitinib				
Overall survival	67 per 100	66 per 100 (58 to 73)	HR 0.95 (0.77 to 1.18)	489 (2 studies)	High	Both trials were open-label. IPASS did not report independent blinded review.
Progression-free survival	89 per 100	57 per 100 (50 to 65)	HR 0.39 (0.32 to 0.48)	485 (2 studies)	High	Both trials were open-label. IPASS did not report independent blinded review.

*The basis for the assumed risk is calculated as the event rate in the treatment group
The corresponding risk is calculated as the assumed risk x the risk ratio (RR) of the intervention where RR = (1 - exp(HR x ln(1 - assumed risk)))/assumed risk
CI: confidence interval; **RR:** risk ratio; **HR:** hazard ratio

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.

Summary of findings 3. Gefitinib vs pemetrexed + carboplatin with pemetrexed maintenance

First-line treatment of advanced epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive (M+) non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): gefitinib comparisons

Patient or population: EGFR M+ patients with NSCLC

Settings: oncology

Intervention: gefitinib

Comparison: pemetrexed + carboplatin

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Pemetrexed + carboplatin	Gefitinib				
Overall survival	**568 per 1000**	**505 per 1000** (410 to 606)	HR 0.84 (0.63 to 1.11)	371 (2 studies)	Moderate[a]	Both trials were conducted in single centres. Both trials were open-label with no independent blinded review.
Progression-free survival	**924 per 1000**	**782 per 1000** (695 to 852)	HR 0.59 (0.46 to 0.74)	371 (2 studies)	Moderate[b]	Both trials were conducted in single centres. Both trials were open-label with no independent blinded review.

*The basis for the assumed risk is calculated as the event rate in the treatment group
The corresponding risk is calculated as the assumed risk x the risk ratio (RR) of the intervention where RR = (1 - exp(HR x ln(1 - assumed risk)))/assumed risk
CI: confidence interval; **RR:** risk ratio; **HR:** hazard ratio

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.

[a] downgraded by one due to imprecise estimate that includes beneficial and non-beneficial effect
[b]downgraded by one due to risk of bias. Both trials were open-label with no independent blinded review

Summary of findings 4. Afatinib vs chemotherapy

First-line treatment of advanced epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive (M+) non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): afatinib comparisons

Patient or population: EGFR M+ patients with NSCLC

Settings: oncology

Intervention: afatinib

Comparison: cytotoxic chemotherapy

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				

	Cytotoxic chemotherapy	Afatinib				
Overall survival	66 per 100	63 per 100 (56 to 70)	HR 0.91 (0.75 to 1.10)	709 (2 studies)	High	Both trials were open-label but included blinded independent central review.
Progression-free survival	56 per 100	29 per 100 (24 to 35)	HR 0.42 (0.34 to 0.53)	709 (2 studies)	High	Both trials were open-label but included blinded independent central review.

*The basis for the assumed risk is calculated as the event rate in the treatment group
The corresponding risk is calculated as the assumed risk x the risk ratio (RR) of the intervention where RR = (1 - exp(HR x ln(1 - assumed risk)))/assumed risk
CI: confidence interval; **RR:** risk ratio; **HR:** hazard ratio

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.

BACKGROUND

Description of the condition

Lung cancer (along with breast cancer) is the most common cancer in the world and the third most common cancer diagnosed in the UK (Cancer Research UK). Globally, in 2018, two million people were diagnosed with lung cancer, representing 11.6 % of all cancers (GLOBOCAN 2018). In the UK annually, 47,800 new cases of lung cancer are diagnosed, 13% of all new cancers (Cancer Research UK 2019). In both men and women, smoking is the primary cause of lung cancer (Cancer Research UK 201a). Prognosis is poor, as early-stage lung cancer is often asymptomatic and the majority of patients are diagnosed at a late stage (Cancer Research UK 2019). Between 2015 and 2017, 35,000 people in the UK died of lung cancer, representing 21% of all deaths from cancer in the UK (Cancer Research UK 2019a).

Non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) accounts for the majority (80% to 85%) of lung cancer cases in the UK and comprises two main histological subgroups: squamous cell carcinoma and non-squamous cell carcinoma (Cancer Research UK 2019c). Squamous cell carcinoma accounts for 25% to 30% of all NSCLC cases, whilst non-squamous cell carcinoma (including adenocarcinoma and large cell carcinoma) accounts for 29% of NSCLC cases. Approximately 12% to 13% of patients have NSCLC that is 'not-otherwise specified' with the diagnosis based on cytology alone (NLCA 2015; Schiller 2002). The prognosis for people with advanced NSCLC is poor, with a median survival of the order of six months without treatment.

Treatment for people with NSCLC depends not only on the histological subtype and genetic subtype of the tumour, but also on disease stage, comorbidity, and performance status. Chemotherapy, in most cases comprising a cisplatin doublet, for advanced disease can extend overall survival by several months compared to best supportive care and improves health-related quality of life (Brown 2013).

In recent years, the biological subtypes of NSCLC have become relevant to the selection of treatment regimens. Attention has been drawn to tumours that harbour the epidermal growth factor receptor mutation (EGFR M+). The EGFR, a protein located on the cell surface, binds to and activates epidermal growth factor. This binding induces receptor dimerisation and tyrosine kinase autophosphorylation, leading through signal transduction to cell proliferation (Han 2012; NCBI). It is estimated that 10% to 15% of people with non-squamous NSCLC have tumours that are EGFR M + (Peters 2012; Rosell 2012). An EGFR mutation is more frequently observed in never-smokers than ever-smokers (51% versus 10%) in adenocarcinomas compared to cancers of other histologies (40% versus 3%), in people of East Asian ethnicity versus other ethnicities (30% versus 8%), and in females rather than males (42% versus 14%) (Rosell 2009; Scoccianti 2012; Ulivi 2012).

The identification of people with EGFR M+ tumours has led to the development of targeted therapies comprising small molecule tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) directed at the signal transduction pathway between the cell membrane and the nucleus, while monoclonal antibodies (MABs) bind to and inactivate the receptor on the cell membrane. Since the majority of the phase III trials in this review were started, it has become apparent that activating mutations in exons 19 and 21 are associated with response to the TKIs, while the 1% of tumours with the exon 20 T790M mutation are resistant. The TKIs are orally administered agents, while the MABs are given intravenously. People of interest to this review were chemotherapy-naive patients with locally advanced or metastatic (stage IIIB or IV) EGFR M+ NSCLC who were not suitable for treatment with curative intent, such as surgery or radical radiotherapy.

Description of the intervention

In Europe, there are five licensed treatments that target EGFR M+ NSCLC: afatinib, dacomitinib, erlotinib, gefitinib and osimertinib. Icotinib is only available in China. These drugs are TKIs of EGFR and target proteins on the cancer cells related to activation of the signal transduction pathway. These treatments (tablets) are taken orally daily until the disease progresses.

In the UK, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence has recommended the use of monotherapy erlotinib (NICE 2012), gefitinib (NICE 2010), afatinib (NICE 2014), and dacomitinib NICE 2019 for the first-line treatment of EGFR M+ NSCLC. In Europe, the European Society for Medical Oncology guidelines recommend first-line treatment with monotherapy erlotinib, or gefitinib, afatinib, dacomitinib and osimertinib (ESMO 2018). There is no consensus over which agent is preferred (ESMO 2018). In the USA, the Food and Drug Administration has approved the use of monotherapy erlotinib (FDA 2013), afatinib (FDA 2014), dacomitinib (FDA 2018(a)), and osimertinib (FDA 2018). Globally, there is considerable variation in the use of each of these drugs to treat people with NSCLC and in the availability and quality control of mutation testing, which determines patient selection. Cetuximab is not approved for EGFR M+ NSCLC in any jurisdiction.

Why it is important to do this review

Treatments for people with NSCLC have been evolving rapidly following the Medical Research Council meta-analysis that demonstrated improved survival for chemotherapy compared with best supportive care (MRC 1995). Until early 2000, people with NSCLC were offered standard cytotoxic chemotherapy treatments (for example cisplatin, docetaxel, vinorelbine, paclitaxel, and gemcitabine), often given in two-drug platinum-based combinations (Brown 2013). However, in recent years patients have been treated with drugs according to their histological subtype (for example pemetrexed plus cisplatin for non-squamous disease). Even more recently, as understanding of NSCLC has evolved, targeted treatments have been developed to treat specific groups of patients based on molecular criteria, for example TKIs and MABs. It is estimated that around 10% (n = 4000 annually) of all lung cancer patients in the UK have locally advanced or metastatic EGFR M+ NSCLC (NICE 2010), with a higher prevalence in Asian populations. It is therefore important to synthesise evidence for the clinical effectiveness and toxicity of these new treatments to ensure that patients are being treated with the most clinically effective drugs for their specific disease subtype.

OBJECTIVES

To assess the clinical effectiveness of single-agent or combination EGFR therapies used in the first-line treatment of people with locally advanced or metastatic EGFR M+ NSCLC compared with other cytotoxic chemotherapy agents used alone or in combination, or best supportive care (BSC). The primary outcome

was overall survival. Secondary outcomes included progression-free survival, response rate, symptom palliation, toxicity, and health-related quality of life.

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

Parallel-group randomised controlled trials (RCTs).

Types of participants

Chemotherapy-naive patients with locally advanced or metastatic (stage IIIB or IV) EGFR M+ NSCLC unsuitable for treatment with curative intent with surgery or radical radiotherapy. We included studies that included or excluded exon 20 T790 in the review.

Types of interventions

EGFR M+ targeted agents, alone or in combination with cytotoxic agents, compared with cytotoxic agents used alone or in combination or BSC.

We excluded trials comparing single-agent or combinations of cytotoxic chemotherapy without a targeted therapy in either arm and trials with targeted therapy in both arms, and we did not evaluate maintenance or second-line strategies. We also excluded cross-over trials.

Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes

1. Overall survival
2. Progression-free survival

Secondary outcomes

1. Tumour response
2. Toxicity and adverse effects of treatment
3. Health-related quality of life (e.g. Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy - Lung (FACT-L) and Trial Outcome Index (TOI))
4. Symptom palliation

Search methods for identification of studies

Electronic searches

We searched the following electronic databases for relevant published literature up to 27 July 2020. We did not restrict searches by language.

- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) (2020, Issue 7) (Appendix 1);
- MEDLINE (from 1980) (accessed via PubMed and OvidSP) (Appendix 2);
- Embase (from 1946) (OvidSP) (Appendix 3);
- ISI Web of Science (from 1899) (Appendix 4).

We ran an initial search in October 2012. We ran an updated search (updated by the Cochrane Lung Cancer Group Information Specialist) in January 2014 and June 2015. As the updated search (Appendix 2) included amendments to the initial search strategy, we conducted a PubMed search from inception to 27 July 2020 to ensure that no relevant articles had been missed. We compared the results of the overall PubMed search with the results of all other searches and examined any non-duplicate articles for possible inclusion in the review. We identified no relevant publications.

Searching other resources

We searched bibliographies of identified sources and use of Evidence Review Group (ERG) reports to the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. We searched the proceedings of relevant conferences such as the American Society for Clinical Oncology and the European Society for Medical Oncology up to July 2020. If data were available, we considered including them in the review.

We developed a database of relevant references using EndNote X8 software (Thomson Reuters).

Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies

Two review authors independently took part in all stages of trial selection (FV and VB: Search 1; VB and JG: Search 2; JAG and YD, JAG and JG: Search 3). Review authors first independently scanned the titles and abstracts of references identified by the search strategy. We obtained full details of possibly relevant trials and independently assessed these for inclusion in the review. In case of disagreement, the review authors attempted to reach consensus by discussion, or by involving a third review author (AB or YD). We excluded trials that did not meet all of the inclusion criteria and listed their bibliographic details with reasons for exclusion. We listed ongoing trials that did not report relevant data but met the inclusion criteria for future use. We included trials published in abstract form only if it was clear that the trial was eligible. If it was not clear, we contacted authors for further information and placed the trial in 'Studies awaiting classification' until we received a reply.

Data extraction and management

Two review authors carried out the data extraction (FV and VB: Search 1; VB and JG: Search 2; JAG and JG: Search 3) using pre-tested data extraction forms, and a third review author (KD who has left the team or MC) independently checked the extracted data for accuracy. We extracted data relating to the outcome measures as well as information on trial design and participants (for example, baseline characteristics). Where data from trials were presented in multiple publications, we extracted and reported these as a single trial with all other relevant publications listed.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

We assessed each included trial for risk of bias using criteria outlined in Chapter 8 of the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (see domains listed below) (Higgins 2011). Two review authors (FV and JG: Search 1; JG and KD: Search 2; JG and MC: Search 3) independently carried out the assessments. Any disagreements were resolved through discussion.

1. Random sequence generation (selection bias).
2. Allocation concealment (selection bias).
3. Blinding of participants (performance bias).
4. Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias).
5. Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias).

6. Selective outcome reporting (reporting bias).
7. Any other identified bias, including inappropriate influence of funders.

We reported bias as either high, low, or unclear (further details of reporting bias are outlined in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011)). We assessed the domains of blinding and incomplete outcome data at the outcome level.

Summary of findings and assessment of the certainty of the evidence

We presented four 'Summary of findings' tables (Summary of findings 1; Summary of findings 2; Summary of findings 3; Summary of findings 4) with each outcome graded accordingly using the GRADE approach (GRADE Working Group 2004).

The following outcomes were included in each table: OS and PFS.

Measures of treatment effect

For binary outcomes, where sufficient data were available, we presented relative treatment effects in the form of risk ratios with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Where studies provided measures of effect rather than raw data, we considered it pragmatic to present meaures of treatment effect other than RR (i.e. OR). For continuous outcomes, we calculated mean differences and 95% CIs provided there was no evidence that the data were subject to skew. If statistical tests used in the original paper were for skewed data, or if median and interquartile ranges were reported, we assumed the data were skewed. We calculated standardised mean differences for health-related quality of life variables, where appropriate. For time-to-event outcomes, we extracted log hazard ratios (log HRs) when available, with 95% CIs. If the log HR was not reported, we requested data from authors.

All trials allowed participant cross over to another treatment after progression, but no details were provided regarding how this was dealt with in any of the analyses of overall survival (OS).
We considered trials for inclusion in the review that: (1) provided only unplanned, interim findings; and (2) were continuing to recruit participants, but we did not include these in the meta-analysis.

Unit of analysis issues

We did not include trials designed as cross-over trials, as the use of more than one treatment would impact on the assessment of OS (our primary outcome). However, we noted that many of the RCTs included in our review allowed participants from the control arm access to the intervention treatment when their disease progressed; we acknowledge that this limits our assessment of OS.

Dealing with missing data

We contacted authors (and sponsors) of trials for missing data. In cases where authors did not respond, we categorised the studies as awaiting classification and recorded details in the 'Characteristics of studies awaiting classification' table.

Assessment of heterogeneity

We assessed statistical heterogeneity between trials visually by inspection of the forest plots and using the Chi^2 test ($P < 0.1$ was considered significant due to the low power of the test). We also calculated the I^2 statistic, which describes the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance). Values of I^2 range from 0 to 100, with 0 representing no heterogeneity and 100 representing considerable heterogeneity.

For this review:

- 0% to 29%, heterogeneity might not be important;
- 30% to 49% may represent moderate heterogeneity;
- 50% to 74% may represent substantial heterogeneity; and
- 75% to 100%, considerable heterogeneity.

Assessment of reporting biases

If we had identified a sufficient number of trials, we would have constructed a funnel plot. If asymmetry was present in the funnel plot, we would have explored possible causes of bias, such as heterogeneity or outcome reporting bias. As there were not enough trials (at least 10) included in any one meta-analysis, we did not include funnel plots in this update of the review.

Data synthesis

We have summarised individual trial data in structured tables and as a narrative description. As a major clinical issue is the toxicity of platinum-based doublet chemotherapy (cytotoxic chemotherapy), we presented subgroups separately with comparators cytotoxic chemotherapy, single-agent vinorelbine in elderly participants, and placebo. We dealt with the comparison of the combination of an EGFR-targeted therapy and cytotoxic chemotherapy with cytotoxic chemotherapy alone as a separate comparison in view of concerns about interactions between chemotherapy and a tyrosine kinase inhibitor. We combined data for time-to-event outcomes using the generic inverse variance method. We used the Mantel-Haenszel method for dichotomous outcomes. In future versions of this review, where data are available, we may combine continuous outcomes using the inverse variance method.

We conducted meta-analyses using the fixed-effect model, unless there was substantial heterogeneity ($I^2 > 50\%$), in which case we used a random-effects model as a sensitivity analysis. If there was considerable heterogeneity ($I^2 > 75\%$) some data have been combined, but our conclusions highlighted the amount of heterogeneity present.

Indirect comparisons and network meta-analysis

We considered that a network meta-analysis (NMA) was not appropriate because of the different populations across the included trials. We identified other barriers to conducting NMA: some trials reported adjusted analyses, whereas all other trials reported unadjusted analyses and combining these is statistically unsound; participants in all trials were allowed to switch treatment after progression, and we had no information about how this was handled in the analysis for OS. Finally, the Kaplan-Meier plots shown in the trial reports crossed in four of the trials, indicating that using a Cox proportional hazards model may not be appropriate.

If in future versions of this review we identify trials comparing different interventions that are similar enough in their populations and outcomes, we may make indirect comparisons for competing interventions that have not been compared directly. Multiple-treatments meta-analysis (also referred to as network meta-

analysis) may combine direct and indirect comparisons using multivariate meta-analysis, as this will also take into account any multi-arm trials. We will use a random-effects model within STATA to conduct analyses using code from www.mtm.uoi.gr.

We will evaluate transitivity (the trials making different direct comparisons must be sufficiently similar in all respects other than the treatments being compared) clinically. We will compare the distributions of possible effect modifiers (smoking status, age, gender, ethnicity, and performance status) across comparisons using subgroup analysis. As the review only considers first-line treatment, indications are similar.

We will evaluate consistency using a loop-specific approach (Salanti 2009), and use a design interaction consistency model (Higgins 2012). If we identify inconsistency, we will not present the network meta-analysis.

We will assess estimates of treatment effect by pairwise meta-analysis. We will conduct network meta-analysis where appropriate.

Prior to analysis we will draw a diagram of the network for all relevant interventions, indicating the number of trials per comparison. We will derive and display ranking probabilities for each treatment using the Surface Under the Cumulative RAnking curve (SUCRA) plot and rankograms (Salanti 2011).

We will discuss the possible effects of risk of bias on the clinical effectiveness data and review findings.

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

In an update of this review when enough trials are included and if data are available, we may conduct analyses to investigate any differential effects in terms of:

- smoking status
- age
- sex
- ethnicity
- performance status
- type of mutation (exon 19/exon 21)
- type of histology

Sensitivity analysis

In an update of this review when sufficient trials are included, we will conduct sensitivity analyses based on the overall risk of bias of the included trials. We will base overall risk of bias on sequence generation, allocation concealment, and blinding (for the specific outcome), and will base the summary assessment on recommendations in Table 8.7a of the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011).

Summary of findings and assessment of the certainty of the evidence

We presented four 'Summary of findings' tables (Summary of findings 1; Summary of findings 2; Summary of findings 3; Summary of findings 4) with each outcome graded accordingly using the GRADE approach (GRADE Working Group 2004).

The following outcomes are included in each table: OS and PFS.

RESULTS

Description of studies

Results of the search

The database search strategy yielded 12,481 non-duplicate papers. We identified a further eight records via handsearching of reference lists. Of these, we screened 386 full-text records for inclusion in the review. We screened all of the potentially relevant references and included 22 eligible RCTs (reported in 59 publications) comparing EGFR-targeted therapy to chemotherapy as first-line treatment in NSCLC patients in our review (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Study flow diagram.

We classified two trials as 'awaiting classification' and have not yet included them in the review (TALENT; TRIBUTE). We contacted the authors of TALENT and TRIBUTE and asked them to provide data on the EGFR M+ population. We have not received a response.

Included studies

See Characteristics of included studies.

The 22 trials that met the inclusion criteria were published or updated between 2003 and 2017 (BMSO99; CHEN; CONVINCE; ENSURE; EURTAC; FASTACT 2; First-SIGNAL; FLEX; GTOWG; Han 2017; INTACT 1; INTACT 2; IPASS; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG; OPTIMAL;Patil 2017; TOPICAL; TORCH; WJTOG3405; Yu 2014). With the exception of GTOWG, all trials were published as peer-reviewed papers. The overall number of people recruited to the trials ranged between 113 in CHEN and 1217 in IPASS. The median length of follow-up (where reported) ranged from 15.7 months, in CONVINCE, to 59 months, in WJTOG3405.

Ten trials included EGFR M+ participants only (CONVINCE; ENSURE; EURTAC; Han 2017; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG; OPTIMAL; Patil 2017; WJTOG3405). The number of participants recruited to the EGFR M+ only trials ranged from 121 in Han 2017 to 364 in LUX-Lung 6, with a total population of 2371. The remaining 12 trials recruited a 'mixed' population of participants - that is, participants were not selected for inclusion in the trial on the basis of their EGFR mutation status. These latter trials reported results for the subgroup of participants with EGFR M+ mutation status. The numbers of participants reported in these subgroups ranged from 10 in GTOWG to 261 in IPASS, with a combined total of 645. The combined total of participants with EGFR M+ NSCLC was 3023, of whom approximately 2563 were of Asian origin.

Three trials were conducted exclusively in Europe (EURTAC; GTOWG; TOPICAL); 13 were conducted exclusively in Asia (CHEN; CONVINCE; ENSURE; FASTACT 2; First-SIGNAL; Han 2017; IPASS; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG; OPTIMAL; Patil 2017; WJTOG3405; Yu 2014); and one was conducted in the USA (BMSO99). The remaining trials were more international: (TORCH), (INTACT 2), LUX-Lung 3, INTACT 1, and FLEX. The 10 trials that recruited exclusively EGFR M+ patients were conducted in Asia: CONVINCE; ENSURE; Han 2017; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG; OPTIMAL; Patil 2017; WJTOG3405; and Europe: EURTAC, with one international trial: (LUX-Lung 3).

Four of the trials were placebo-controlled and double-blinded (FASTACT 2; INTACT 1; INTACT 2; TOPICAL); the remainder were specifically reported as being open-label or did not report blinding status. In the latter case, we assumed these to be open-label due to the nature of the interventions and comparator (that is, oral versus intravenous treatments). Four trials were phase II (CHEN; GTOWG; Han 2017; Yu 2014), whilst the others were phase III. Sixteen trials were partially or totally funded by a pharmaceutical company (BMSO99; CHEN; CONVINCE; ENSURE; EURTAC; FASTACT 2; First-SIGNAL; FLEX; INTACT 1; INTACT 2; IPASS; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; OPTIMAL; TOPICAL; TORCH); the Han 2017; NEJSG; and WJTOG3405 trials were funded by scientific groups.The Patil 2017 trial was funded by a hospital grant. The funding source for the GTOWG and Yu 2014 trials was not reported.

Four categories of comparisons for all four agents were described:

1. targeted agent versus established platinum-based combinations (e.g. cisplatin or carboplatin and gemcitabine or docetaxel) - the term platinum-based refers to cisplatin or carboplatin-based combinations, both drugs being metabolised to the same active moiety;
2. targeted agent versus single-agent chemotherapy drug vinorelbine, for which clinical interest is limited to the elderly population due to its favourable toxicity profile;
3. cytotoxic chemotherapy with the targeted agent versus chemotherapy alone; and
4. erlotinib versus placebo.

Population characteristics

All trials provided data for age, sex, performance status, and smoking status except for the INTACT 1, INTACT 2, and GTOWG trials (no details of smoking history). The median age of the overall population of all participants in the included trials ranged from 56 to 77 years; the median age of participants in the EGFR M+ only trials ranged from 56 to 65 years. Two trials only included people aged over 70 years (CHEN; GTOWG), and NEJSG, Patil 2017, and Yu 2014 only reported mean age. There were more females (than males) in 11 trials (CONVINCE; ENSURE; EURTAC; First-SIGNAL;Han 2017; IPASS; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG; OPTIMAL; WJTOG3405), and more males (than females) in seven trials (BMSO99; CHEN; FLEX; GTOWG; INTACT 1; INTACT 2; Patil 2017; TORCH). The majority of participants were of good performance status (ECOG or WHO 0 or 1). The GTOWG abstract did not report performance status.

It is notable that, with the exception of Patil 2017, in all of the trials that recruited EGFR M+ patients only, the proportion of females was greater than males (CONVINCE; ENSURE; EURTAC;Han 2017; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG; OPTIMAL; WJTOG3405).

Interventions

Erlotinib

Eight trials used erlotinib (n = 754 EGFR M+) as the EGFR-targeted therapy (CHEN; ENSURE; EURTAC; FASTACT 2; GTOWG; OPTIMAL; TOPICAL; TORCH). CHEN and GTOWG used the drug vinorelbine as a single agent or with carboplatin, respectively, in elderly populations. In FASTACT 2, erlotinib was used in combination with a platinum doublet containing gemcitabine. We classified trials using erlotinib into the following comparison groups.

- Erlotinib versus platinum-based chemotherapy: One trial compared erlotinib versus gemcitabine plus carboplatin (OPTIMAL), two trials compared erlotinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin (ENSURE; TORCH), and one trial compared erlotinib versus docetaxel plus cisplatin or gemcitabine plus cisplatin (EURTAC).
- Erlotinib versus vinorelbine +/- other chemotherapy: One trial compared erlotinib versus vinorelbine (CHEN); one trial compared erlotinib versus carboplatin plus vinorelbine (GTOWG).
- Erlotinib plus chemotherapy versus chemotherapy plus placebo: One trial compared erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin versus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin plus placebo (FASTACT 2).
- Erlotinib versus placebo: One trial considered this comparison (TOPICAL).

Gefitinib

Nine trials used gefitinib (n = 1184 EGFR M+) as the EGFR-targeted therapy (First-SIGNAL; Han 2017; INTACT 1; INTACT 2; IPASS; NEJSG; Patil 2017; WJTOG3405; Yu 2014). The Han 2017 trial included three treatment arms. Four trials used gefitinib in combination with chemotherapy (Han 2017; INTACT 1; INTACT 2; Yu 2014). We classified trials using gefitinib into the following comparison groups.

- Gefitinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin: One trial considered this comparison (First-SIGNAL).
- Gefitinib versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin: Two trials considered this comparison (IPASS; NEJSG).
- Gefitinib versus docetaxel plus cisplatin: One trial considered this comparison (WJTOG3405).
- Gefitinib versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin and maintenance pemetrexed. Two trials considered this comparison (Han 2017; Patil 2017).
- Gefitinib and carboplatin plus paclitaxel or cisplatin plus gemcitabine versus cytotoxic chemotherapy alone: Two trials considered this comparison (INTACT 1; INTACT 2). However, as EGFR M+ specific data from both trials were analysed as though from one trial, data were only presented narratively.
- Gefitinib plus pemetrexed and cisplatin versus pemetrexed plus cisplatin: One trial considered this comparison (Yu 2014).
- Gefitinib plus pemetrexed and carboplatin versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin. One trial considered this comparison (Han 2017).

Afatinib

Two trials compared afatinib (n = 709) with cytotoxic chemotherapy (LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6). These trials differed principally in the selection of the cytotoxic chemotherapy comparator, LUX-Lung 3 comparing afatinib with cisplatin and pemetrexed in an ethnically diverse population, and LUX-Lung 6 comparing afatinib with cisplatin and gemcitabine in an Asian population. We combined these trials in a meta-analysis for progression-free survival, overall survival, and response.

Icotinib

One trial compared icotinib (n = 285) with cytotoxic chemotherapy. The CONVINCE trial compared icotinib with four cycles of pemetrexed with cisplatin, followed by pemetrexed alone as maintenance therapy.

Cetuximab

Two trials (n = 81) compared cetuximab plus chemotherapy with combination chemotherapy (BMSO99; FLEX).

Of the nine trials that recruited only people with EGFR M + NSCLC, two trials used afatinib (LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6), three used erlotinib (ENSURE: EURTAC; OPTIMAL), three used gefitinib (Han 2017; NEJSG; WJTOG3405) and one used icotinib (CONVINCE). Seven EGFR M+ only trials compared targeted treatment with cytotoxic chemotherapy (ENSURE; EURTAC; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG; OPTIMAL; WJTOG3405), one trial with cytotoxic chemotherapy followed by maintenance chemotherapy. The three-arm trial (Han 2017) compared targeted treatment with cytotoxic chemotherapy and with targeted treatment combined with cytotoxic chemotherapy.

Outcomes

The primary outcome for the majority of trials was progression-free survival with secondary outcomes of overall survival, tumour response rate, symptom palliation, health-related quality of life, and safety. Overall survival was the primary outcome in six trials (First-SIGNAL; FLEX; INTACT 1; INTACT 2; TOPICAL; TORCH).

Excluded studies

See Characteristics of excluded studies.

We excluded 327 records after the selection procedure (Figure 1). The main reasons for exclusion were the use of non-randomised designs (including systematic reviews and reports from conferences), non-assessment of participants' EGFR mutation status, and non-administration of treatments as first-line therapy. We excluded other trials if they were designed to assess maintenance treatment, or if an EGFR-targeted therapy was used in both trial arms. We were unable to easily exclude articles at the screening stage, as we could not be certain from the abstract whether subgroup analyses of outcomes of participants with EGFR M+ tumours were reported. In the Characteristics of excluded studies table, we have listed the 20 trials that appeared to meet the inclusion criteria, but on closer examination were not a complete match. Participants in five trials were not tested for EGFR mutations (Crino 2008; Gatzemeier 2003; Goss 2009; Lilenbaum 2008; Rosell 2004). Two trials tested for EGFR expression only (Rosell 2008; Thatcher 2014). Three trials included too few participants with EGFR M+ tumours to warrant analysis (FASTACT; Heigener 2014; White), and in eight trials tyrosine kinase inhibitors treatment was included in both trial arms (Hirsh 2011; Janne 2012; JO25567; Massuti 2014; NEJ005 2014; NEJ009; Xie 2015; Yang 2015). One trial only assessed outcomes of patients who had survived at one year (Boutsikou 2013), and in another trial there were insufficient samples available for testing (ECOG 4508).

Risk of bias in included studies

Allocation

Of the 22 included trials, 14 reported adequate information about the methods used to generate the randomisation sequence (CONVINCE; EURTAC; FASTACT 2; FLEX; Han 2017; IPASS; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG; OPTIMAL; Patil 2017;TOPICAL; TORCH; WJTOG3405). We considered these trials to be at low risk of bias and the remaining 8 trials to be at unclear risk of bias. We considered that 13 trials (CONVINCE; EURTAC; FASTACT 2; FLEX; IPASS; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG; OPTIMAL; Patil 2017;TOPICAL; TORCH; WJTOG3405) provided adequate information about allocation concealment procedure; we considered these trials to be at low risk of bias. We considered the risk of bias for the remaining eight trials to be unclear due to lack of reported information (BMSO99; CHEN; ENSURE; First-SIGNAL; GTOWG;Han 2017; INTACT 1; INTACT 2; Yu 2014).

Blinding

Performance bias

Only four of the 22 included trials reported employing blinding procedures (INTACT 1; INTACT 2; NEJSG; TOPICAL). The remaining trials explicitly stated they were open-label or did not report blinding status. In the latter case, we assumed these trials were

open-label due to the differences between interventions and comparator (that is, oral versus intravenous).

Detection bias

We considered 12 of the trials to be at low risk of detection bias for the outcome of progression-free survival, as they incorporated independent verification procedures, in BMSO99; CONVINCE; ENSURE; EURTAC; FASTACT 2; First-SIGNAL; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; and NEJSG;, or blinded outcome assessment, in INTACT 1; INTACT 2, and TOPICAL. None of the remaining trials reported any independent assessment procedures and were considered to be at high risk of bias for the outcome of progression-free survival.

Incomplete outcome data

We considered one trial (CONVINCE) to be at high risk of bias as 11 participants did not receive treatment in the chemotherapy arm, but the reasons were not reported and a per protocol analysis was conducted. In all other trials, all participants were accounted for in the analyses. There did not appear to be any major imbalances in dropout rates between trial arms in any of the trials and therefore we considered all trials to be at low risk of bias.

Selective reporting

We considered two trials to be at high risk of reporting bias (CHEN; CONVINCE). The trial protocol for CHEN stated time to progression as a secondary outcome of the trial, but the published paper did not report this outcome. The trial protocol was not available for the CONVINCE trial. The trial outcomes listed at NCT01719536 for the CONVINCE trial were PFS (primary), OS and objective response rate. No data were presented for objective response rate. We considered two trials to be at unclear risk of bias as the available information was insufficient to judge selective reporting (FLEX; GTOWG) and one trial (Patil 2017) did not report the HRQoL outcomes that were measured. We considered all other trials to be at a low risk of bias, as either trial protocols were available, or all outcomes stated in the methods section of the papers were reported.

Other potential sources of bias

Eighteen trials were sponsored fully or in part by pharmaceutical companies. One trial was terminated early as the non-inferiority of the intervention arm was demonstrated by the first planned interim analysis (TORCH). Two trials were terminated early for benefit (ENSURE; EURTAC).

Effects of interventions

See: **Summary of findings 1** Erlotinib vs control; **Summary of findings 2** Gefitinib vs paclitaxel + carboplatin; **Summary of findings 3** Gefitinib vs pemetrexed + carboplatin with pemetrexed maintenance; **Summary of findings 4** Afatinib vs chemotherapy

Pairwise meta-analysis

Erlotinib versus placebo, platinum-based chemotherapy, or other cytotoxic agents

1. Overall survival

Data from four trials were available for overall survival (OS) (CHEN; ENSURE; EURTAC; TORCH). Two trials presented limited data (OPTIMAL; TOPICAL), and one trial presented no data (GTOWG).

Erlotinib versus platinum-based chemotherapy: The pooled treatment effect estimate for three trials (N = 429), hazard ratio (HR) of 0.95 (95% confidence interval (CI) 0.75 to 1.22; I^2 = 0%) (Analysis 1.1) indicated no evidence of clinical benefit in OS between the groups (ENSURE; EURTAC; TORCH). OPTIMAL reported that OS did not differ between the two treatment arms (HR = 1.065, P = 0.6849). No standard error was reported, so the results could not be entered into a meta-analysis.

Erlotinib versus vinorelbine: CHEN reported a HR of 2.16 (95% CI 0.58 to 8.10) for OS comparing erlotinib versus vinorelbine in elderly patients. As the CI was very wide, the possibility of no clinical benefit of erlotinib for OS could not be ruled out (Analysis 1.1).

Erlotinib versus placebo: TOPICAL reported the median overall survival, which was 10.4 months (95% CI 5.5 to 15.1) for erlotinib (n = 17) versus 3.7 months (95% CI 0.3 to 49.3) for placebo (n = 11).

2. Progression-free survival

Five trials reported progression-free survival (PFS) (CHEN; ENSURE; EURTAC; OPTIMAL; TORCH). One trial did not report hazard ratios and only presented limited data (TOPICAL), and one trial reported no data (GTOWG).

Erlotinib versus platinum-based chemotherapy: The pooled treatment effect estimate for four trials (HR 0.31, 95% CI 0.25 to 0.39; fixed-effect; I^2 = 75%) favoured erlotinib (ENSURE; EURTAC; OPTIMAL; TORCH) (Analysis 1.2). As there was a substantial amount of heterogeneity, we performed a sensitivity analysis using the random-effects model, and results were similar to the main analysis (HR 0.32, 95% CI 0.20 to 0.51).

Erlotinib versus vinorelbine: CHEN reported a HR of 0.55 (95% CI 0.21 to 1.46) for PFS indicating no evidence of any difference between the treatments (Analysis 1.2).

Erlotinib versus placebo: TOPICAL reported the median PFS, which was 4.8 months (95% CI 1.6 to 8.8) for erlotinib (n = 17) and 2.9 months (95% CI 0.3 to 10.1) for placebo (n = 11).

ENSURE, EURTAC, and OPTIMAL showed an improvement in PFS for the exon 19 deletion in favour of erlotinib. We did not perform meta-analysis of these preliminary data.

1. Tumour response

Erlotinib versus platinum-based chemotherapy: The pooled treatment effect estimate for five trials favoured erlotinib (risk ratio (RR) 2.26, 95% CI 1.85 to 2.76; I^2 = 57%) (ENSURE; EURTAC; GTOWG; OPTIMAL; TORCH). As there was a substantial amount of heterogeneity, we performed a sensitivity analysis using a random-effects model, and results were similar (RR 2.20, 95% CI 1.53 to 3.17) (Analysis 1.3).

Erlotinib versus vinorelbine: CHEN reported a RR of 0.83 (95% CI 0.19 to 3.67; 24 participants) for tumour response, indicating no evidence of clinical benefit of erlotinib in tumour response.

TOPICAL did not report tumour response for EGFR M+ participants.

2. Toxicity and adverse effects of treatment.

The most commonly reported adverse effects of treatment (AEs) in participants treated with erlotinib as a monotherapy were rash, diarrhoea, and fatigue (CHEN; ENSURE; EURTAC;

GTOWG; OPTIMAL; TOPICAL; TORCH) (Table 1). Other AEs included mouth ulcers, constitutional symptoms, nausea, increased alanine aminotransferase, dyspnoea, and pulmonary toxicities. Cytotoxic chemotherapy was associated with greater grade 3/4 myelosuppression, fatigue and anorexia.

3. Health-related quality of life

Three trials reported on the health-related quality of life (HRQoL) of EGFR M+ participants (ENSURE; OPTIMAL; TORCH). One trial used the Lung Cancer Symptom Scale (LCSS) to measure HRQoL, but compliance was so poor that the authors regarded the analysis as inconclusive (EURTAC).

HRQoL was measured but not reported in the trial reports in GTOWG, and was not available for the EGFR M+ subgroup in two trials (CHEN; TOPICAL).

TORCH used the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) Quality of Life Questionnaire - Core 30 (QLQ-C30) and the lung cancer-specific module (EORTC QLQ-LC13) to evaluate HRQoL. The number of participants who were improved/stable/worse was reported for selected and unselected participants receiving erlotinib and chemotherapy. Improvement in terms of global QoL and physical functioning was particularly evident in the small numbers of EGFR M+ participants (n = 36/39 available for analysis) for erlotinib compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy.

OPTIMAL used the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Lung (FACT-L), LCSS, and Trial Outcome Index (TOI) to assess HRQoL. The odds ratios (ORs) (with covariates EGFR mutation type, smoking history, and histological type) were in favour of erlotinib and were 6.69 (95% CI 3.01 to 14.85; P = 0.0001), 7.54 (95% CI 3.38 to 16.85; P = 0.0001), and 8.07 (95% CI 3.57 to 18.26; P = 0.0001), respectively.

ENSURE used the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Lung (FACT-L), LCSS, and Trial Outcome Index (TOI) to assess HRQoL. Deterioration in TOI was 11.4 months for erlotinib compared to 4.2 months for chemotherapy (HR 0.51, 95% CI 0.34 to 0.76; P = 0.0006), and time to deterioration in HRQoL was 8.2 months for erlotinib compared to 2.8 months for chemotherapy (HR 0.64, 95% CI 0.44 to 0.93; P = 0.0168).

4. Symptom palliation

In the TORCH trial, the time to deterioration curves for cough, dyspnoea, and pain in the first 20 weeks were visually assessed for erlotinib versus chemotherapy, and no major differences were observed. No statistical analyses were provided by the authors.

The OPTIMAL trial reported that the time to improvement of symptoms on the FACT-L, TOI, and LCSS (sometimes abbreviated to Lung Cancer Subscale (LCSS)) was significantly shorter for erlotinib compared to chemotherapy: FACT-L 1.51 versus 3.19 months (P = 0.0067); TOI 2.79 versus 3.48 months (P = 0.003); LCSS 1.48 versus 3.15 months (P = 0.0010). There was also significant correlation between overall response and improvement in symptom scores (P = 0.0006, 0.0002, and 0.0213 for FACT-L, TOI, and LCSS, respectively).

In the ENSURE trial, preliminary data using the FACT-L showed that time to symptomatic progression was 13.8 months for erlotinib compared to 5.5 months for chemotherapy (HR 0.56, 95% CI 0.36 to 0.87; P = 0.0076).

Erlotinib plus platinum-based chemotherapy versus platinum-based chemotherapy plus placebo

The FASTACT 2 trial compared erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin versus placebo plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin.

1. Overall survival

FASTACT 2 reported a HR of 0.48 (95% CI 0.27 to 0.85) for OS indicating a clinical benefit of erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin in a trial of 91 participants (Analysis 2.1).

2. Progression-free survival

FASTACT 2 demonstrated a clinical benefit for PFS favouring erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin (HR 0.25, 95% CI 0.16 to 0.39) (Analysis 2.2).

1. Tumour response

FASTACT 2 observed an objective response in 41 (84%) of 49 participants with EGFR-activating mutations in the erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin group, and 7 (15%) of 48 participants in the placebo plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin group. The corresponding RR was 5.74 (95% CI 2.86 to 11.50) (Analysis 2.3).

2. Toxicity and adverse effects of treatment.

Commonly reported AEs in the FASTACT 2 trial were neutropenia, thrombocytopenia, and anorexia (Table 1).

3. Health-related quality of life

HRQoL was not available for the EGFR M+ subgroup in FASTACT 2.

4. Symptom palliation

The FASTACT 2 trial did not report data on symptom palliation.

Gefitinib versus platinum-based chemotherapy

1. Overall survival

We could not combine data for all six trials comparing gefitinib to platinum-based chemotherapy (First-SIGNAL; IPASS; NEJSG; WJTOG3405, Han 2017; Patil 2017), as two trials reported only adjusted analyses (IPASS; NEJSG). It is not advisable to combine adjusted and unadjusted estimates.

Gefitinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin: One trial, First-SIGNAL, reported a HR of 1.04 (95% CI 0.50 to 2.20) (Analysis 3.1).

Gefitinib versus carboplatin and paclitaxel: Pooled analysis of the two trials indicated no evidence of a difference in OS between the groups (HR 0.95, 95% CI 0.77 to 1.18; $I^2 = 0$) (IPASS; NEJSG) (Analysis 3.1).

Gefitinib versus docetaxel plus cisplatin: WJTOG3405 reported a HR of 1.25 (95% CI 0.88 to 1.78), indicating no evidence of a difference in OS between the groups (Analysis 3.1).

Gefitinib versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin with premetrexed maintenance: Pooled analysis of the two trials indicated no evidence of a difference in OS between the groups (HR 0.84, 95% CI 0.63 to 1.11, $I^2 = 0$) (Han 2017; Patil 2017) (Analysis 3.1).

2. Progression-free survival

We could not combine data for all six trials comparing gefitinib to platinum-based chemotherapy (First-SIGNAL; IPASS; NEJSG; WJTOG3405, Han 2017; Patil 2017), as two trials reported only adjusted analyses (IPASS; NEJSG). It is not advisable to combine adjusted and unadjusted estimates.

Gefitinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin: First-SIGNAL reported a HR of 0.54 (95% CI 0.27 to 1.10). The wide CI indicates that the possibility of no difference in PFS between the groups cannot be ruled out (Analysis 3.2).

Gefitinib versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin: The pooled treatment effect estimate for two trials showed a clinical benefit in PFS between the groups, favouring gefitinib (HR 0.39, 95% CI 0.32 to 0.48; I^2 = 73%) (IPASS; NEJSG) (Analysis 3.2). As there was a substantial amount of heterogeneity, we performed a sensitivity analysis using a random-effects model, and results were similar (HR 0.39, 95% CI 0.26 to 0.59).

Gefitinib versus docetaxel plus cisplatin: WJTOG3405 reported a clinical benefit in PFS favouring gefitinib (HR 0.49, 95% CI 0.34 to 0.71) (Analysis 3.2).

Gefitinib versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin with pemetrexed maintenance: The pooled treatment effect estimate for two trials showed a clinical benefit in PFS between the groups, favouring gefitinib (HR 0.59, 95% CI 0.46 to 0.74; I^2 = 77%) (Han 2017; Patil 2017) (Analysis 3.2).

IPASS and NEJSG both showed an improvement in PFS for the exon 19 deletion in the gefitinib population.

1. Tumour response

The pooled treatment effect estimate for six trials, First-SIGNAL, IPASS, NEJSG, WJTOG3405, Han 2017 and Patil 2017 favoured gefitinib (RR 1.74, 95% CI 1.53 to 1.97; I^2 = 54%) (Analysis 3.3). There was considerable heterogeneity between the two trials that investigated gefitinib versus paclitaxel+carboplatin, although both trials favoured treatment with gefitinib and so the heterogeneity is quantitative in nature.

Response at cross-over after progression on first-line treatment

NEJSG reported that 28.2% of 52 participants responded to carboplatin and paclitaxel after progressing on gefitinib, and 58.5% of 106 participants responded to gefitinib after progressing on carboplatin and paclitaxel.

2. Toxicity and adverse effects of treatment

The most commonly reported AE for gefitinib monotherapy was rash, followed by liver toxicity, anorexia, and diarrhoea (Table 1). Cytoxic chemotherapy was associated with greater grade 3/4 myelosuppression in all comparisons and greater anorexia in one trial (First-SIGNAL).

3. Health-related quality of life

Two trials reported on HRQoL (IPASS; NEJSG). HRQoL was not measured in one trial (WJTOG3405), and not available for the EGFR M+ subgroup in one trial (First-SIGNAL).

IPASS used the FACT-L and TOI symptom improvement by the LCSS and achieved 89.5% compliance for the cytotoxic chemotherapy group and 94.8% for the gefitinib group. Gefitinib was significantly favoured over carboplatin plus paclitaxel in the proportion of participants showing improvement in FACT-L total score, TOI, and LCSS (FACT-L total score: 70.2% versus 44.5% (OR 3.01, 95% CI 1.79 to 5.07), TOI: 70.2% versus 38.3% (OR 3.96, 95% CI 2.33 to 6.71), LCSS: 75.6% versus 53.9% (OR 2.70, 95% CI 1.58 to 4.62)). The time-to-deterioration data showed a median of 15.6 months for gefitinib compared to 3.0 months for cytotoxic chemotherapy for FACT-L; 16.6 months for gefitinib compared to 2.9 months for cytotoxic chemotherapy for TOI; and 11.3 months for gefitinib compared to 2.9 months for cytotoxic chemotherapy for LCSS. In the 131 participants in the gefitinib group who improved, the median time to improvement in all three scores was either eight or 11 days.

NEJSG assessed HRQoL weekly using the Care Notebook and achieved compliance in 72 participants (63%) on chemotherapy and 76 participants (69%) on gefitinib. They used three categories of physical, mental, and 'life' well-being, each of which had three subcategories. The number of participants who were improved/stable/worse was also reported, and there was no difference between the treatment arms in mental well-being. However, the physical and life scales were all better for gefitinib than for cytotoxic chemotherapy. The data for daily functioning was quoted as HR 0.32 (95% CI 0.17 to 0.59; P < 0001).

4. Symptom palliation

In the NEJSG trial, participants who received gefitinib had a significantly longer time to deterioration in the time up to 20 weeks than participants who received paclitaxel plus carboplatin using both 9.1% and 27.3% levels of deterioration. The data for 27.3% deterioration for pain and shortness of breath showed a HR of 0.28 (95% CI 0.17 to 0.46; P = 0.0001) in favour of gefitinib.

Gefitinib and platinum-based chemotherapy versus platinum-based chemotherapy.

1. Overall survival

Han 2017, a phase 2 trial, reported a HR of 0.46 (95% CI 0.24 to 0.87) indicating a clinical benefit in favour of gefinitib plus platinum-based chemotherapy (Analysis 4.1). INTACT 1 and INTACT 2 reported a combined HR of 1.77 (95% CI 0.50 to 6.23). The wide CI indicates that the possibility of no difference in OS between the groups cannot be ruled out. Yu 2014 did not report on OS.

2. Progression-free survival

INTACT 1 and INTACT 2 reported a HR of 0.55 (95% CI 0.19 to 1.60); there was insufficient evidence to indicate any clinical benefit in PFS between the groups (combined total of 32 participants).

Yu 2014 reported a HR of 0.20 (95% CI 0.05 to 0.75) for PFS for comparison of gefitinib plus pemetrexed and cisplatin versus pemetrexed plus cisplatin, while Han 2017 reported a HR of 0.16 (95% CI 0.09 to 0.29) indicating a clinical benefit in favour of gefinitib plus platinum-based chemotherapy (Analysis 4.2). We did not pool results from these two studies as it was not clear whether results from Han were unadjusted or adjusted.

1. Tumour response

Han 2017 reported a RR of 2.54 (95% CI 1.59 to 4.06), indicating a clinical benefit in favour of gefinitib plus platinum-based

chemotherapy (Analysis 4.3). INTACT 1 and INTACT 2 showed that the response rates for gefitinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy were the same as for cytotoxic chemotherapy alone (30.4% versus 28.7%). Yu 2014 reported a response rate of 77% for cytotoxic chemotherapy plus gefitinib compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy alone (50%) (P = 0.13).

Response at cross-over after progression on first-line treatment

INTACT 1 and INTACT 2 reported that 13 out of 18 (72%) of EGFR M + participants responded to gefitinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy, while 2 out of 5 (40%) of EGFR M+ participants responded to cytotoxic chemotherapy alone.

2. Toxicity and adverse effects of treatment

The commonly reported AEs for gefitinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy were thrombocytopenia, rash, diarrhoea and neutropenia (INTACT 1; INTACT 2).

3. Health-related quality of life

HRQoL was measured but not reported in the trial report in one trial (INTACT 2), and was not measured in one trial (INTACT 1),

4. Symptom palliation

No data were available on symptom palliation.

Afatinib versus cisplatin-based chemotherapy

Afatinib versus pemetrexed plus cisplatin: One trial considered this comparison (LUX-Lung 3).

Afatinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin: One trial considered this comparison (LUX-Lung 6).

1. Overall survival

The pooled treatment effect estimate indicated no evidence of a difference in OS between the groups (HR 0.91, 95% CI 0.75 to 1.10; I^2 = 0; 2 trials) (Analysis 5.1). A preliminary report of a pooled analysis of participants with an exon 19 deletion or L858R mutation showed improved survival for afatinib compared to cisplatin-based chemotherapy in participants with an exon 19 deletion (HR 0.81, 95% CI 0.66 to 0.99; P = 0.037) (Yang 2014). We did not formally assess outcome by mutation site in this review.

2. Progression-free survival

The pooled treatment effect estimate showed a clinical benefit in PFS between the groups favouring afatinib (HR 0.42, 95% CI 0.34 to 0.53; I^2 = 90%; 2 trials) (Analysis 5.2). As there was a substantial amount of heterogeneity, we performed a sensitivity analysis using a random-effects model, and results were similar (HR 0.41, 95% CI 0.20 to 0.83).

1. Tumour response

The pooled treatment effect estimate favoured afatinib (RR 2.71, 95% CI 2.12 to 3.46; I^2 = 0%; 2 trials) (Analysis 5.3).

2. Toxicity and adverse effects of treatment

The most commonly reported grade 3/4 AEs in the afatinib-treated participants were rash and diarrhoea, paronychia, and stomatitis/mucositis (LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6) (Table 1). Myelosuppression was consistently greater in the chemotherapy arms, while greater fatigue was seen in one comparison. Diarrhoea was worse with afatinib in both trials.

3. Health-related quality of life

In LUX-Lung 3, improvement was noted using the EORTC QLQ-C30 scale in global health, physical, cognitive, and role function in favour of afatinib over cisplatin plus pemetrexed chemotherapy.

LUX-Lung 6 also used the EORTC QLQ-C30 scale and the lung cancer-specific module QLQ-LC13 with greater than 90% compliance. A greater percentage of participants showed improvement in global health scores/QoL scores (P < 0.0001), physical function (P < 0.0001), and social function (P < 0.0001) with afatinib when compared to cisplatin plus gemcitabine. Subgroup analysis showed delay in time to deterioration in cough, dyspnoea, and pain.

4. Symptom palliation

In the LUX-Lung 3 trial, time-to-deterioration curves for cough and dyspnoea showed a significant effect in favour of afatinib (HR 0.60, 95% CI 0.41 to 0.87; P = 0.007) and (HR 0.68, 95% CI 0.50 to 0.93; P = 0.02), respectively. The HR for pain, 0.83 (95% CI 0.62 to 1.10), showed no evidence of a difference between the two groups (P = 0.19).

In the LUX-Lung 6 trial, time-to-deterioration for cough (HR 0.45; P = 0.0003), dyspnoea (HR 0.54; P < 0.0001), and pain (HR 0.70; P = 0.003) showed a clinical benefit in favour of afatinib (HR 0.56, 95% CI 0.41 to 0.77; P = 0.0002).

Cetuximab plus platinum-based chemotherapy versus platinum-based chemotherapy

Cetuximab plus paclitaxel or docetaxel plus carboplatin versus paclitaxel or docetaxel plus carboplatin: One trial considered this comparison (BMSO99).

Cetuximab plus vinorelbine plus cisplatin versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin: One trial considered this comparison (FLEX).

1. Overall survival

We could not pool data for the two trials comparing cetuximab plus platinum-based chemotherapy to platinum-based chemotherapy alone, as one trial reported only an adjusted analysis (FLEX).

BMSO99 reported a HR of 1.62 (95% CI 0.54 to 4.84), indicating no evidence of clinical benefit in OS between the groups (Analysis 6.1).

FLEX reported a HR of 1.48 (95% CI 0.77 to 2.82), indicating no evidence of clinical benefit in OS between the groups (Analysis 6.1).

2. Progression-free survival

We could not pool data for the two trials comparing cetuximab plus platinum-based chemotherapy to platinum-based chemotherapy alone, as one trial reported only an adjusted analysis (FLEX).

BMSO99 reported a HR of 1.17 (95% CI 0.36 to 3.80), indicating no evidence of clinical benefit in PFS between the groups (Analysis 6.2).

FLEX reported a HR of 0.92 (95% CI 0.53 to 1.60), indicating no evidence of clinical benefit in PFS between the groups (Analysis 6.2).

1. Tumour response

The pooled treatment effect estimate (RR 1.43, 95% CI 0.83 to 2.47; I^2 = 40%; 2 trials) indicated no evidence of clinical benefit between the groups (Analysis 6.3).

2. Toxicity and adverse effects of treatment

The most commonly reported AEs in the cetuximab-treated participants were neutropenia, leukopenia, febrile neutropenia, and fatigue (BMSO99; FLEX) (Table 1).

3. Health-related quality of life

FLEX used the EORTC QLQ-C30 and LCSS, and found no difference in HRQoL between the groups.

HRQoL was not available for the EGFR M+ subgroup in BMSO99.

4. Symptom palliation

Neither trial reported specifically on symptom palliation.

Icotinib versus platinum-based chemotherapy

Icotinib versus cisplatin/pemetrexed plus pemetrexed maintenance therapy: one trial investigated this comparison (CONVINCE).

1. Overall survival

The CONVINCE trial reported a HR of 0.97 (95% CI: 0.72 to 1.31), indicating no difference in OS between the groups.

2. Progression-free survival

The CONVINCE trial reported a HR of 0.61 (95% CI: 0.43 to 0.87), indicating a clinical benefit in PFS in favour of icotinib.

1. Tumour response

The CONVINCE trial did not report tumour response data.

2. Toxicity and adverse effects of treatment

The main AEs associated with icotinib were rash, elevated serum AST (aspartate aminotransferase), diarrhoea and leukopenia. In the chemotherapy arm, the main AEs were nausea, leukopenia and neutropenia.

3. Health-related quality of life

The CONVINCE trial did not report HRQoL data.

4. Symptom palliation

The CONVINCE trial did not report symptom palliation data.

Toxicity and adverse effects of treatment - general comments

The reporting of AEs differed across the 22 included trials. We described in Table 1 the trial-defined reporting of AEs, and tabulated the three most frequently occurring grade 3 or 4 AEs for both the intervention and comparator arms of each trial. The data reported were for overall trial populations, and therefore included non-EGFR M+ participants in trials where these were unselected. The trials were grouped according to the EGFR-targeted treatment employed (erlotinib, gefitinib, afatinib, icotinib, cetuximab).

LUX-Lung 3 and LUX-Lung 6 reported three and two participants with interstitial lung disease, respectively (1%) in the afatinib arms. The AEs associated with cytotoxic chemotherapy in all comparisons were neutropenia, fatigue, leukopenia, vomiting, anaemia, decreased appetite, diarrhoea, anorexia, thrombocytopenia, arthralgia, neuropathy, and dyspnoea.

Assessment of reporting biases

We have not included a funnel plot in the current review as we did not include a sufficient number of trials (n = 10) in any meta-analysis. However, we devised and carried out a thorough search strategy to reduce the impact of publication bias.

Subgroup analyses

We did not include sufficient trials to allow subgroup analyses of smoking history, age, sex, ethnicity, type of mutation, or performance status.

Sensitivity analyses

We did not include sufficient trials in any one meta-analysis to allow us to undertake the sensitivity analyses specified in the Methods section. However, where we detected moderate heterogeneity, we used a random-effects model as a sensitivity analysis to compare results with the fixed-effect model. We have reported these in the Effects of interventions section.

Network meta-analysis

We considered that network meta-analysis was not appropriate because of the different populations within the included trials. We identified other barriers to conducting network meta-analysis: two trials reported adjusted analyses (IPASS; NEJSG), whereas all other trials reported unadjusted analyses; participants in all trials were allowed to switch treatment after progression, and we had no information regarding how this was handled in the analysis for OS; and finally, the Kaplan-Meier plots shown in the trial reports crossed in four trials, indicating that using a Cox proportional hazards model may not be appropriate.

Summary of findings table

We have presented tables for pooled analyses for the outcomes of OS and PFS: Summary of findings 1; Summary of findings 2; Summary of findings 3; Summary of findings 4.

DISCUSSION

Summary of main results

This review included 22 RCTs with a combined total of 3023 participants with EGFR M+ NSCLC. We identified five EGFR-targeted treatments: afatinib (two trials); cetuximab (two trials); erlotinib (eight trials); gefitinib (nine trials); icotinib (one trial). We did not consider network meta-analysis to be appropriate because of the different populations of included trials, the reporting of adjusted analyses versus unadjusted analyses, and the inappropriate use of the Cox proportional hazards model in some trials.

Our primary endpoints were:

1. overall survival (OS), and only two small trials reported an OS gain for participants treated with erlotinib or gefitinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy alone (FASTACT 2;Han 2017). None of the remaining 20 trials demonstrated any OS benefit of targeted therapy compared with

cytotoxic chemotherapy. No OS effect was demonstrated in pooled analyses of erlotinib in ENSURE, EURTAC, and OPTIMAL. Pooled analysis of two gefitinib versus paclitaxed plus carboplatin trials, IPASS and NEJSG, two gefitinib versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin with pemetrexed maintenance trials, Han 2017 and Patil 2017, and the two afatinib trials, LUX-Lung 3 and LUX-Lung 6, also showed no OS benefit. It is important to note that the majority of the included trials of anti-EGFR monotherapy allowed participants to switch treatments on disease progression, which will have a confounding effect on any OS analysis.

2. progression-free survival (PFS). A pooled analysis of four trials (ENSURE; EURTAC; OPTIMAL; TORCH) of erlotinib (583 participants) demonstrated a clinical benefit compared with cytotoxic chemotherapy (HR 0.31, 95% CI 0.25 to 0.39; I^2= 75%, high-certainty evidence) . Of the non-pooled trials, for erlotinib compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy, CHEN reported a non-significant PFS effect of erlotinib (n = 24), and FASTACT 2 (n = 97) reported a significant PFS benefit for erlotinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy (HR 0.25, 95% CI 0.16 to 0.39). The pooled analysis of the gefitinib trials IPASS and NEJSG (N = 491) demonstrated a significant benefit of gefitinib compared with paclitaxel with carboplatin (HR 0.39, 95% CI 0.32 to 0.48; I^2=73%, high-certainty evidence). The pooled analysis of the gefitinib trials Han 2017 and Patil 2017 (N = 371) demonstrated a significant benefit of gefitinib compared with pemetrexed with carboplatin and pemetrexed maintenance (HR 0.59, 95% CI 0.46 to 0.74; I^2= 77%, moderate-certainty evidence). A single trial, WJTOG3405, also demonstrated a significant difference in PFS favouring gefitinib (HR 0.49, 95% CI 0.34 to 0.71). One other trial, First-SIGNAL, demonstrated no clinical benefit of gefitinib compared with gemcitabine plus cisplatin (n = 42). For the comparison of gefitinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy versus chemotherapy, Han 2017 and Yu 2014 both reported a significant benefit of the TKI plus chemotherapy (HR 0.16, 95% CI 0.09 to 0.29, HR 0.20, 95% CI 0.05 to 0.75). INTACT 1 and INTACT 2 reported no difference between a regimen of gefitinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy compared with cytotoxic chemotherapy plus placebo (n = 32). Heterogeneity was high in the pooled analyses of both erlotinib and gefitinib. Five trials showed a significant improvement in PFS for the tyrosine-kinase inhibitor (TKI) in tumours harbouring the Del19 mutation compared to chemotherapy (EURTAC; IPASS; LUX-Lung 3; NEJSG; OPTIMAL). We have not performed meta-analysis of this mutation site-specific data.

In the analysis of tumour response, a pooled analysis of five trials of erlotinib including 593 participants favoured treatment with erlotinib (RR 2.26, 95% CI 1.85 to 2.7) (EURTAC; ENSURE; GTOWG; OPTIMAL; TORCH). One trial of erlotinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy (n = 97) also favoured treatment with erlotinib (FASTACT 2), whilst one other small trial of erlotinib compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy reported no benefit from erlotinib (n = 24) (CHEN). For gefitinib, all six trials demonstrated a clinical benefit for gefitinib compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy: a pooled analysis of six trials including 996 participants yielded a RR of 1.74 (95% CI 1.53 to 1.97) (First-SIGNAL;Han 2017; IPASS; NEJSG; Patil 2017; WJTOG3405). In Han 2017, the gefitinib plus cytotoxic chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone comparison favoured the gefitinib arm (RR 2.54, 95% CI 1.59 to 4.06). Both afatinib trials (n = 709) reported a clinical benefit of afatinib compared with cytotoxic chemotherapy (LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6); the pooled analysis yielded a RR of 2.71 (95% CI 2.12 to 3.46). Heterogeneity was high for the erlotinib and gefitinib pooled comparisons and low for the two afatinib trials. No benefit for cetuximab was reported for either trial (BMSO99; FLEX).

The most commonly reported adverse effects (AEs) for people treated with TKI monotherapy were rash, diarrhoea, paronychia, stomatitis/mucositis (afatinib), and rash, diarrhoea, and fatigue (erlotinib and gefitinib). These AEs are consistent with those listed in the Summary of Product Characteristics for these products, which include diarrhoea, rash, interstitial lung disease, liver impairment, and ocular disorders. Participants treated with cytotoxic chemotherapy experienced the AEs usually associated with this treatment, for example, neutropenia, febrile neutropenia, leukopenia, and fatigue. However, it was difficult to accurately characterise and compare AEs across trials because of the different methods of reporting (definitions used and styles of reporting). This is particularly relevant to the rare but serious AE of interstitial lung disease. A meta-analysis of erlotinib and gefitinib trials reported an incidence of 1.2% for interstitial lung disease with a mortality rate of 22.8% (Shi 2014). The data presented for afatinib suggest this complication occurs with equal frequency with all three TKIs, although no data on duration of therapy was provided. In addition, it should be noted that the AEs reported are relevant to an overall trial population and the 12 trials where EGFR M+ status was not an inclusion criterion were drawn from a much larger population. However, our comparisons highlight the differences in the AEs associated with TKIs and cytotoxic chemotherapy (Pilkington 2012).

Seven trials measured health-related quality of life for participants with EGFR M+ tumours by a number of different methods (two comparing afatinib with cytotoxic chemotherapy, two comparing erlotinib with cytotoxic chemotherapy, and two comparing gefitinib with cytotoxic chemotherapy); all seven trials reported a beneficial effect of the TKI compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy. All three TKIs showed symptom palliation of cough, pain, and dyspnoea, although the methodology used was not standardised.

Any benefit in survival has to be weighed against increased toxicity. The median number of chemotherapy cycles given in the control arms was four out of a planned six three-weekly cycles. The CONVINCE trial stated a median number of chemotherapy cycles of seven, but it was not clear if this included the maintenance phase of pemetrexed. The Han 2017 trial also included maintenance pemetrexed and provided limited information on adverse effects, and did not comment on discontinuations. The oral agents (TKIs) were generally given until progression and appeared to be better tolerated. The median duration of therapy was estimated to be around nine to 12 months. In the two gefitinib trials where data were presented, the number of participants discontinuing therapy was similar in the two groups, while in the EURTAC trial a higher proportion of participants on chemotherapy than on erlotinib discontinued due to toxicity.

Overall completeness and applicability of evidence

The median survival of people with advanced stages III or IV NSCLC is on the order of 12 months, and for adenocarcinomas 18 months. At present, there is no indication that increases in PFS fully translate into OS benefit, which is consistent with the evidence in the current literature base (Booth 2012). There was wide variation in the selection criteria for the included trials, including age, sex, smoking, and EGFR sequencing method. The later trials recruited

participants only with proven EGFR mutations, and saw longer survival times. However, with the comparatively short survival in NSCLC, AEs and health-related quality of life for either first-line or second-line treatments are important. The interpretation of OS was limited by cross-over in most trials. From the limited data available on cross-over at disease progression, the targeted agents and cytotoxics would appear to act on different cell populations.

This review did not include trials of either dacomitinib or osimertinib as both drugs were assessed against another TKI (gefitinib and erlotinib or gefitinib, respectively), and not versus cytotoxic chemotherapy.

Mutations in EGFR can be assessed by several methods including direct sequencing of the tumours, circulating tumour cells (Maheswaran 2008), or cell-free DNA (Bai 2013) and these vary in specificity and sensitivity. Firstly, heterogeneity in the proportion of malignant and normal/stromal cells in the tissues sampled may contribute to variation in the classification of tumours as EGFR M+ or EGFR wild type based on the location of the sample, as in the majority of trials in this review (Tsiatis 2010), and there is preliminary evidence of heterogeneity of mutation analysis with multiple tissue sampling (Bai 2013). Secondly, methodological issues in the assessment of EGFR mutations may contribute to false-negative results (Vogelstein 2013). We excluded immunohistochemical-only categorisation of mutation from this review.

Data on the types of mutations in relation to their sensitivity to targeted therapy is limited (EURTAC). There is evidence that tumours with codon 20 mutations are resistant to EGFR TKI although this mutation commonly appears in acquired resistance to TKIs, while tumours with exon 19 or L858R codon 21 mutations are sensitive to EGFR TKI (Yasuda 2011). The improved survival of exon 19 deletion patients with afatinib compared to cytotoxic chemotherapy suggests that further data will evolve based on more detailed molecular characterisation of EGFR M+ NSCLC (Yang 2014). The cetuximab trials assessed K-RAS and HER-2 mutations and demonstrated no predictive effect of the biomarkers (Linardou 2008). Non-randomised trials have shown that some mutations, principally T790M in codon 20, may contribute to the development of acquired resistance to these agents (Kosaka 2006; Rosell 2011; Su 2012). The majority of trials only included the common mutations in codons 19 and 21, although only four of the included trials excluded T790M mutations (FLEX; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG).

With improving data on individualisation of treatment according to morphological and molecular criteria, patient choice may be a factor in the decision to accept significant toxicity (for example, from cytotoxic chemotherapy) at an earlier or later stage of NSCLC management. This review provides strong data supporting first-line EGFR TKI in NSCLC patients whose EGFR mutation status is known to be positive. As mutation testing is not universally available, and the response time of reporting can be prolonged, chemotherapy may be an acceptable first-line option when histological subtype and smoking history are known in patients with good performance status. Quality control of mutation profiling methodology and international agreement on standardisation would improve confidence in the use of EGFR TKIs in EGFR M+ patients. A more practical issue is the variation in turn-round time for genetic testing which may lead to clinicians opting for empirical treatment (NCLA 2020).

There is some published evidence of ethnic differences in platinum-based haematological toxicity, with Asian patients having a higher incidence of grade 3/4 neutropenia compared to non-Asian patients, based on a pooled analysis of 11,271 participants in 50 phase II and III trials (Hasegawa 2011). It is less well established if there are ethnic differences in response to targeted therapies in the EGFR M+ subgroup, and there was wide variation in the ethnic composition of the reported trials. The majority of the data came from Asian patients, whose tumours may differ in genetic composition, both inherited and that acquired from carcinogen exposure, from non-Asian patients.

Quality of the evidence

All the included trials were randomised, and the overall number of participants (n = 3023) in the 22 trials provides reasonable power to support the conclusions. The participants were spread across five different drug treatments (cetuximab, afatinib, erlotinib, gefitinib, icotinib), reducing the number providing data for each treatment.

We considered the quality of the evidence to be high for the comparisons of erlotinib versus control, gefitinib versus paclitaxel + carboplatin and afatinib versus chemotherapy (Summary of findings 1; Summary of findings 2; Summary of findings 4). We considered the quality of the evidence to be moderate for the comparison of gefitinib versus pemetrexed + carboplatin with pemetrexed maintenance. With the exception of FASTACT 2, all trials were of an open-label design, however, all but three trials (Han 2017; IPASS; Patil 2017) reported independent review of radiographic outcomes.

The 'Risk of bias' table indicates a mixed risk of bias across the included trials for the majority of the assessment criteria, with most trials at unclear or high risk of bias (Figure 2; Figure 3). The two items considered to be at high risk of bias across the trials were related to blinding of treatment allocation for participants and personnel and blinding of outcome assessment. Blinding of participants and administrators is difficult to achieve in trials that compare oral therapy with intravenous chemotherapy treatments, and even if blinding procedures are implemented, the appearance of a rash (a common side effect of treatment with a TKI) would indicate the treatment regimen used. FASTACT 2 was blinded in both treatment allocation and imaging assessment. Blinding of outcome assessment is important when time-to-treatment-failure outcomes, such as PFS, are the indicators of treatment efficacy, and blinded outcome assessment or blinded review of assessment should be part of the trial protocol. Of the large industry-funded trials, OPTIMAL did not report blinding of outcome assessment for erlotinib, and neither did IPASS or WJTOG3405 for gefitinib. We acknowledge that some trials may have implemented such procedures but did not report them. Among the three new trials, CONVINCE was considered to be at high risk of bias for incomplete outcome data and selective reporting.

Figure 2. Risk of bias graph: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies.



Figure 3. Risk of bias summary: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included trial.



Figure 3. (Continued)

The comparisons with cytotoxic chemotherapy were in general direct, but there was wide variation in the choice of cytotoxic chemotherapy in the comparator arm. This reflects variation in clinical practice, in particular, physician preference in relation to patient performance status and comorbidity in the NSCLC populations. For example, single-agent vinorelbine, used as the comparator in two of the smaller erlotinib trials (CHEN; GTOWG), is associated with lower toxicity than the more widely given doublet chemotherapy combinations used in the other trials, and participants in both CHEN and GTOWG were selected on the basis of age (older than 70 years) and not primarily performance status. The trials also varied in the extent to which they included never-smokers or former smokers, and in the male/female ratio. The remaining major factor contributing to heterogeneity was ethnicity, as the eight trials recruiting exclusively in Asia contributed 64% of the participants. All of these factors may contribute to variation in drug handling of both cytotoxic chemotherapy and targeted therapy. Heterogeneity was high for assessment of PFS for erlotinib, gefitinib, and afatinib comparisons in the pooled data. In keeping with emerging evidence from updated pemetrexed trials, CONVINCE, Han 2017 and Patil 2017 included maintenance pemetrexed in the chemotherapy and combined arms.

The results of this review should be interpreted cautiously. Just 10 of the included trials recruited only people with EGFR mutations (n = 2371). This means that the data extracted from the remaining 12 trials (n = 645) are derived from subgroups, with all the issues that the interpretation of subgroup data entails. However, it is worth noting that the subgroup of EGFR M+ patients in the IPASS trial, at 261, was larger than the total trial population of four of the EGFR M+ only trials (EURTAC; NEJSG; OPTIMAL; WJTOG3405) and Han 2017. It should be further noted that, in four trials. the tissue analyses were carried out retrospectively on a limited number of samples that were available at the end of the trial (BMSO99; FLEX; INTACT 1; INTACT 2). However, these four trials provided data from only 113 participants, and 80 of these participants were from the cetuximab trials. We do not believe this factor has an impact on the overall conclusions with respect to the three TKIs.

The confidence limits of the PFS and OS plots were narrow, with the exception of the small trial of erlotinib (CHEN), and suggest the data are precise. We saw wider confidence limits for response, which may reflect the subjective nature of the assessment, even with external review, and current concerns that PFS is the better endpoint for trial assessment where cross-over is a factor (Booth 2012).

There is evidence that Asian patients with NSCLC have a higher proportion of EGFR M+ positivity which may imply there are differences in the biology of NSCLC between individuals of Asian and non-Asian ethnicity. Of the 3023 participants reported on in this review, 2298 were recruited exclusively in trials conducted in Asian countries. We found no evidence that there was a different set of mutations in Asian and white patients, or differences in their toxicity profiles for the targeted or chemotherapy arms of the included trials.

Potential biases in the review process

We excluded trials that utilised EGFR-targeted treatments but did not report any EGFR mutation testing of participants. However, inspection of review papers and reference lists indicated that in relation to four of these trials (BMSO99; FLEX; INTACT 1; INTACT 2), retrospective analyses of tissue samples from participants had taken place, the results of which were reported in papers separate to the original trial publication. It is possible that there are other retrospective analyses that we did not identify, however the patient population from any such analyses is likely to be small.

Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews

The results are in agreement with the meta-analysis of Ku 2011, which compared gefitinib with first-line chemotherapy. A more recent meta-analysis of 14,570 participants given TKIs in first-line, second-line, and maintenance RCTs also reported improved PFS in EGFR M+ participants treated with erlotinib and gefitinib (Lee 2013). This analysis included data on subgroups of participants (n = 67) from TALENT, TOPICAL, and TRIBUTE that were not available to us at the time of analysis. The Lee review analysed no data on participant characteristics, toxicity, and health-related quality of life (Lee 2013). Their analysis combined the data from 10 first-line trials in a meta-analysis of OS and PFS, and showed an overall HR of 0.43 (95% CI 0.38 to 0.49; P < 0.001) for PFS and no effect on OS. As described above, we considered this pooling to be inappropriate on statistical grounds, as adjusted and unadjusted data were combined. An updated meta-analysis by the same group focused on seven trials (ENSURE; EURTAC; LUX-Lung 3; LUX-Lung 6; NEJSG; OPTIMAL; WJTOG3405), and concluded that never-smokers, those with tumours with exon 19 deletions, and women had a greater benefit from erlotinib than chemotherapy (Lee 2015). Other reviews have combined data from seven phase III trials (in Hasegawa 2015) and eight phase lll trials (in Haaland 2014) for first-line chemotherapy, and confirmed the benefit in PFS and response. The data on benefit in non-smokers is difficult to interpret in these studies. One network meta-analysis of 12 trials combined first- and second-line treatments, and concluded that erlotinib, gefitinib, and afatinib showed similar effectiveness (Liang 2014). Our review of participants across 22 trials included additional trials and comparable data from the 3023 EGFR M+ participants on afatinib, erlotinib, and gefitinib. An individual patient meta-analysis of four RCTs of cetuximab, Pujol 2014, (including BMSO99 and FLEX) in NSCLC reported improved PFS in squamous cell cancers (based on a subgroup analysis) but not in non-squamous carcinomas, although these data were not analysed by mutation status.

The prespecified analysis of the Del19 subgroup across a pooled analysis of both of the afatinib trials showed an OS advantage for afatinib compared to chemotherapy in that subgroup, while the L858R subgroup (codon 21 mutation) showed no OS benefit (Yang 2014). Notably, cross-over to afatinib in the control arm was not allowed, whilst in the majority of comparisons of erlotinib and gefitinib with cytotoxic chemotherapy, cross-over to the corresponding TKI was permitted. Overall, there was a lack of data

on the OS benefit of EGFR inhibitors, but with a low confidence in this, due to the inconsistency and imprecision of the results.

AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS

Implications for practice

Compared with cytotoxic chemotherapy, erlotinib, gefitinib, afatinib and icotinib are effective in prolonging PFS but not OS in EGFR M+ NSCLC patients, with acceptable toxicity. Health-related quality of life and response are closely linked, and the available data would favour selection of TKIs over chemotherapy as first-line treatment based on both these criteria, although only six trials reported on health-related quality of life solely in the EGFR M+ population. The majority of trials included people with a performance status (PS) of 1 and 2, but the data on AEs suggest that some PS 3 as well as elderly patients might tolerate the agents better than cytotoxic chemotherapy (CHEN; GTOWG). TKIs may be an alternative to best supportive care in people with EGFR M+ NSCLC unsuitable for chemotherapy. Other reviews have concluded that the cytotoxic chemotherapy standard for non-squamous NSCLC should now be cisplatin and pemetrexed (Brown 2013), at least in patients with a good PS. If mutation testing is not available, a decision about the selection of first-line TKI therapy or chemotherapy may have to be made on the basis of histology, gender, smoking history, and ethnicity.

In people with a good PS, the intercalated regimen of erlotinib or gefitinib and cytotoxic chemotherapy is another option in view of its preliminary OS benefit (FASTACT 2; Han 2017). The lack of overall OS benefit across the majority of trials is likely to be due in large part to treatment cross-over and may prove difficult to resolve.

Our results for AEs underline the evidence for reduced toxicities experienced with TKI therapy versus cytotoxic chemotherapy. This will have implications for patient care and healthcare costs (Pilkington 2012).

Implications for research

Future trials of these agents should only include participants with known EGFR mutations, and attempt to clarify the effectiveness in the common mutant subtypes (codons 19, and 21) as well as the estimated 12% with multiple and rare mutations (Kobayashi 2016). Biomarker trials may help to select patients in whom optimal activity will be demonstrated; for example, codon 19 to 21 mutations are more likely to be associated with receptor internal domain alterations which will not respond to the ligand-binding action of cetuximab (Khambata-Ford 2010) and, as the preliminary data presented here have shown, individual TKIs may prove more effective for specific codon alterations. The FLAURA trial has shown the value of the third generation TKI osimertinib in the treatment of patients with the T790M mutation, which contributes to intrinsic and acquired resistance to first and second generation agents, and efficacy in those with brain metastases. It follows that stratification of NSCLC patients by appropriate molecular profile will evolve progressively with the introduction of new agents.

The effectiveness of combining EGFR-targeted therapy and cytotoxic chemotherapy and the associated toxicity remain to be established, but the data from the BMSO99, FLEX, INTACT 1, and INTACT 2 trials do not favour this approach, either in terms of effectiveness or toxicity. The FASTACT 2 trial demonstrated positive outcomes for the combination of erlotinib and cytotoxic chemotherapy given in an intercalated design, and another small trial Han 2017 showed a survival gain for a combination of gefitinib and chemotherapy. Further evaluation of the value of combinations of TKIs with chemotherapy in terms of effectiveness and toxicity is needed.

Evidence is accumulating that there may be different subgroups of non-squamous NSCLC based on driver gene mutations such as KRAS (Kirsten ras sarcoma gene) and the ALK (anaplastic lymphoma kinase) gene rearrangement and these would appear to be mutually exclusive with the EGFR M+; only isolated case reports have shown multiple gene mutations in the same patient.

Further comparative trials with cytotoxic chemotherapy would seem unlikely to be of value in EGFR M+ patients; the focus should instead be on identifying the predictive value of specific mutations to optimise survival and minimise toxicity from inappropriate therapy (Lee 2015).

The majority of studies in this review used a range of molecular sequencing techniques from a primary tumour biopsy for stratification. Research is currently in progress to assess the utility of less invasive technologies such as cell-free DNA (Murtaza 2013). Future trials should report in detail the degree and duration of symptom control as well as health-related quality of life scores to improve patient selection.

The management of relapsed disease after first line TKI, in particular the high incidence of brain metastases, is an area requiring further study. Finally, there is a continuing concern about the emergence of new mutations, including to the third generation agents such as osimertinib.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank all authors who provided data: Chen, Di Maio (TORCH), Maemondo, Mitsudomi, Zhou (OPTIMAL), and Reck (GTOWG); Prabhash (Patil 2017), members of the Cochrane Lung Cancer Group and peer reviewers who provided helpful comments (Virginie Westeel, Mia Schmidt-Hansen, Fergus Macbeth, Frederic Fiteni, Marta Roqué, Ivan Sola, and Ian Stubbin). Thanks to Corynne Marchal for all her review and procedural advice and the Cochrane Lung Cancer Group, who provided our searches. Many thanks to Kerry Dwan who provided statistical expertise for the previous two versions of this review. We also thank Gemma Cherry for her reviewing skills.

REFERENCES

References to studies included in this review

BMSO99 *{published data only}*

Khambata-Ford S, Harbison CT, Hart LL, Awad M, Xu L-A, Horak CE, et al. Analysis of potential predictive markers of cetuximab benefit in BMS099, a phase III study of cetuximab and first-line taxane/carboplatin in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2010;**28**(6):918-27.

* Lynch TJ, Patel T, Dreisbach L, McCleod M, Heim WJ, Hermann RC, et al. Cetuximab and first-line taxane/carboplatin chemotherapy in advanced non-small cell lung cancer: results of the randomized multicenter phase III trial BMS099. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2010;**28**(6):911-7.

CHEN *{published data only}*

* Chen YM, Tsai CM, Fan WC, Shih JF, Liu SH, Wu CH, et al. Phase II randomized trial of erlotinib or vinorelbine in chemonaive, advanced, non-small cell lung cancer patients aged 70 years or older. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 2012;**7**(2):412-8.

CONVINCE *{published data only}*

Shi YK, Wang L, Han BH, Li W, Yu P, Liu YP, et al. First-line icotinib versus cisplatin/pemetrexed plus pemetrexed maintenance therapy for patients with advanced EGFR mutation-positive lung adenocarcinoma (CONVINCE): a phase 3, open-label, randomized study. *Annals of Oncology* 2017;**28**(10):2443-50.

ENSURE *{published data only}*

* Wu Y-L, Zhou C, Liam CK, Wu G, Liu X, Zhong Z, et al. First-line erlotinib versus gemcitabine/cisplatin in patients with advanced EGFR mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer: analyses from the phase III, randomized, open-label, ENSURE study. *Annals of Oncology* 2015;**26**(9):1883-9.

Wu Y-L, Zhou C, Wu G, Liu X, Zhong Z, Lu S, et al. Quality of life (QOL) analysis from ENSURE, a phase 3, open-label study of first-line erlotinib versus gemcitabine/cisplatin in Asian patients with epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive (MUT+) non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 2014;**9**:S37.

EURTAC *{published and unpublished data}*

De Marinis F, Rosell R, Vergnenegre A, Massuti B, Felip E, Gervais R, et al. Erlotinib vs chemotherapy (CT) in advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients with epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) activating mutations – the EURTAC Phase II randomized trial interim results. *European Journal of Cancer* 2011;**47**:S597.

De Marinis F, Vergnenegre A, Passaro A, Dubos-Arvis C, Carcereny E, Drozdowskyj A, et al. Erlotinib-associated rash in patients with EGFR mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer treated in the EURTAC trial. *Future Oncology* 2015;**11**(3):421-9.

* Rosell R, Carcereny E, Gervais R, Vergnenegre A, Massuti B, Felip E, et al. Erlotinib versus standard chemotherapy as first-line treatment for European patients with advanced EGFR mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer (EURTAC): a multicentre, open-label, randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncology* 2012;**13**(3):239-46.

FASTACT 2 *{published data only}*

Mok T, Ladrera G, Srimuninnimit V, Sriuranpong V, Yu CJ, Thongprasert S, et al. Tumor marker analyses from the phase III, placebo-controlled, FASTACT-2 study of intercalated erlotinib with gemcitabine/platinum in the first-line treatment of advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer* 2016;**98**:1-8.

Mok T, Wu YL, Thongprasert S, Yu C, Zhang J, Ladrera L, et al. A randomized placebo-controlled phase III study of intercalated erlotinib with gemcitabine/platinum in first-line advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): FASTACT-II. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;**30**(Suppl):7519.

* Wu YL, Lee JS, Thongprasert S, Yu CJ, Zhang L, Ladrera G, et al. Intercalated combination of chemotherapy and erlotinib for patients with advanced stage non-small-cell lung cancer (FASTACT-2): a randomised, double-blind trial. *Lancet Oncology* 2013;**14**(8):777-86.

First-SIGNAL *{published data only}*

* Han JY, Park K, Kim SW, Lee DH, Kim HY, Kim HT, et al. First-SIGNAL: first-line single-agent Iressa versus gemcitabine and cisplatin trial in never-smokers with adenocarcinoma of the lung. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;**30**(10):1122-8.

FLEX *{published data only}*

O'Byrne J, Gatzemeier U, Bondarenko I, Barrios C, Eschbach C, Martens UM, et al. Molecular biomarkers in non-small cell lung cancer: a retrospective analysis of data from the phase 3 FLEX study. *Lancet Oncology* 2011;**12**:795-805.

Pirker R, Pereira JR, Szczesna A, Von Pawel J, Krzakowski M, Ramlau R, et al. Cetuximab plus chemotherapy in patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer (FLEX): an open-label randomised phase III trial. *Lancet* 2009;**373**(9674):1525-31.

GTOWG *{published data only}*

Reck M, Von Pawel J, Fischer Jr, Kortsik C, Von Eiff M, Koester W, et al. Erlotinib versus carboplatin/vinorelbine in elderly patients (age 70 or older) with advanced non-small cell lung carcinoma (NSCLC): a randomised phase II study of the German Thoracic Oncology Working Group. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2010;**28**:15s.

Han 2017 *{published data only}*

Han B, Jin B, Chu B, Niu T, Dong Y, Xu Y et al. Combination of chemotherapy and gefitinib as first-line treatment for patients with advanced lung adenocarcinoma and sensitive EGFR mutations: a randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Cancer* 2017;**141**(6):2443-50.

INTACT 1 *{published data only}*

Bell DW, Lynch TJ, Haserlat SM, Harris PL, Okimoto RA, Brannigan BW, et al. Epidermal growth factor receptor mutations in non-small cell lung cancer: molecular analysis of the IDEAL/INTACT gefitinib studies. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2005;**23**:8081-92.

* Giaccone G, Herbst R, Manegold C, Scagliotti G, Rosell R, Miller V, et al. Gefitinib in combination with gemcitabine and cisplatin in advanced non-small cell lung cancer: a phase III trial - INTACT 1. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2004;**22**:777-84.

INTACT 2 *{published data only}*

Herbst RS, Giaccone G, Schiller JH, Natale RB, Miller V, Manegold C, et al. Gefitinib in combination with paclitaxel and carboplatin in advanced non-small cell lung cancer: a phase III trial - INTACT 2. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2004;**22**:785-94.

IPASS *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*

Fukuoka M, Wu YL, Thongprasert S, Sunpaweravong P, Leong SS, Sriuranpong V, et al. Biomarker analyses and final overall survival results from a phase III, randomized, open-label, first-line study of gefitinib versus carboplatin/paclitaxel in clinically selected patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer in Asia (IPASS). *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2011;**29**(21):2866-74.

Ichinose Y, Nishiwaki Y, Ohe Y, Yamamoto N, Negoro S, Duffield E, et al. Analyses of Japanese patients recruited in IPASS, a phase III, randomized, open-label, first-line study of gefitinib vs carboplatin/paclitaxel in selected patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 2009;**4**:S443.

Mok T, Wu YL, Thongprasert S, Yang CH, Chu D, Saijo N, et al. Phase III randomised open-label first-line study of gefitinib vs carboplatin/paclitaxel in clinically selected patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (IPASS). *Annals of Oncology* 2008;**19**:1.

* Mok TS, Wu YL, Thongprasert S, Yang CH, Chu DT, Saijo N, et al. Gefitinib or carboplatin-paclitaxel in pulmonary adenocarcinoma. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2009;**361**(10):947-57.

Ohe Y, Ichinose Y, Nishiwaki Y, Yamamoto N, Negoro S, Duffield E, et al. Phase III, randomized, open-label, first-line study of gefitinib versus carboplatin/paclitaxel in selected patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (IPASS): evaluation of recruits in Japan. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2009;**27**(15s):8044.

Thongprasert S, Duffield E, Saijo N, Wu YL, Yang JC, Chu DT, et al. Health-related quality-of-life in a randomized phase III first-line study of gefitinib versus carboplatin/paclitaxel in clinically selected patients from Asia with advanced NSCLC (IPASS). *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 2011;**6**(11):1872-80.

Wu Y, Fukuoka L, Mok M, Saijo TSK, Thongprasert N, Yang S, et al. Tumor response and health-related quality of life in clinically selected patients from Asia with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer treated with first-line gefitinib: post hoc analyses from the IPASS study. *Lung Cancer* 2013;**81**:280-7.

Wu Y, Mok T, Chu D, Han B, Liu X, Zhang L, et al. Evaluation of clinically selected patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer recruited in China in a phase III, randomized, open-label, first-line study in Asia of gefitinib versus carboplatin/paclitaxel (IPASS). *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2009;**27**(15s):8041.

Wu YL, Chu DT, Han B, Liu X, Zhang L, Zhou C, et al. Phase III, randomized, open-label, first-line study in Asia of gefitinib versus carboplatin/paclitaxel in clinically selected patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer: evaluation of patients recruited from mainland China. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;**8**:232-43.

Wu YL, Saijo N, Thongprasert S, Yang JC, Han B, Margono B, et al. Efficacy according to blind independent central review: post-hoc analyses from the phase III, randomized, multicenter, IPASS study of first-line gefitinib versus carboplatin/paclitaxel in Asian patients with EGFR mutation-positive advanced NSCLC. *Lung Cancer* 2017;**104**:119-25.

Yang CH, Fukuoka M, Mok T, Wu YL, Thongprasert S, Saijo N, et al. Final overall survival (OS) results from a phase III, randomised, open-label, first-line study of gefitinib v carboplatin/paclitaxel in clinically selected patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer in Asia (IPASS). *Annals of Oncology* 2010;**21**:LBA2.

LUX-Lung 3 *{published data only}*

Boehringer Ingelheim. Submission of evidence on the use of afatinib in adult patients with locally advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) with activating Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor (EGFR) mutation(s). www.nice.org.uk/guidance/TA310/documents/lung-cancer-non-small-cell-egfr-mutation-positive-afatinib-evaluation-report (accessed prior to 2 Feb 2021).

O'Byrne KJ, Sequist LV, Schuler M, Yamamoto N, Hirsh V, Mok T, et al. LUX-Lung 3: symptom and health-related quality of life results from a randomized phase III study in 1st-line advanced NSCLC patients harbouring EGFR mutations. In: 11th Annual British Thoracic Oncology Group Conference; 2013 January 23-25; Dublin Ireland. 2013:S11.

* Sequist LV, Yang JCH, Yamamoto N, O'Byrne K, Hirsh V, Mok T, et al. Phase III study of afatinib or cisplatin plus pemetrexed in patients with metastatic lung adenocarcinoma with EGFR mutations. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2013;**31**:1-11.

Yang JC, Schuler M, Yamanoto N, O'Byrne K, Hirsch V, Mok T, et al. LUX-Lung 3: a randomized, open-label, phase III study of afatinib vs cisplatin/pemetrexed as first line treatment for patients with advanced adenocarcinoma of the lung harboring EGFR-activating mutations. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;**30**:LBA7500.

LUX-Lung 6 *{published data only}*

Geater SL, Xu C-R, Zhou C, Hu C-P, Feng J, Lu S, et al. Symptom and quality of life improvement in LUX-Lung 6: an open-label phase III study of afatinib versus cisplatin/gemcitabine in Asian patients with EGFR mutation-positive advanced non–small-cell lung cancer. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 2015;**10**(6):883-9.

Geater SL, Zhou C, Hu C-P, Feng JF, Lu S, Huang Y, et al. LUX-Lung 6: patient-reported outcomes (PROs) from a randomized open-label, phase III study in first-line advanced NSCLC patients harboring epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutations. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2013;**31**(15 (May Suppl)):8016.

* Wu Y-L, Zhou C, Hu C-P, Feng J, Lu S, Huang Y, et al. Afatinib versus cisplatin plus gemcitabine for first-line treatment of Asian patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer harbouring EGFR mutations (LUX-Lung 6): an open-label, randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncology* 2014;**15**(2):213-22.

Yang C-HJ, Wu Y-L, Schuler M. Afatinib versus cisplatin-based chemotherapy for EGFR mutation-positive lung adenocarcinoma (LUX-Lung 3 and LUX-Lung 6): analysis of overall survival data from two randomised, phase 3 trials. *Lancet Oncology* 2015;**14**:1173-8.

NEJSG *{published and unpublished data}*

Fukuhara T, Maemondo M, Inoue A, Kobayashi K, Sugawara S, Oizumi S, et al. Factors associated with a poor response to gefitinib in the NEJ002 study: smoking and the L858R mutation. *Lung Cancer* 2015;**88**:181-6.

Inoue A, Kobayashi K, Maemondo M, Sugawara S, Oizumi S, Isobe H, et al. Updated overall survival results from a randomized phase III trial comparing gefitinib with carboplatin–paclitaxel for chemo-naïve non-small cell lung cancer with sensitive EGFR gene mutations (NEJ002). *Annals of Oncology* 2012;**24**(1):54-9.

Kinoshita I, Inoue A, Kobayashi K, Maemondo M, Sugawara S, Oizumi S. Phase III study of gefitinib versus chemotherapy by carboplatin (CBDCA) plus paclitaxel (TXL) as first-line therapy for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) with EGFR mutations: North East Japan Gefitinib Study Group Trial 002 (NEJ002). *Respirology* 2009;**14**:A127.

* Maemondo M, Inoue A, Kobayashi K, Sugawara S, Oizumi S, Isobe H, et al. Gefitinib or chemotherapy for non–small cell lung cancer with mutated EGFR. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2010;**362**(25):2380-8.

Oizumi S, Kobayashi K, Inoue A, Maemondo M, Sugawara S, Yoshizawa H, et al. Quality of life with gefitinib in patients with EGFR-mutated non-small cell lung cancer: quality of life analysis of North East Japan Study Group 002 Trial. *Oncologist* 2012;**17**(6):863-70.

Satoh H, Inoue A, Kobayashi K, Maemondo M, Oizumi S, Isobe H, et al. Low-dose gefitinib treatment for patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer harboring sensitive epidermal growth factor receptor mutations. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 2011;**6**(8):1413-7.

Watanabe S, Inoue A, Nukiwa T, Kobayashi K. Comparison of gefitinib versus chemotherapy in patients with non-small cell lung cancer with Exon 19 deletion. *Anticancer Research* 2015;**35**(12):6957-61.

OPTIMAL *{published and unpublished data}*

Chen G, Feng JF, Zhou C, Wu Y-L, Liu XQ, Wang C, et al. Quality of life (QoL) analyses from OPTIMAL (CTONG-0802), a phase III, randomised, open-label study of first-line erlotinib versus chemotherapy in patients with advanced EGFR mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *Annals Oncology* 2013;**24**(6):1615-22.

Wu YL, Zhou C, Chen G, Feng J, Liu X, Wang C, et al. First biomarker analyses from a phase III randomised open-label first-line study of erlotinib versus carboplatin plus gemcitabine in Chinese patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) with EGFR activating mutations (OPTIMAL, CTONG0802). *Annals of Oncology* 2010;**21**:1883-9.

Zhou C, Wu Y, Liu L, Wang X, Chen C, Feng G, et al. Overall survival (OS) results from OPTIMAL (CTONG0802), a phase III trial of erlotinib (E) versus carboplatin plus gemcitabine (GC) as first-line treatment for Chinese patients with EGFR mutation-positive advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;**30**(15 (May Suppl)):7520.

Zhou C, Wu YL, Chen G, Feng J, Liu X, Wang C, et al. Efficacy results from the randomised phase III OPTIMAL (CTONG 0802) study comparing first-line erlotinib versus carboplatin plus gemcitabine in Chinese advanced non small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients with EGFR activating mutations. *Annals of Oncology* 2010;**21**:6.

Zhou C, Wu YL, Chen G, Feng J, Liu X, Wang C, et al. Final overall survival results from a randomised, phase III study of erlotinib versus chemotherapy as first-line treatment of EGFR mutation-positive advanced non small-cell lung cancer (OPTIMAL, CTONG-0802). *Annals of Oncology* 2015;**26**:1877-83.

* Zhou C, Wu YL, Chen G, Feng J, Liu XQ, Wang C, et al. Erlotinib versus chemotherapy as first-line treatment for patients with advanced EGFR mutation positive non-small cell lung cancer (OPTIMAL, CTONG-0802): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, phase 3 study. *Lancet Oncology* 2011;**12**(8):735-42.

Patil 2017 *{published data only}*

Patil VM, Noronha V, Joshi A, Choughule AB, Bhattacharjee A, Kumar R, et al. Phase III study of gefitinib or pemetrexed with carboplatin in EGFR mutated advanced lung adenocarcinoma. *European Society for Medical Oncology Open* 2017;**2**:e000168.

TOPICAL *{published data only}*

Lee SM, Khan I, Upadhyay S, Lewanski C, Falk S, Skailes G, et al. First-line erlotinib in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer unsuitable for chemotherapy (TOPICAL): a double-blind, placebo-controlled phase III trial. *Lancet Oncology* 2012;**13**(11):1161-70.

TORCH *{published data only}*

Di Maio M, Leighl NB, Gallo C, Feld R, Ciardiello F, Butts C, et al. Quality of life analysis of TORCH, a randomized trial testing first-line erlotinib followed by second-line cisplatin/gemcitabine chemotherapy in advanced non–small cell lung cancer. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 2012;**7**(12):1830-44.

Gridelli C, Butts C, Ciardiello F, Feld R, Gallo C, Perrone F. An international, multicenter, randomized phase III study of first-line erlotinib followed by second-line cisplatin/gemcitabine versus first-line cisplatin/gemcitabine followed by second-line erlotinib in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: treatment rationale and protocol dynamics of the TORCH trial. *Clinical Lung Cancer* 2008;**9**(4):235-8.

* Gridelli C, Ciardiello F, Gallo C, Feld R, Butts C, Gebbia V, et al. First-line erlotinib followed by second-line cisplatin-

gemcitabine chemotherapy in advanced non-small cell lung cancer: the TORCH randomized trial. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;**30**(24):3002-11.

Kim L, Saieg M, Di Maio M, Gallo C, Butts C, Ciardiello F, et al. Biomarker analysis of the phase 3 TORCH trial for first line erlotinib versus chemotherapy in advanced non-small cell lung cancer patients. *Oncotarget* 2017;**8**(34):57528-36.

Tsao M, Gallo S, Saieg C, Santos M, Gebbia GDC, Perrone V, et al. Biomarkers of torch trial on first-line erlotinib followed by second-line chemotherapy in advanced non-small cell lung cancer patients. In: International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer, 3rd European Lung Cancer Conference; 2012 April 18-21; Geneva, Switzerland. 2012.

WJTOG3405 *{published data only}*

Mitsudomi T, Morita S, Yatabe Y, Negoro S, Okamoto I, Seto T, et al. Updated overall survival results of WJTOG 3405, a randomized phase III trial comparing gefitinib (G) with cisplatin plus docetaxel (CD) as the first-line treatment for patients with non-small cell lung cancer harboring mutations of the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR). *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;**30**(15 (S1)):7521.

* Mitsudomi T, Morita S, Yatabe Y, Negoro S, Okamoto I, Tsurutani J, et al. Gefitinib versus cisplatin plus docetaxel in patients with non-small cell lung cancer harbouring mutations of the epidermal growth factor receptor (WJTOG3405): an open label, randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncology* 2009;**11**(2):121-8.

Yoshioka H, Mitsudomi T, Morita S, Yatabe Y, Negoro S, Okamoto I, et al. Final overall survival results of WJTOG 3405, a randomized phase 3 trial comparing gefitinib (G) with cisplatin plus docetaxel (CD) as the first-line treatment for patients with non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) harboring mutations of the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR). *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2014;**32**(15 (May Suppl)):8117.

Yoshioka H, Shimokawa M, Seto T, Morita S, Yatabe Y, Okamoto I, et al. Final overall survival results of WJTOG3405, a randomized phase III trial comparing gefitinib versus cisplatin with docetaxel as the first-line treatment for patients with stage IIIB/IV or postoperative recurrent EGFR mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer. *Annals of Oncology* 2019;**30**(12):1979-84. [DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mdz399]

Yu 2014 *{published data only}*

* Yu H, Zhang J, Wu X, Luo Z, Wang H, Sun S, et al. A phase II randomized trial evaluating gefitinib intercalated with pemetrexed/platinum chemotherapy or pemetrexed/platinum chemotherapy alone in unselected patients with advanced non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer. *Cancer Biology & Therapy* 2014;**15**(7):832-9.

References to studies excluded from this review

Boutsikou 2013 *{published data only}*

Boutsikou E, Kontakiotis T, Zarogoulidis P, Darwiche K, Eleptheriadou E, Porpodis K, et al. Docetaxel-carboplatin in combination with erlotinib and/or bevacizumab in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. *OncoTargets and Therapy* 2013;**6**:125-34.

Crino 2008 *{published data only}*

* Crinò L, Cappuzzo F, Zatloukal P, Reck M, Pesek M, Thompson JC, et al. Gefitinib versus vinorelbine in chemotherapy-naive elderly patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer (INVITE): a randomized, phase II study. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2008;**26**(26):4253-60.

ECOG 4508 *{published data only}*

Aggarwal C, Dahlberg S, Hanna E, Kolesar N, Hirsch FR, Duresh S, et al. Exploratory biomarker analyses from ECOG 4508: three-arm randomized phase II study of carboplatin (C) and paclitaxel (P) in combination with cetuximab (CET), IMC-A12, or both for advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients (pts). *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2013;**31**(15 (S1)):8106.

FASTACT *{published data only}*

* Mok TSK, Wu Y-L, Yu C-J, Zhou C, Chen YM, Zhang L, et al. Randomized, placebo-controlled, phase II study of sequential erlotinib and chemotherapy as first-line treatment for advanced non–small-cell lung cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2009;**27**(30):5080-7.

Gatzemeier 2003 *{published data only}*

* Gatzemeier U, Rosell R, Ramlau R, Robinet R, Szczesna A, Quoix E, et al. Cetuximab (C225) in combination with cisplatin/vinorelbine vs. cisplatin/vinorelbine alone in the first-line treatment of patients (pts) with epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) positive advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2003;**22**:642.

Goss 2009 *{published data only}*

* Goss G, Ferry D, Wierzbicki R, Laurie SA, Thompson J, Biesma B, et al. Randomized phase II study of gefitinib compared with placebo in chemotherapy-naive patients with advanced non–small cell lung cancer and poor performance status. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2009;**27**(13):2253-60.

Heigener 2014 *{published data only}*

Heigener DF, Deppermann KM, Pawel J, Fischer JR, Kortsik C, Bohnet S, et al. Open, randomized, multi-center phase II study comparing efficacy and tolerability of erlotinib vs. carboplatin/vinorelbin in elderly patients (> 70 years of age) with untreated non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer* 2014;**84**(1):62-6.

Hirsh 2011 *{published data only}*

Hirsch FR, Kabbinavar F, Eisen T, Martins R, Schnell FM, Dziadziuszko R, et al. A randomized, phase II, biomarker-selected study comparing erlotinib to erlotinib intercalated with chemotherapy in first-line therapy for advanced non–small-cell lung cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2011;**29**(26):3567-73.

Janne 2012 *{published data only}*

Jänne PA, Wang X, Socinski MA, Crawford J, Stinchcombe TE, Gu L, et al. Randomized phase II trial of erlotinib alone or with carboplatin and paclitaxel in patients who were never or light former smokers with advanced lung

adenocarcinoma: CALGB30406 trial. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;**30**(17):2046-55.

JO25567 *{published data only}*

Seto T, Kato T, Nishio M, Goto K, Atagi S, Hosomi Y, et al. Erlotinib alone or with bevacizumab as first-line therapy in patients with advanced non-squamous non-small-cell lung cancer harbouring EGFR mutations (JO25567): an open-label, randomised, multicentre, phase 2 study. *Lancet Oncology* 2014;**15**(11):1236-44.

Lilenbaum 2008 *{published data only}*

* Lilenbaum R, Axelrod R, Thomas S, Dowlati A, Seigel L, Albert D, et al. Randomized phase II trial of erlotinib or standard chemotherapy in patients with advanced non–small cell lung cancer and a performance status of 2. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2008;**26**(6):863-9.

Massuti 2014 *{published data only}*

Massuti B, Campelo RG, Abreu DR, Remon J, Majem M, Galvez E, et al. Open, phase II randomized trial of gefitinib alone versus olaparib (AZD2281) plus gefitinib in advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients (P) with epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutations: Spanish Lung Cancer Group trial. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2014;**32**(15 Suppl 1):TPS8127.

NEJ005 2014 *{published data only}*

* Minato K, Oizumi S, Sugawara S, Harada T, Inoue A, Fujita Y, et al. Randomized PII of concurrent vs sequential alternating gefitinib and chemotherapy in EGFR-mutant NSCLC: NEJ005/TCOG0902. *Annals of Oncology* 2014;**25**:V56.

Oizumi S, Sugawara S, Minato K, Harada T, Inoue A, Fujita Y, et al. Randomized phase II study of concurrent gefitinib and chemotherapy versus sequential alternating gefitinib and chemotherapy in previously untreated non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) with sensitive EGFR mutations: NEJ005/TCOG0902. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2014;**32**(15):8016.

Sugawara S, Oizumi S, Minato K, Harada T, Inoue A, Fujita Y, et al. Randomized phase II study of concurrent versus sequential alternating gefitinib and chemotherapy in previously untreated non-small cell lung cancer with sensitive EGFR mutations: NEJ005/TCOG0902. *Annals of Oncology* 2015;**26**(5):888-94.

NEJ009 *{published data only}*

Inoue A, Hosomi Y, Maemondo M, Sugawara S, Kato T, Takahashi K, et al. NEJ009 trial: a randomized phase III study of gefitinib (G) in combination with carboplatin (C) plus pemetrexed (P) versus G alone in patients with advanced nonsquamous non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) with EGFR mutation. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2014;**32**(15):TPS8131.

Rosell 2004 *{published data only}*

* Rosell R, Daniel C, Ramlau R, Szczesna A, Constenla M, Mennecier B, et al. Randomized phase II study of cetuximab in combination with cisplatin (C) and vinorelbine (V) vs. CV alone in the first-line treatment of patients with epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR)-expressing advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2004;**22**(14S):7012.

Rosell 2008 *{published data only}*

Rosell R, Robinet G, Szczesna A, Ramlau R, Constenla M, Mennecier BC, et al. Randomized phase II study of cetuximab plus cisplatin/vinorelbine compared with cisplatin/vinorelbine alone as first-line therapy in EGFR-expressing advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *Annals of Oncology* 2008;**19**(2):362–9.

Thatcher 2014 *{published data only}*

Thatcher N, Hirsch FR, Szczesna A, Ciuleanu TE, Szafranski W, Dediu M, et al. A randomized, multicenter, open-label, phase III study of gemcitabine-cisplatin (GC) chemotherapy plus necitumumab (IMC-11F8/LY3012211) versus GC alone in the first-line treatment of patients (pts) with stage IV squamous non-small cell lung cancer (sq-NSCLC). *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2014;**32**(15):8008.

White *{published data only}*

Michael M, White SC, Abdi E, Nott L, Clingan P, Zimet A, et al. Multicenter randomized, open-label phase II trial of sequential erlotinib and gemcitabine compared with gemcitabine monotherapy as first-line therapy in elderly or ECOG PS two patients with advanced NSCLC. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2015;**11**(1):4-14.

Xie 2015 *{published data only}*

Xie Y, Liang J, Su N. Gefitinib versus erlotinib as first-line treatment for patients with advanced EGFR mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer. *Nan Fang Yi Ke Da Xue Xue Bao* 2015;**35**(3):446-9.

Yang 2015 *{published data only}*

Yang XB, Wu WY, Long SQ, Deng H, Pan ZQ, He WF, et al. Fuzheng Kang'ai decoction combined with gefitinib in advanced non-small cell lung cancer patients with epidermal growth factor receptor mutations: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 2015;**16**(1):146.

References to studies awaiting assessment

TALENT *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*

Gatzmeier U, Pluzanska A, Szczesna A, Kaukel E, Roubec J, De Rosa F, et al. Phase III study of erlotinib in combination with cisplatin and gemcitabine in advanced non-small cell lung cancer: the Tarceva Lung Cancer Investigation trial. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2007;**25**(12):1545-52.

TRIBUTE *{published data only}*

* Herbst RS, Prager D, Hermann R, Fehrenbacher, Johnson BE, Sandler A, et al. TRIBUTE: a phase III trial of erlotinib hydrochloride (OSI-774) combined with carboplatin and paclitaxel chemotherapy in advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2005;**25**:5892-9.

Additional references

Bai 2013

Bai H, Wang Z, Wang Y, Zhuo M, Zhou Q, Duan J, et al. Detection and clinical significance of intratumoral EGFR mutational heterogeneity in Chinese patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *PLOS One* 2013;**8**(2):e54170.

Booth 2012

Booth CM, Eisenhauer EA. Progression-free survival: meaningful or simply measurable? *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;**30**(10):100-33.

Brown 2013

Brown T, Pilkington G, Bagust A, Boland A, Oyee J, Tudur-Smith C, et al. Clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of first-line chemotherapy for adult advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technology Assessment* 2013;**17**(31):1-278.

Cancer Research UK

Cancer Research UK . Lung cancer incidence. www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/lung-cancer#heading-Zero (accessed April 2020).

Cancer Research UK 2019

Cancer Rearch UK . Lung cancer incidence statistics. www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/lung-cancer#heading-Zerowww.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/lung-cancer#heading-Zero (accessed April 2020).

Cancer Research UK 2019a

Cancer Research UK . Lung cancer mortality statistics. www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/lung-cancer/mortality (accessed April 2020).

Cancer Research UK 2019c

Cancer Research UK . Lung cancer incidence by morphology. about-cancer.cancerresearchuk.org/about-cancer/lung-cancer/stages-types-grades/types?_ga=2.235353729.1634280933.1587130128-852209561.1582902408 (accessed April 2020).

Cancer Research UK 201a

Cancer Research UK . Lung cancer risk factors. www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/lung-cancer#heading-Three://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancer-info/cancerstats/types/lung/riskfactors/ (accessed April 2020).

ESMO 2018

Planchard D, Popat S, Reck M, Kerr K, Novello S, Smit EF, et al. Metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC): ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Annals of Oncology* 2018;**29**(Suppl 4):iv192-iv237.

FDA 2013

US Food and Drug Administration. Erlotinib. www.fda.gov/drugs/informationondrugs/approveddrugs/ucm352317.htm (accessed December 2014).

FDA 2014

US Food and Drug Administration. Afatinib. www.fda.gov/Drugs/InformationOnDrugs/ApprovedDrugs/ucm360574.htm (accessed December 2014).

FDA 2018

US Food and Drug Administration. FDA approves osimertinib for first-line treatment of metastatic NSCLC with most common EGFR mutations. www.fda.gov/drugs/resources-information-approved-drugs/fda-approves-osimertinib-first-line-treatment-metastatic-nsclc-most-common-egfr-mutations (accessed prior to 2 Feb 2021).

FDA 2018(a)

US Food and Drug Administration. FDA approves dacomitinib for metastatic non-small cell lung cancer. www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/fda-approves-dacomitinib-metastatic-non-small-cell-lung-cancer (accessed prior to 2 Feb 2021).

FLAURA trial

Soria J-C, Ohe Y, Vansteenkiste J, Reungwetwattana T, Chewaskulyong B, Lee KH, et al. Osimertinib in untreated EGFR-mutated advanced non–small-cell lung cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2017;**378**(2):113-25.

GLOBOCAN 2018

International Agency for Research on Cancer. GLOBOCAN 2018: Estimated cancer incidence, mortality and prevalence worldwide in 2018. gco.iarc.fr/today/data/factsheets/cancers/15-Lung-fact-sheet.pdf (accessed April 2020).

GRADE Working Group 2004

GRADE Working Group. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2004;**328**:1490-4.

Haaland 2014

Haaland B, Tan PS, De Castro G Jr, Lopes G. Meta-analysis of first-line therapies in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer harboring EGFR-activating mutations. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 2014;**9**(6):805-11.

Han 2012

Han W, Lo HW. Landscape of EGFR signalling network in human cancer. *Cancer Letters* 2012;**318**(2):124-34.

Hasegawa 2011

Hasegawa Y, Kawaguchi T, Kubo A, Ando M, Shiraishi J, Isa S, et al. Ethnic difference in haematological toxicity in patients with non-small-cell lung cancer treated with chemotherapy: a pooled analysis on Asian versus non-Asian in phase II and III clinical trials. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 2011;**6**(11):1881-8.

Hasegawa 2015

Hasegawa Y, Ando M, Maemondo M, Yamamoto S, Isa S, Saka H, et al. The role of smoking status on the progression-free survival of non-small cell lung cancer patients harboring activating epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutations receiving first-line EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitor versus platinum doublet chemotherapy: a meta-analysis of prospective randomized trials. *Oncologist* 2015;**20**(3):307-15.

Higgins 2011

Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated

March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from training.cochrane.org/handbook/archive/v5.1.

Higgins 2012

Higgins JPT, Jackson D, Barrett JK, Lu G, Ades AE, White IR. Consistency and inconsistency in network meta-analysis: concepts and models for multi-arm studies. *Research Synthesis Methods* 2012;**3**:98-110.

Khambata-Ford 2010

Khambata-Ford S, Harbison CT, Hart LL, Awad M, Xu Li-An, Horak CE, et al. Analysis of potential predictive markers of cetuximab benefit in BMS099, a Phase III study of cetuximab and first-line taxane/carboplatin in advanced non small cell lung cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2010;**28**:918-27.

Kobayashi 2016

Kobayashi Y, Mitsudomi T. Not all epidermal growth factor receptor mutations are created equal. *Cancer Science* 2016;**107**:1179-86.

Kosaka 2006

Kosaka T, Yatabe Y, Endoh, Yoshida K, Hida T, Tsuboi M, et al. Analysis of epidermal growth factor receptor gene mutation in patients with non-small-cell-lung cancer and acquired resistance to gefitinib. *Clinical Cancer Research* 2006;**12**:5764.

Ku 2011

Ku GK, Haaland B, De Lima Lopes G. Gefitinib vs chemotherapy as first-line therapy in advanced non-small cell lung cancer: meta- analysis of phase III trials. *Lung Cancer* 2011;**74**:469-73.

Lee 2013

Lee CK, Brown C, Gralla RJ, Hirsh V, Thongprasert S, Tsai C-M, et al. Impact of EGFR inhibitor in non–small cell lung cancer on progression-free and overall survival: a meta-analysis. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 2013;**105**:595-605.

Lee 2015

Lee CK, Wu YL, Ding PN, Lord SJ, Inoue A, Zhou C, et al. Impact of specific epidermal growth factor receptor mutations and clinical characteristics on outcomes after treatment with EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors versus chemotherapy in EGFR-mutant lung cancer: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2015;**33**(17):1958-65.

Liang 2014

Liang W, Wu X, Fang W, Zhao Y, Yang Y, Hu Z, et al. Network meta-analysis of erlotinib, gefitinib, afatinib and icotinib in patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer harboring EGFR mutations. *PLOS One* 2014;**9**(2):e85245.

Linardou 2008

Linardou H, Dahabreh IJ, Kanalopti D, Siannis F, Bafaloukos D, Kosmidis P, et al. Assessment of somatic k-ras mutations as a mechanism associated with resistance to EGFR-targeted agents: a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer and metastatic colorectal cancer. *Lancet Oncology* 2008;**9**(10):962-72.

Maheswaran 2008

Maheswaran S, Sequist LV, Nagrath S, Ulkus L, Brannigan B, Collura CV, et al. Detection of mutations in EGFR in circulating lung-cancer cells. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2008;**359**(4):366-77.

MRC 1995

Non-Small Cell Lung Collaborative Group. Chemotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer: a meta-analysis using updated data on individual patients from 52 randomised clinical trials. *BMJ* 1995;**311**:899-912.

Murtaza 2013

Murtaza M, Dawson SJ, Tsui DW, Gale D, Forshew T, Piskorz AM, et al. Non-invasive analysis of acquired resistance to cancer therapy by sequencing of plasma DNA. *Nature* 2013;**497**(7447):108-12. [DOI: 10.1038/nature12065]

NCLA 2020

Royal College of Physicians. National Lung Cancer Audit. Spotlight on molecular testing. www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/spotlight-audit-molecular-testing-advanced-lung-cancer-2019-diagnoses-2017 (accessed 31/07/2020).

NICE 2010

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. TA192: Gefitinib for the first-line treatment of locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer. www.nice.org.uk/TA192 (accessed December 2014).

NICE 2012

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Erlotinib for the first-line treatment of locally advanced or metastatic EGFR-TK mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer. publications.nice.org.uk/erlotinib-for-the-first-line-treatment-of-locally-advanced-or-metastatic-egfr-tk-mutation-positive-ta258 (accessed December 2014).

NICE 2014

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Lung cancer (non small cell, EGFR mutation positive) - afatinib: final appraisal determination document. guidance.nice.org.uk/TAG/341/FAD/FinalAppraisalDetermination/pdf/English (accessed December 2014).

NLCA 2015

Clinical Effectiveness and Evaluation Unit. National Lung Cancer Audit. www.hqip.org.uk/public/cms/253/625/19/354/2015-12-02%20National%20Lung%20Cancer%20Report.pdf?realName=9wvAlU.pdf&v=0 (accessed May 2016).

Peters 2012

Peters S, Adjei AA, Gridelli C, Reck M, Kerr K, Felip E. Metastatic non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Annals of Oncology* 2012;**23 Suppl 7**:56-64.

Pilkington 2012

Pilkington G, Dickson R. Why novel treatments require changes in disease management. *Cancer Nursing Practice* 2012;**11**(8):21-4.

Pujol 2014

Pujol J-L, Pirker R, Lynch TJ, Butts CA, Roselle R, Shepherd FA, et al. Meta-analysis of individual patient data from randomized trials of chemotherapy plus cetuximab as first-line treatment for advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer* 2014;**83**:211-8.

Rosell 2009

Rosell R, Moran T, Queralt C, Porta R, Cardenal F, Camps C, et al. Screening for epidermal growth factor receptor mutations in lung cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2009;**361**(10):958-67.

Rosell 2011

Rosell R, Molina MA, Costa C, Simonetti S, Gimenez-Capitan A, Bertran-Alamillo J, et al. Pretreatment EGFR T790M mutation and BRCA1 mRNA expression in erlotinib-treated advanced non–small cell lung cancer patients with EGFR mutations. *Clinical Cancer Research* 2011;**17**(5):1160-8.

Rosell 2012

Rosell R, Carcereny E, Gervais R, Vergnenegre A, Massuti B, Felip E, et al. Erlotinib versus standard chemotherapy as first-line treatment for European patients with advanced EGFR mutation-positive non-small cell lung cancer (EURTAC): a multicentre, open-label, randomized phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncology* 2012;**13**(3):239-46.

Salanti 2009

Salanti G, Marinho V, Higgins JPT. A case study of multiple-treatments meta-analysis demonstrates that covariates should be considered. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2009;**62**:857-64.

Salanti 2011

Salanti G, Ades AE, Ioannidis JP. Graphical methods and numerical summaries for presenting results from multiple-treatment meta-analysis: overview and tutorial. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2011;**64**(2):163-71.

Schiller 2002

Schiller JH, Harrington D, Belani CP, Langer C, Sandler A, Krook J, et al. Comparison of four chemotherapy regimens for advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2002;**346**(2):92-8.

Scoccianti 2012

Scoccianti C, Vesin A, Martel G, Olivier M, Brambilla E, Timsit JF. Prognostic value of TP53, KRAS and EGFR mutations in non-small cell lung cancer: EUELC cohort. *European Respiratory Journal* 2012;**40**(1):177-84.

Shi 2014

Shi L, Tang J, Tong L, Liu Z. Risk of interstitial lung disease with gefitinib and erlotinib in advanced non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical trials. *Lung Cancer* 2014;**83**:231-9.

Su 2012

Su KY, Chen HY, li KC, Kuo ML, Yang JCH, Chan WK, et al. Pretreatment epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) T790M mutation predicts shorter EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitor response duration in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;**38**:3224.

Tsiatis 2010

Tsiatis AC, Norris-Kirby A, Rich RG, Hafez MJ, Gocke CD, Eshleman JR, et al. Comparison of Sanger sequencing, pyrosequencing, and melting curve analysis for the detection of KRAS mutations: diagnostic and clinical implications. *Journal of Molecular Diagnostics* 2010;**12**(4):425-32.

Ulivi 2012

Ulivi P, Romagnoli M, Chiadini E, Casoni GL, Capeli L, Gurioli C, et al. Assessment of EGFR and K-ras mutations in fixed and fresh specimens from transesophageal ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration in non-small cell lung cancer patients. *International Journal of Oncology* 2012;**41**(1):147-52.

Vogelstein 2013

Vogelstein B, Papadopoulos N, Velculescu VE, Zhou S, Diaz LA, Kinzler KW. Cancer genome landscapes. *Science* 2013;**339**:1546-58.

Yang 2014

Yang JC-H, Sequist LV, Schuler MH, Mok T, Yamamoto N, O'Byrne KJ, et al. Overall survival (OS) in patients (pts) with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) harboring common (Del19/L858R) epidermal growth factor receptor mutations (EGFR mut): pooled analysis of two large open-label phase III studies (LUX-Lung 3 [LL3] and LUX-Lung 6 [LL6]) comparing afatinib with chemotherapy (CT). *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2014;**32**:5s.

Yasuda 2011

Yasuda H, Kobyashi S, Costi DB. EGFR exon 20 insertion mutations in non-small cell lung cancer. *Lancet Oncology* 2011;**12**(8):735-42.

References to other published versions of this review

Cochrane protocol 2013

Green JA, Bates V, Greenhalgh J, Boland A, Jain P, Dickson RC, et al. First-line treatment of advanced epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* February 2013, Issue 4. Art. No: CD010383. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD010383]

Cochrane Review 2016

Greenhalgh J, Dwan K, Boland A, Bates V, Vecchio F, Dundar Y, Jain P, Green JA. First-line treatment of advanced epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation positive non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* May 2016, Issue 5. Art. No: CD010383. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD010383.pub2]

NICE 2019

National Institute for Health Care Excellence (NICE). Dacomitinib for untreated EGFR mutation positive non-small cell lung cancer. www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ta595# Accessed March 2021.

* Indicates the major publication for the study

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES

Characteristics of included studies *[ordered by study ID]*

BMSO99

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label, randomised, multicentre phase III trial conducted in the USA Length of follow-up: not reported The trial included a mixed patient population. The analysis of EGFR M+ data only (n = 17) was retrospective and reported in a paper separate to the primary published paper.
Participants	676 people with histologically or cytologically confirmed stage IV, stage IIIB (with malignant pleural effusion), or recurrent (after radiotherapy or surgery) NSCLC with bidimensionally measurable disease Inclusion criteria: > 18 years; ECOG PS < 2. People with previously treated CNS metastases accepted, but people with symptomatic, uncontrolled disease or requiring corticosteroids were not. Prior surgery (4 weeks) or chest radiation (12 weeks) but no prior chemotherapy for NSCLC or EGFR-targeted therapy Exclusion criteria: previous infusion reactions to chimerised/murine MABs; pregnant/nursing women; history of acute myocardial infarction (3 months prior); grade 2 peripheral neuropathy; inadequate haematologic, hepatic, or renal function Median age: 64 years Male: 57% Ethnicity: 88% white
Interventions	Treatment arm (8/338 participants EGFR M+): cetuximab plus taxane/carboplatin Comparator arm (9/338 participants EGFR M+): taxane/carboplatin Cetuximab, the first dose was 400 mg/m^2, 120-minute IV, with subsequent doses of 250 mg/m^2, 60-minute IV, weekly until disease progression or intolerable toxicity, even after completion of chemotherapy Paclitaxel 225 mg/m^2, 3-hour IV, or docetaxel 75 mg/m^2, 1-hour IV with carboplatin (AUC = 6, 30-minute IV) on day 1 every 3 weeks until disease progression or intolerable toxicity for 6 cycles
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS (based on modified WHO criteria) Secondary outcomes: ORR, OS, HRQoL, safety
Mutation Assessment Method	QIAamp
Exons assessed	18 to 21
Notes	The trial was originally designed as a randomised phase II trial to provide noncomparative data on the efficacy of cetuximab combined with standard chemotherapy (ORR as primary endpoint). 10 months after accrual initiation, the protocol was amended to be conducted as a phase III trial to evaluate the addition of cetuximab to taxane plus carboplatin, with a primary endpoint of PFS. Participant accrual was increased from 300 to 660.

BMSO99 *(Continued)*

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information provided on randomisation
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information provided
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	This was an open-label trial.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Independent radiological assessment was undertaken.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	13 participants in the cetuximab arm did not receive treatment; 18 participants in the taxane-only arm did not receive treatment. Reasons not given. However, ITT analysis was carried out.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All stated outcomes reported
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial support from drug manufacturers

CHEN

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label, randomised phase II trial conducted in Taiwan Length of follow-up: not reported The trial included a mixed patient population. The analysis of EGFR M+ data only (n = 24) was presented as subgroup analysis in the primary published paper.
Participants	113 participants aged 70 years or older with histologic or cytologic diagnosis of inoperable NSCLC who had never received chemotherapy, targeted therapy, or hormonal therapy were entered into the trial after giving informed consent. Inclusion criteria: ECOG PS of 0 to 3; measurable lesion(s); no previous radiotherapy on measurable lesion(s); adequate bone marrow reserve with granulocyte count more than or equal to 1500/mm^3, platelets more than or equal to 100,000/mm^3, and haemoglobin more than or equal to 10 g/dL Exclusion criteria: Previous therapy, symptomatic or unstable brain metastases, inadequate liver or renal function, or uncontrolled systemic disease Median age: 77 years Male: 81% Ethnicity: 100% East Asian
Interventions	Treatment arm (9/57 participants EGFR M+): erlotinib 150 mg/daily

CHEN *(Continued)*

	Comparator arm (15/56 participants EGFR M+): vinorelbine 60 mg/m^2 days 1 and 8 of every 3-weekly cycle Responding participants and those with stable disease continued treatment until disease progression or completion of 6 cycles. Participants could continue treatment beyond 6 cycles provided their disease was controlled.
Outcomes	Primary outcome: ORR Secondary outcomes: OS, PFS (RECIST version 1 criteria), disease control rate, tolerability, HRQoL (FACT-L)
Mutation Assessment Method	VarientSEQr
Exons assessed	18 to 21
Notes	All participants were aged 70 years or older. Vinorelbine dose increased to 80 mg/m^2 beginning from cycle 2 if no toxicity of grade 2 or higher.

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Paper stated that participants were randomised with stratification. No other information given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	The trial was open-label.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	No evidence of independent assessment of PFS
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants were accounted for.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	The protocol stated that time to progression was a secondary outcome. This was not mentioned or reported in the published paper.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial partially sponsored by pharmaceutical company

CONVINCE

Study characteristics

Methods	Open-label, randomised phase III trial conducted across 18 sites in China Length of follow-up (median): 18 months (icotinib) 15.7 months (cytotoxic chemotherapy)

CONVINCE *(Continued)*

Participants	296 patients were randomised. 285 patients were treated. Inclusion criteria: histologically confirmed stage IIIB or IV lung adenocarcinoma (AJCC TNM version 7) with activating EGFR mutations (exon 19 deletion or L858R mutation in exon 21) assessed by the central laboratory, older than 18 years, no history of chemotherapy for metastatic disease, measurable lesion according to Response Evaluation Criteria In Solid Tumors (RECIST) version 1.1, an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status (ECOG PS) of 0–2, and adequate organ function Exclusion criteria; non-adenocarcinoma or negative EGFR mutation, uncontrolled brain metastases, and serious lung or cardiac disease, or had received previous systemic anticancer therapy for advanced disease Male: 29% Median age: 56 years Ethnicity: not reported, but all patients recruited from centres in China
Interventions	Treatment arm (148/148 participants EGFR M+): icotinib 375 mg daily until disease progression, toxicity, or withdrawal of consent Comparator arm (137/137 participants EGFR M+): 3 week cycles of intravenous chemotherapy (75 mg/m^2cisplatin plus 500 mg/m^2 pemetrexed on day 1. Patients with non-progressive disease after 4 cycles of chemotherapy were maintained with pemetrexed, until progressive disease or withdrawal of consent.
Outcomes	Primary PFS (IRC) Secondary OS AEs
Mutation Assessment Method	Amplification refractory mutation system (ARMS; Therascreen EGFR Mutation Test kit, Qiagen Manchester Ltd, Manchester, UK)
Exons assessed	19 and 21
Notes	EGFR mutation analysis defined as inclusion criteria, therefore all enrolled participants were EGFR positive. 11/148 patients randomised to chemotherapy were not treated. Dose reductions were allowed in the chemotherapy arm if necessary. Dose reductions of icotinib were not recommended, but treatment was allowed to be interrupted for up to 14 days if Grade 3 or 4 adverse events were observed.

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomisation was done centrally by Department of Medical Statistics of the Fourth Military Medical University of Chinese PLA using an interactive web-based randomisation system
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised allocation system used

CONVINCE *(Continued)*

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	Neither physicians nor patients were masked to treatment assignment.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	PFS was assessed by independent response evaluation committee.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	11 participants did not receive treatment in the chemotherapy arm, but reasons not reported. A per protocol analysis was conducted.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Trial protocol was not available. Outcomes listed at NCT01719536 were PFS (primary), OS and objective response rate. No data were presented for objective response rate.
Other bias	Unclear risk	The trial received funding from a pharmaceutical company and from China's National Key Special Program for Innovative Drugs. Two investigators were employees and shareholders of the sponsoring pharmaceutical company.

ENSURE

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label phase III RCT conducted in Asia Length of follow-up: 28.9 months (erlotinib), 27.1 months (cytotoxic chemotherapy)
Participants	217 people with stage IIIB/IV non-small cell lung cancer with EGFR mutations in their tumours Median age erlotinub = 57.5 (33–79) Median age cytotoxic chemotherapy = 56.0 (30–78)
Interventions	Erlotinib (n = 110) 150 mg once daily until progression/unacceptable toxicity Gemcitabine plus cisplatin (n = 117) gemcitabine 1250 mg/m^2 IV days 1 and 8 plus cisplatin 75 mg/m^2 IV day 1, every 3 weeks, for up to 4 cycles
Outcomes	Primary PFS (RECIST) Secondary ORR, DCR, OS, AEs, HRQoL
Mutation Assessment Method	cobas EGFR Mutation Test (Roche Molecular Systems)
Exons assessed	19, 21
Notes	Estimated primary completion date: December 2015. ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT01342965 Trial ended early after interim analysis (73% of PFS events). PFS data cutoff July 2012 and OS data cutoff April 2014

ENSURE *(Continued)*

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No description given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No description given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	The trial was open-label.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Independent radiological assessment used as a sensitivity analysis
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for in the analyses
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes measured were reported.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial stopped after interim analysis Trial sponsored by pharmaceutical company

EURTAC

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label, randomised phase III trial conducted in Spain, France, and Italy Length of follow-up (months): 41 (erlotinib) and 35 (cytotoxic chemotherapy)
Participants	173 people with NSCLC and EGFR mutations Inclusion criteria: Histological diagnosis of stage IIIB (with pleural effusion) or stage IV NSCLC (based on the 6th TNM staging system), measurable or evaluable disease. Activating EGFR mutations (exon 19 deletion or L858R mutation in exon 21), age older than 18 years, and no history of chemotherapy for metastatic disease (neoadjuvant or adjuvant chemotherapy was allowed if it ended ≥ 6 months before entry to trial) Exclusion criteria: Non-EGFR mutated patients, previous chemotherapy for metastatic disease Median age: 65 years Male: 28% Ethnicity: 92% white
Interventions	Treatment arm (86/86 participants EGFR M+): erlotinib 150 mg/daily until disease progression, toxicity, or withdrawal of consent

EURTAC *(Continued)*

	Comparator arm (87/87 participants EGFR M+): cisplatin 75 mg/m^2 on day 1, docetaxel 75 mg/m^2 on day 1, or gemcitabine 1250 mg/m^2 on day 1 and 8. Cycle of 3 weeks for up to 4 cycles People who were ineligible for cisplatin treatment received IV carboplatin chemotherapy instead (3-week cycles of AUC 6 on day 1 with 75 mg/m^2 docetaxel on day 1, or AUC 5 on day 1 with 1000 mg/m^2 gemcitabine on days 1 and 8)
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS (RECIST version 1 criteria) Secondary outcomes: OS, ORR
Mutation Assessment Method	ABI Prism 3130 Genetic Analyzer
Exons assessed	19, 21
Notes	EGFR mutation analysis defined as inclusion criteria, therefore all enrolled participants were EGFR positive. Trial enrolment was stopped at interim data analysis as trial had met primary endpoint.

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated randomisation, stratified by EGFR mutation type and ECOG performance status
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised allocation system used
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	The trial was open-label.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	PFS and treatment responses were confirmed by an external review of CT scans by a central review board.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants were accounted for.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes reported (trial protocol available via NICE STA process)
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial sponsored in part by pharmaceutical company. Trial enrolment was stopped at interim data analysis as trial had met primary endpoint.

FASTACT 2

Study characteristics

Methods	Double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomised phase III trial conducted in Asia Length of follow-up (months): erlotinib = 28; cytotoxic chemotherapy = 28

FASTACT 2 *(Continued)*

	The trial included a mixed patient population. The analysis of EGFR M+ data only (n = 97) is presented as a subgroup analysis in the primary published paper.
Participants	451 people with stage IIIB/IV NSCLC Inclusion criteria: ECOG PS 0 or 1; measurable disease according to RECIST version 3.0. Exclusion criteria: Previous treatment with agents targeting the HER axis; previous systemic antitumour treatment; adjuvant or neoadjuvant treatment for non-metastatic disease within 6 months; surgery less than 4 weeks before the trial; localised radiotherapy; brain metastasis; any unstable illness; people known to be HIV positive Median age: 58 years Male: 60% Ethnicity: 100% Southeast Asian
Interventions	Treatment arm (49/226 participants EGFR M+): erlotinib 150 mg per day plus gemcitabine (1250 mg/m^2 on days 1 and 8 of a 4-week cycle, intravenously) plus platinum (carboplatin 5 × AUC or cisplatin 75 mg/m^2 on day 1 of a 4-week cycle) Comparator arm (48/225 participants EGFR M+): placebo plus gemcitabine (1250 mg/m^2 on days 1 and 8 of a 4-week cycle, intravenously) plus platinum (carboplatin 5 × AUC or cisplatin 75 mg/m^2 on day 1 of a 4-week cycle) plus placebo
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS Secondary outcomes: OS, ORR, duration of response, TTP, safety
Mutation Assessment Method	cobas 4800 system
Exons assessed	19, G719X, L858R, or L861Q
Notes	

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants were randomly assigned in a 1:1 ratio by use of a central randomisation programme with a minimisation algorithm.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Central randomisation and drug-pack allocation were assigned by use of an interactive internet response system.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Everyone outside the company responsible for the interactive internet response system was masked to treatment allocation with the exception of a small independent group that was responsible for monitoring data and safety early in the trial.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	An independent review committee masked to treatment assignment reviewed all tumour images and determined tumour response and progression status.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for in final analysis. ITT analysis conducted. Equal numbers (n = 4) in each arm did not receive allocated treatment.

FASTACT 2 *(Continued)*

Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes reported in protocol were assessed and presented in published paper.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial sponsored in part by pharmaceutical company

First-SIGNAL

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label, randomised, multicentre phase III trial conducted in Korea Length of follow-up (months): 35 The trial included a mixed patient population. The analysis of EGFR M+ data only (n = 42) is presented as a subgroup analysis in the primary published paper.
Participants	313 Korean never-smoker patients with stage IIIB or IV lung adenocarcinoma Inclusion criteria: Chemotherapy-naive never-smokers older than 18 years with stage IIIB (ineligible for curative radiotherapy) or IV adenocarcinoma of the lung with measurable or non-measurable disease, PS of 0 to 2, and adequate bone marrow, liver, and renal function Exclusion criteria: Severe hypersensitivity to gefitinib or any constituents of this product; any evidence of clinically active interstitial lung disease; severe or uncontrolled systemic disease; concomitant use of phenytoin, carbamazepine, rifampin, barbiturate, or St John's Wort; and non-stable brain metastasis Median age: 57 years Male: 11% Ethnicity: 100% East Asian
Interventions	Treatment arm (26/159 participants): gefitinib 250 mg/daily until disease progression Comparator arm (16/154 participants): cisplatin 75 mg/m^2 on day 1 and gemcitabine 1250 mg/m^2 on days 1 and 8. Cycle of 3 weeks for up to 9 cycles
Outcomes	Primary outcome: OS Secondary outcomes: PFS (WHO criteria), HRQoL (European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire C30 and the lung cancer–specific module LC13), ORR
Mutation Assessment Method	QIAamp
Exons assessed	19 to 21
Notes	

Risk of bias		
Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Participants were recruited to the trial by 1:1 random assignment and stratified by sex, PS, and disease stage. No details of randomisation procedures reported

First-SIGNAL *(Continued)*

Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	The trial was open-label.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Independent blinded assessment of PFS was reported.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for (4 withdrew consent in gemcitabine arm prior to treatment)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No protocol available, but all outcomes stated in the paper as measured were reported.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial sponsored in part by a pharmaceutical company

FLEX

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label, randomised phase III trial conducted internationally Length of follow-up (months): cetuximab = 24; cytotoxic chemotherapy = 24 The trial included a mixed patient population. The analysis of EGFR M+ data only (n = 64) was retrospective and reported in a paper published separately from the main analyses.
Participants	1125 chemotherapy-naive patients with histologically or cytologically proven stage IIIB or IV NSCLC and IHC evidence of EGFR expression in at least 1 positively stained tumour cell Inclusion criteria: > 18 years, ECOG PS 0 to 2, adequate organ function, at least 1 bi-dimensionally measurable tumour lesion Exclusion criteria: Brain metastases, previous treatment with EGFR-targeted drugs or MABs, major surgery within previous 4 weeks, chest irradiation 12 weeks prior to trial entry, active infection, pregnancy, symptomatic peripheral neuropathy Median age: 59 years Male: 70% Ethnicity: 85% white
Interventions	Treatment arm (28/557 participants EGFR M+): cetuximab plus cisplatin and vinorelbine. Cetuximab starting dose of 400 mg/m^2 intravenous infusion over 2 hrs on day 1, and from day 8 onwards at 250 mg/m^2 over 1 hr per week. Cisplatin 80 mg/m^2 intravenous infusion on day 1, and vinorelbine 25 mg/m^2 intravenous infusion on days 1 and 8 of every 3-week cycle for up to 6 cycles Comparator arm (36/568 participants EGFR M+): cisplatin plus vinorelbine Cetuximab was continued after the end of chemotherapy until disease progression or unacceptable toxicity occurred.

FLEX *(Continued)*

Outcomes	Primary outcome: OS Secondary outcomes: PFS (modified WHO criteria), TTP, ORR, HRQoL, AEs
Mutation Assessment Method	DxS EGFR 29 Mutation Test Kit
Exons assessed	19
Notes	

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated randomisation schedule
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised IVRS used
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open-label
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open-label. No evidence of independent assessment of radiological outcomes
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for. ITT analysis
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	All outcomes reported except disease control rate
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial supported by pharmaceutical company

GTOWG

Study characteristics

Methods	A randomised phase II trial conducted in Germany Length of follow-up (months): not reported The trial included a mixed patient population. The analysis of data for participants with EGFR M+ tumours (n = 10) was retrospective in the primary publication
Participants	284 people aged 70 years or older with stage IIIB or IV NSCLC
Interventions	Treatment arm (144 participants): erlotinib 150 mg/daily Comparator arm (140 participants): carboplatin AUC 5 d 1 and vinorelbine 25 mg/m^2 day 1, 8 every 21 days for up to 6 cycles

GTOWG *(Continued)*

Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS (RECIST criteria) Secondary outcomes: OS, response, tolerability, HRQoL
Mutation Assessment Method	Direct
Exons assessed	Not reported
Notes	The patient population was over 70 years old. Only exons 17 and 19 were screened using the ABI 3500 Genetic Analyzer. Health-related quality of life was not reported, nor was OS or PFS for EGFR M+ participants. Trial information taken from poster provided by trial authors

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomised. No information provided. Trial information taken from conference abstract
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information. Trial information taken from conference abstract
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information provided. Trial information taken from conference abstract
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	9 participants did not receive treatment, but reasons not reported
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Health-related quality of life not reported
Other bias	Unclear risk	Pharmaceutical company support unclear

Han 2017

Study characteristics

Methods	Open-label, randomised phase II trial conducted in a single centre in China Length of follow-up not reported
Participants	121 participants Inclusion: 18 years of age or older with a histologic or cytologic diagnosis of locally advanced or metastatic adenocarcinoma (Stage IIIB or IV) with a confirmed activating mutation of EGFR (an exon 19 deletion or an exon 21 L858R point mutation). The staging was performed according to the 7th edition of the TNM classification. Patients required at least one measurable lesion meeting Response Evalua-

Han 2017 *(Continued)*

	tion Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST) guidelines and an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status (PS) of 0–1. Exclusion: any systemic anticancer therapy for advanced disease, symptomatic or untreated brain metastases or unstable systemic disease, including active infection, uncontrolled hypertension or unstable angina Median age: not reported Male: 41% Ethnicity: not reported, but all patients recruited from a single centre in China
Interventions	Treatment arm A (n = 40): pemetrexed (500 mg/m^2 on day 1) plus carboplatin (AUC 5 on day 1) combined with gefitinib (250 mg/day on days 5–21) and repeated every four weeks for up to six cycles and then continued to receive pemetrexed combined with gefitinib every four weeks Treatment arm B (n = 40): pemetrexed (500 mg/m^2 on day 1) plus carboplatin (AUC 5 on day 1) repeated every four weeks for up to six cycles and then received pemetrexed alone every four weeks Treatment arm C (n = 41): gefitinib alone (250 mg/day)
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS Secondary outcomes: OS, response rate and AEs
Mutation Assessment Method	Amplification Refractory Mutation System(ARMS) according to the manufacturer's protocol of the DxS EGFR mutation test kit (DxS)
Exons assessed	19 and 21
Notes	

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Patients were allocated in a 1:1:1 ratio using minimisation software.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	Clinicians and study participants were not masked to the identity of the study treatment.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	PFS was assessed according to RECIST criteria. However, no independent verification of assessments was reported.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants were accounted for. ITT analysis was conducted.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	No protocol available, but all outcomes stated in paper and at NCT02148380 were reported.

Han 2017 *(Continued)*

Other bias	Unclear risk	One trial author had received fees from a number of pharmaceutical companies.

INTACT 1

Study characteristics	
Methods	Double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase III trial conducted internationally Length of follow-up (months): 15.9 Combined retrospective molecular analysis of INTACT 1 and 2 participants (combined total of 32) was reported in a publication separate to the main trial publication.
Participants	1093 people histologically/cytologically confirmed NSCLC, locally advanced stage III disease not curable with surgery or radiotherapy or stage IV disease Inclusion criteria: Aged 18 years or older and WHO PS of 0 to 2 Exclusion criteria (main): Previous chemotherapy (prior surgery or localised radiation were allowed); hypersensitivity to mannitol, corticosteroids, H2-antagonists, antihistamines, or agents formulated with polyoxyethylated castor oil; radiotherapy within the last 2 weeks; unresolved toxicity from previous radiation therapy or incomplete healing from previous surgery; pre-existing motor or sensory neurotoxicity; severe or uncontrolled systemic disease; recent conditions requiring medication or uncontrolled significant active infections; pregnant or breastfeeding; coexisting malignancies or malignancies diagnosed within the last 5 years with the exception of basal-cell carcinoma or cervical cancer in situ; mixed NSCLC plus small-cell lung cancer Median age: 60 years Male: 74% Ethnicity: 90% white
Interventions	Treatment arm A (365 participants): gefitinib 500 mg/daily plus gemcitabine 1250 mg/m^2 IV 30 minutes on days 1 and 8 and cisplatin 80 mg/m^2 after gemcitabine administration on day 1 only Treatment arm B (365 participants): gefitinib 250 mg/daily plus gemcitabine and cisplatin Comparator arm (363 participants): placebo plus gemcitabine and cisplatin Chemotherapy was administered in 3-week cycles for a total of 6 cycles; subsequently, participants continued on gefitinib or placebo until disease progression.
Outcomes	Primary outcome: OS Secondary outcomes: TTP (RECIST), response rate, and safety
Mutation Assessment Method	BigDye Terminator
Exons assessed	18 to 21
Notes	Number of EGFR M+ participants unclear

Risk of bias		
Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**

INTACT 1 *(Continued)*

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomly assigned. No information given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double-blind, placebo-controlled design
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	No independent review, but outcome assessors were blinded.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No protocol available, but all outcomes stated in paper as measured were reported.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Supported by a grant from AstraZeneca, Wilmington, DE

INTACT 2

Study characteristics	
Methods	Double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase III trial conducted mainly in the USA Length of follow-up (months): not reported Combined retrospective molecular analysis of INTACT 1 and 2 participants (combined total of 32) was reported in a publication separate to the main trial publication.
Participants	1037 people with histologically confirmed NSCLC, unresectable stage III or IV disease Inclusion criteria: No prior chemotherapy, aged 18 years or older, and WHO PS 0 to 2 Exclusion criteria (main): Mixed NSCLC or small-cell lung cancer, brain metastases that were newly diagnosed or had not been treated with surgery or radiation, previously treated CNS metastases or spinal-cord compression in the absence of clinically stable disease, less than 2 weeks since radiotherapy, unresolved toxicity from prior radiotherapy or incomplete healing from surgery, severe systemic disease, pregnancy or breastfeeding, and hypersensitivity to mannitol, corticosteroids, H2-antagonists, antihistamines, or agents formulated with polyoxyethylated castor oil Median age: 62 years Male: 59% Ethnicity: 90% white
Interventions	Treatment arm A (347 participants): gefitinib 500 mg/daily plus intravenous paclitaxel 225 mg/m^2 over 3 hours on day 1 of a 3-week cycle immediately followed by intravenous carboplatin area under concentration/time curve of 6 mg/min/mL over 15 to 30 minutes on day 1

INTACT 2 *(Continued)*

	Treatment arm B (345 participants): gefitinib 250 mg/daily plus intravenous paclitaxel 225 mg/m^2 over 3 hours on day 1 of a 3-week cycle immediately followed by intravenous carboplatin area under concentration/time curve of 6 mg/min/mL over 15 to 30 minutes on day 1 Comparator arm (345 participants): placebo plus intravenous paclitaxel 225 mg/m^2 over 3 hours on day 1 of a 3-week cycle immediately followed by intravenous carboplatin area under concentration/time curve of 6 mg/min/mL over 15 to 30 minutes on day 1 Chemotherapy was continued for 6 cycles in the absence of disease progression. Thereafter, participants were maintained on gefitinib or placebo (control arm) until disease progression or drug intolerance.
Outcomes	Primary outcome: OS Secondary outcomes: TTP (RECIST criteria), ORR, symptom control, HRQoL, AEs
Mutation Assessment Method	BigDye Terminator
Exons assessed	18 to 21
Notes	Number of EGFR M+ participants unclear

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomised
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Double-blind, placebo-controlled design
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	No independent review, but outcome assessors were blinded
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No protocol available, but all outcomes stated in paper as measured were reported
Other bias	Unclear risk	Supported by a grant from AstraZeneca, Wilmington, DE

IPASS

Study characteristics

Methods	Open-label, randomised phase III trial conducted in East Asia

IPASS *(Continued)*

	Length of follow-up (months): 17 The trial included a mixed patient population. The analysis of EGFR M+ data only (n = 261) was retrospective and reported in a paper published separately from the main analyses.
Participants	1217 people who had advanced pulmonary adenocarcinoma and who were non-smokers or former light smokers Inclusion criteria: 18 years of age or older, histologically or cytologically confirmed stage IIIB or IV NSCLC with histologic features of adenocarcinoma (including bronchoalveolar carcinoma), were non-smokers (people who had smoked < 100 cigarettes in their lifetime) or former light smokers (those who had stopped smoking at least 15 years previously and had a total of ≤ 10 pack-years of smoking), and who had had no previous chemotherapy or biologic or immunologic therapy Median age: 57 years Male: 20% Ethnicity: 99% East Asian
Interventions	Treatment arm (132/609 participants EGFR M+): gefitinib 250 mg/daily Comparator arm (129/608 participants EGFR M+): carboplatin at a dose calculated to produce an area under the concentration–time curve of 5.0 or 6.0 mg per millilitre per minute, administered intravenously over a period of 15 to 60 minutes in cycles of once every 3 weeks for up to 6 cycles and paclitaxel (200 mg/m^2), administered intravenously over a 3-hour period on the first day of the cycle in cycles of once every 3 weeks for up to 6 cycles
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS (RECIST criteria) Secondary outcomes: OS, ORR, HRQoL (FACT–L questionnaire, Trial Outcome Index, and reduction in symptoms, assessed with LCSS score), safety, and adverse event profile
Mutation Assessment Method	DxS EGFR 29 Mutation Test Kit
Exons assessed	18 to 21
Notes	

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Use of dynamic balancing randomisation procedure. Assumed computer program used
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Although not reported in paper, interactive voice response system was used (source AstraZeneca evidence submission to NICE).
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open-label
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	PFS was assessed according to RECIST criteria. However, no independent verification of assessments was reported.

IPASS *(Continued)*

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No selective reporting occurred
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial sponsored by pharmaceutical company

LUX-Lung 3

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label, international phase III trial Length of follow-up (months): 16.4
Participants	345 participants with adenocarcinoma, stage IIIB or IV, EGFR M+, and ECOG PS of 0 to 1 Inclusion criteria: Activating mutation in EGFR treatment-naive advanced lung adenocarcinoma; good performance status (ECOG 0 or 1); adequate end-organ function; and measurable disease using RECIST version 1.1 Median age: 61 years Male: 34.5% Ethnicity: 71% East Asian
Interventions	Treatment arm (230/345 participants EGFR M+): afatinib 40 mg/day, escalated to 50 mg if limited adverse events observed in cycle 1 until progression Comparator arm (115/115 participants EGFR M+): cisplatin 75 mg/m^2 and pemetrexed every 21 days for up to 6 cycles
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS Secondary outcomes: OS, ORR, DCR, tumour shrinkage, HRQoL (EORTC QLQ-C30 and QLQ-LC13), AEs
Mutation Assessment Method	therascreen EGFR 29
Exons assessed	18 to 21
Notes	

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Company's standard validated random number-generating system was used to generate the randomisation schedules, verified by a trial-independent statistician.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomisation was performed centrally using IVRS/IWRS

LUX-Lung 3 *(Continued)*

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open-label trial
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Open-label trial but with independent review
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Protocol not available. Outcomes measured unclear from slides
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial sponsored in part by pharmaceutical company

LUX-Lung 6

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label, randomised phase III trial Length of follow-up (months): 16.6
Participants	364 Asian patients all with therascreen positive EGFR M+ NSCLC Inclusion criteria: Pathologically confirmed and previously untreated stage IIIB or IV lung adenocarcinoma ECOG PS 0 or 1; measurable disease according to RECIST version 1.1; adequate organ function. Tumour tissue had to be EGFR M+ at the screening stage. Median age: 58 years Male: 34% Ethnicity: 90% Chinese
Interventions	Treatment arm (242/242 participants EGFR M+) afatinib 40 mg/day Comparator arm (122/122 participants EGFR M+) gemcitabine 1000 mg/m^2 d 1 and 8 and cisplatin 75 mg/m^2 for up to 6 cycles
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS by central independent review Secondary outcomes: overall response rate, disease control rate, OS, safety, HRQoL
Mutation Assessment Method	Therascreen EGFR 29
Exons assessed	19 to 21
Notes	HR 0.26 P < 0.0001 in favour of afatinib. Participant-reported outcomes pain, cough, and dyspnoea all significantly improved
Risk of bias	

LUX-Lung 6 *(Continued)*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomisation was done centrally with a random number-generating system and an interactive internet and voice response system.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	As above
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open-label trial. Clinicians and participants were not masked to treatment assignment.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	The trial investigators who performed assessments of participant-reported outcomes and safety, along with supportive assessments of tumour response (used for sensitivity analyses), were not masked to treatment assignment, but the independent central imaging review group were.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for. ITT analysis conducted
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes reported
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial sponsored in part by pharmaceutical company

NEJSG

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label, randomised phase III trial conducted in Asia Length of follow-up (months): 24
Participants	230 people with metastatic NSCLC and EGFR mutations Inclusion criteria: NSCLC with EGFR mutations, chemo-naive, aged < 75 years Exclusion criteria: Previous chemotherapy/targeted therapy, presence of resistant EGFR mutation T790M Mean age: 62 years Male: 36% Ethnicity: 100% Chinese
Interventions	Treatment arm (114/114 participants EGFR M+): gefitinib 250 mg/daily until disease progression, toxicity, or withdrawal of consent Comparator arm (114/114 participants EGFR M+): carboplatin, dose equivalent to an area under the concentration–time curve of 6, given intravenously over a 1-hour period on day 1 every 3 weeks and paclitaxel 200 mg/m^2, given intravenously over a 3-hour period every 3 weeks. Treatment was given for at least 3 cycles until unacceptable toxicity or withdrawal of consent.
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS (RECIST version 1 criteria)

NEJSG *(Continued)*

	Secondary outcomes: OS, ORR, time to the deterioration of performance status, AEs
Mutation Assessment Method	PNA-LNA
Exons assessed	19 to 21 (excluding T90M)
Notes	EGFR mutation analysis defined as inclusion criteria, therefore all enrolled participants were EGFR positive

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Block randomisation with block size of 2. Stratification factors of mutation type, histology and smoking status (source: company submission to NICE erlotinib 1st line). Assumed computer program used
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised allocation
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	The trial was open-label.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Independent radiological review conducted
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes were reported.
Other bias	Low risk	None identified

OPTIMAL

Study characteristics

Methods	Open-label, randomised, multicentre phase III trial conducted in China Length of follow-up (months): not reported
Participants	165 people with NSCLC Inclusion criteria: Confirmed EGFR mutations in exon 19 or 21; more than 18 years of age; histologically confirmed advanced or recurrent stage IIIB or IV NSCLC measurable disease ECOG PS 0–2; adequate haematological, biochemical, and organ function Exclusion criteria: Uncontrolled brain metastases or had received previous systemic anticancer therapy for advanced disease Median age: 58 years

OPTIMAL *(Continued)*

	Male: 40.5% Ethnicity: 100% Chinese
Interventions	Treatment arm (83/83 participants EGFR M+): erlotinib 150 mg/daily until disease progression Comparator arm (82/82 participants EGFR M+): carboplatin (area under the curve = 5) on day 1 of a 3-week cycle and gemcitabine 1000 mg/m^2 on days 1 and 8 for up to 4 cycles
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS (RECIST version 1 criteria) Secondary outcomes: OS, ORR, TTP, duration of response, safety, HRQoL (FACT-L questionnaire and Lung Cancer Subscale)
Mutation Assessment Method	Direct
Exons assessed	19 to 21
Notes	EGFR mutation analysis defined as inclusion criteria, therefore all enrolled participants were EGFR M+

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants were assigned (1:1) to either erlotinib or chemotherapy by dynamic minimisation procedure with Mini randomisation software. Central randomisation was done by a clinical research organisation.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised allocation by email and telephone
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open-label
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	No independent review of radiological outcomes
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes reported
Other bias	Unclear risk	Trial sponsored by pharmaceutical company

Patil 2017

Study characteristics

Methods	Open-label, randomised, single-centre phase III trial conducted in India

Patil 2017 *(Continued)*

	Length of follow-up (months): 14.2
Participants	290 people with NSCLC Inclusion criteria: Confirmed adenocarcinoma of the lung, EGFR mutations in exon 18, 19 or 21; 18 years and above; locally advanced stage IIIB not amenable to local therapy or stage IV disease; measurable disease according to RECIST V.1.1; adequate organ function; ECOG PS 0–2 Exclusion criteria: uncontrolled medical comorbidities; concurrent use of any other investigational agent; pregnancy; previously received palliative chemotherapy, biological therapy or immunotherapy; known severe hypersensitivity to carboplatin or pemetrexed; pre-existing idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis; life expectancy of less than 12 weeks Mean age: 54 years Male: 56% Ethnicity: Indian
Interventions	Treatment arm (145/145 participants EGFR M+): gefitinib 250 mg/daily until disease progression Comparator arm (145/145 participants EGFR M+): pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 immediately followedby-carboplatin (area under the curve = 5) on day 1 of a 3-week cycle. Patients who had non-progressive disease following the completion of 6 cycles were offered maintenance pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 intravenously every 3 weeks until disease progression, intolerable toxicity or other prespecified criteria for discontinuation were met.
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS (RECIST version 1.1 criteria) Secondary outcomes: OS, ORR, HRQoL (EORTC) and AEs
Mutation Assessment Method	DNA was extracted from the formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tumour blocks and amplified for exons 18, 19, 20 and 21 using a nested-PCR method with Taqman probes
Exons assessed	18, 19 and 21
Notes	EGFR mutation analysis defined as inclusion criteria, therefore all enrolled participants were EGFR M+

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Block randomisation was done centrally by a neutral person who was not a part of the study team and was based in the clinical research secretariat in the hospital campus.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Block randomisation was done centrally by a neutral person who was not a part of the study team and was based in the clinical research secretariat in the hospital campus.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	The trial was open-label.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	No blinding procedures were reported.

Patil 2017 *(Continued)*

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for. ITT analysis conducted
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	The publication stated that HRQoL was measured using the EORTC General and Lung Cancer specific questionnaires. The results of the HRQoL data collection were not reported.
Other bias	Low risk	None identified

TOPICAL

Study characteristics	
Methods	Double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomised, multicentre phase III trial conducted in the UK Length of follow-up (months): not reported The trial included a mixed patient population. The analysis of EGFR M+ data only (n = 28) was reported in the main paper.
Participants	670 people with newly diagnosed, pathologically confirmed NSCLC; stage IIIB or IV disease; chemotherapy naive; no symptomatic brain metastases; deemed unsuitable for chemotherapy because of poor ECOG PS (PS ≥ 2) or presence of several comorbidities Inclusion criteria: Newly diagnosed, pathologically confirmed NSCLC; stage IIIB or IV disease; chemotherapy naive; no symptomatic brain metastases; deemed unsuitable for chemotherapy because of poor ECOG PS (≥ 2) or presence of several comorbidities (including impaired renal function with creatinine clearance < 60 mL/min), or both; estimated life expectancy of at least 8 weeks; older than 18 years Exclusion criteria: Previous treatment with any biological anticancer therapy; previous palliative radiotherapy (except to bone metastases, within the previous 2 weeks); pregnant or lactating women; evidence of significant laboratory finding or concurrent uncontrolled medical illness judged to potentially interfere with the trial treatment; present treatment with a COX-2 inhibitor Median age: 77 years Male: 61% Ethnicity: 97% white
Interventions	Treatment arm (17/350 participants EGFR M+): erlotinib 150 mg/daily Comparator arm (11/320 participants EGFR M+): placebo
Outcomes	Primary: OS Secondary: PFS, HRQoL, AEs
Mutation Assessment Method	Sequenom OncoCarta Panel v1.0
Exons assessed	19, 21
Notes	The trial set out to assess the benefits of erlotinib in a population of patients with NSCLC who were considered unsuitable for chemotherapy.

TOPICAL *(Continued)*

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants were randomised with a computer-generated sequence with a block size of 10.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomisation was done by site staff telephoning the Cancer Research UK and University College London Cancer Trials Centre. All investigators, clinicians, and participants were masked to assignment.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All investigators, clinicians, and participants were masked to assignment. Use of placebo
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All investigators, clinicians, and participants were masked to assignment.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for. ITT analysis conducted
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All specified outcomes reported
Other bias	Unclear risk	Risk of participants in erlotinib arm developing rash, thereby disclosing treatment allocation. Partial funding from pharmaceutical company

TORCH

Study characteristics

Methods	Open-label, randomised phase III trial conducted in Italy and Canada Length of follow-up (months): 24.3 The trial included a mixed patient population. The analysis of EGFR M+ data only (n = 39) was presented as subgroup analysis in the primary publication.
Participants	760 people with NSCLC Inclusion criteria: Histologically or cytologically confirmed NSCLC stage IIIB (with malignant pleural effusion or supraclavicular nodes) or IV, at least 1 target or non-target lesion, age younger than 70 years (no age limits for Canadian centres), ECOG PS 0 to 1. People at first diagnosis and those with recurrence after surgery were eligible. Exclusion criteria: Prior treatment with anti-EGFR agents; history of prior invasive malignancy or inadequate bone marrow; any unstable systemic disease, including active infections and significant cardiovascular, hepatic, renal, or metabolic disease; inflammatory eye surface changes; inability to take or absorb oral medications. Median age: 62.5 years Male: 66%

TORCH *(Continued)*

	Ethnicity: 96% white
Interventions	Treatment arm (19/380 participants EGFR M+): erlotinib 150 mg/daily until disease progression Comparator arm (20/380 participants EGFR M+): cisplatin 80 mg/m^2 intravenously on day 1 and gemcitabine 1200 mg/m^2 intravenously per day on days 1 and 8 every 3 weeks until progression
Outcomes	Primary outcome: OS Secondary outcomes: Total PFS, time from random assignment to progression after second-line treatment or death if it occurred before second progression, or last follow-up visit for participants not included in the previous 2 categories. PFS after first-line therapy (first PFS), defined as the time from random assignment to progression after first-line treatment, or death if it occurred before first progression, or last follow-up visit for participants not included in the previous 2 categories ORR, defined as the number of participants with complete or partial response at any time divided by the total number of participants enrolled onto each arm (All based on RECIST criteria) Toxicity
Mutation Assessment Method	Direct
Exons assessed	19
Notes	The trial was terminated early because non-inferiority of the experimental arm was demonstrated. This was a 2-stage trial with erlotinib given as first-line treatment and cisplatin plus gemcitabine as second-line treatment.

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants were centrally randomly assigned to the 2 treatment arms (1:1 ratio) through a centralised automated minimisation procedure by using histology (adenocarcinoma vs other), smoking status (never- vs ever-smoker), sex, age (< 70 vs ≥ 70years), centre, and PS (0 vs 1) as strata.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised admin system used
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	The trial was open-label.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	No evidence of independent assessment
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for

TORCH *(Continued)*

Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Paper stated that further secondary endpoints, including health-related quality of life, comparisons of resource use, and studies of exploratory biomarkers in tumour and blood samples, were not reported in this article.
Other bias	High risk	The trial was stopped early because non-inferiority of the experimental arm was demonstrated. The trial was funded by a pharmaceutical company.

WJTOG3405

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label, randomised, multicentre phase III trial conducted in Japan Length of follow-up: 59.1 months
Participants	177 chemotherapy-naive patients aged 75 years or younger and diagnosed with stage IIIB/IV NSCLC or postoperative recurrence harbouring EGFR mutations (5 people were excluded after randomisation) Inclusion criteria: Histologically or cytologically confirmed NSCLC, harbouring activating EGFR mutations (either exon 19 deletion or L858R in exon 21), aged 75 years or younger, WHO PS 0 to 1, measurable or non-measurable disease, and adequate organ function Exclusion criteria: Previous drug therapy targeting EGFR, history of interstitial lung disease, severe drug allergy, active infection or other serious disease condition, symptomatic brain metastases, poorly controlled pleural effusion, pericardial effusion or ascites necessitating drainage, active double cancer, or severe hypersensitivity to drugs containing polysolvate 80 Median age: 64 years Male: 36% Ethnicity: 100% Japanese
Interventions	Treatment arm (86/86 participants EGFR M+): gefitinib 250 mg/daily Comparator arm (86/86 participants EGFR M+): cisplatin 80 mg/m^2, IV over 90 min once every 3-week cycle and docetaxel 60 mg/m^2, administered IV over 1 hr once every 3-week cycle Treatment continued until progression of the disease, development of unacceptable toxic effects, a request by the participant to discontinue treatment, serious noncompliance with the protocol, or completion of 3 to 6 chemotherapy cycles. Further therapy after progression of the disease was at the physician's discretion.
Outcomes	Primary outcome: PFS (RECIST criteria) Secondary outcomes: OS, ORR, disease control rate, safety
Mutation Assessment Method	PNA-LNA
Exons assessed	19, 21
Notes	All participants were EGFR M+.
Risk of bias	

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**

WJTOG3405 *(Continued)*

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants were allocated to each treatment group at the data centre using a desktop computer programmed for the minimisation method.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised allocation (see above)
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open-label
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	No independent verification of PFS
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants accounted for
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No concern over selective reporting
Other bias	Unclear risk	7 authors had received remuneration from pharmaceutical companies, including AstraZeneca. The trial group was non-profit-making, but received unrestricted funding from several pharmaceutical companies.

Yu 2014

Study characteristics	
Methods	Open-label, single-centre phase II trial Length of follow-up (months): 35 The trial included a mixed patient population. The analysis of EGFR M+ data only (n = 31) was presented as subgroup analysis in the primary publication.
Participants	117 chemo-naive patients with advanced (stage IIIB or IV) non-squamous NSCLC. ECOG 0 or 1 Mean age: 55 years Male: 50% Ethnicity: 100% Chinese
Interventions	Treatment arm (13/58 participants EGFR M+): gefitinib 250 mg days 3 to 16 + pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 with cisplatin 75 mg/m^2 or carboplatin AUC = 5 every 3 weeks up to 6 cycles Comparator arm (18/59 participants EGFR M+): pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 with cisplatin 75 mg/m^2 or carboplatin AUC = 5 every 3 weeks up to 6 cycles
Outcomes	Primary outcome: non-progression rate (RECIST 1.0) Secondary outcomes: ORR, PFS, OS, AE
Mutation Assessment Method	Direct sequencing

Yu 2014 *(Continued)*

Exons assessed	18 to 21
Notes	Treatment in both arms was administered for a maximum of 6 cycles.

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	Open-label trial
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	No evidence of independent radiological assessment
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	All participants accounted for
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Protocol not available, but all stated outcomes were reported on
Other bias	Unclear risk	No other bias identified

AE: adverse event
AFA: afatinib
AJCC: American Joint Committee on Cancer Classification
AUC: area under the curve
CET: cetuximab
CNS: central nervous system
CT: computed tomography
DCR: disease control rate
DNA: Deoxyribonucleic acid
ECOG PS: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status
EGFR M+: epidermal growth factor receptor mutation positive
EORTC QLQ-LC13: European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire - lung cancer-specific module
EORTC QLQ-C30: European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire - Core 30
ERL: erlotinib
FACT-L: Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy - Lung
GEF: gefitinib
HER: human epidermal growth factor receptor
HIV: human immunodeficiency virus
HR: hazard ratio
HRQoL: health-related quality of life
IHC: immunohistochemistry
IRC: independent review committee
ITT: intention to treat
IV: intravenous
IVRS: interactive voice response system
IWRS: interactive web response system

LCSS: Lung Cancer Symptom Scale
MAB: monoclonal antibody
NICE: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
NSCLC: non-small cell lung cancer
ORR: overall response rate
OS: overall survival
PCR: Polymerase chain reaction
PFS: progression-free survival
PLA: placebo
PS: performance status
RCT: randomised controlled trial
RECIST: Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors
STA: single technology appraisal
TNM: tumour-node-metastasis
TTP: time to progression
TTR: time to treatment response
vs: versus
WHO: World Health Organization

Characteristics of excluded studies *[ordered by study ID]*

Study	Reason for exclusion
Boutsikou 2013	Only people surviving at 1 year were tested for EGFR mutation status.
Crino 2008	EGFR expression tested only
ECOG 4508	Insufficient robust EGFR M+ samples available in trial
FASTACT	Data for the 7 EGFR participants not in usable format
Gatzemeier 2003	EGFR expression tested only
Goss 2009	EGFR expression tested only
Heigener 2014	The number of EGFR M+ participants was considered to be too small for analysis.
Hirsh 2011	TKI used in both trial arms
Janne 2012	TKI used in both trial arms
JO25567	TKI used in both trial arms
Lilenbaum 2008	EGFR expression tested only
Massuti 2014	TKI used in both trial arms
NEJ005 2014	TKI used in both trial arms
NEJ009	TKI used in both trial arms
Rosell 2004	EGFR expression tested only
Rosell 2008	EGFR expression tested only
Thatcher 2014	EGFR testing by IHC

Study	Reason for exclusion
White	Due to small sample size, survival analyses for participants with EGFR mutations were not determined.
Xie 2015	TKI used in both trial arms
Yang 2015	TKI used in both trial arms

EGFR M+: epidermal growth factor receptor mutation positive
IHC: immunohistochemistry
TKI: tyrosine-kinase inhibitor

Characteristics of studies awaiting classification *[ordered by study ID]*

TALENT

Methods	Placebo-controlled, randomised, international phase III trial
Participants	1159 people with histologically documented, unresectable, locally advanced, recurrent, or metastatic (stage IIIB/IV) NSCLC; age 18 years or over; ECOG PS 0 or 1
Interventions	Treatment arm (580 participants): erlotinib 150 mg/daily + cisplatin and gemcitabine Comparator arm (579 participants): placebo + cisplatin and gemcitabine Gemcitabine 1250 mg/m^2 on days 1 and 8 and cisplatin 80 mg/m^2 on day 1 of each cycle Treatment up to 6 cycles
Outcomes	Primary outcome: OS Secondary outcomes: TTP (RECIST criteria), ORR, duration of response, HRQoL, AEs
Notes	

TRIBUTE

Methods	Placebo-controlled, randomised, multicentre phase III trial conducted in the USA
Participants	1079 people with histologically documented stage IIIB/IV NSCLC; age 18 years or over; and ECOG PS 0 or 1
Interventions	Treatment arm (539 participants): erlotinib 150 mg/daily + paclitaxel and carboplatin Comparator arm (540 participants): placebo + paclitaxel and carboplatin Paclitaxel 200 mg/m^2 and carboplatin AUC 6 every 3 weeks until disease progression
Outcomes	Primary outcome: OS Secondary outcomes: TTP, ORR, AEs
Notes	

AE: adverse event

AUC: area under the curve
ECOG PS: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status
HRQoL: health-related quality of life
NSCLC: non-small cell lung cancer
ORR: overall response rate
OS: overall survival
PS: Performance status
RECIST: Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors
TTP: time to progression

DATA AND ANALYSES

Comparison 1. Erlotinib versus CTX

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1.1 Overall survival	4		Hazard Ratio (IV, Random, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1.1 Erlotinib versus platinum-based chemotherapy	3		Hazard Ratio (IV, Random, 95% CI)	0.95 [0.75, 1.22]
1.1.2 Erlotinib versus vinorelbine	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Random, 95% CI)	2.16 [0.58, 8.10]
1.2 Progression-free survival	5		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.2.1 Erlotinib versus CTX	4		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.31 [0.25, 0.39]
1.2.2 Erlotinib versus vinorelbine	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.55 [0.21, 1.46]
1.3 Tumour response	6		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.3.1 Erlotinib versus CTX	5	593	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.26 [1.85, 2.76]
1.3.2 Erlotinib versus vinorelbine	1	24	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.83 [0.19, 3.67]

Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1: Erlotinib versus CTX, Outcome 1: Overall survival

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
1.1.1 Erlotinib versus platinum-based chemotherapy				
ENSURE	-0.0943	0.1876	43.5%	0.91 [0.63 , 1.31]
EURTAC	-0.0943	0.1789	47.8%	0.91 [0.64 , 1.29]
TORCH	0.46	0.42	8.7%	1.58 [0.70 , 3.61]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.95 [0.75 , 1.22]**
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 1.59, df = 2 (P = 0.45); I² = 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.37 (P = 0.71)				
1.1.2 Erlotinib versus vinorelbine				
CHEN	0.77	0.6744	100.0%	2.16 [0.58 , 8.10]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**2.16 [0.58 , 8.10]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.14 (P = 0.25)				



Analysis 1.2. Comparison 1: Erlotinib versus CTX, Outcome 2: Progression-free survival

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.2.1 Erlotinib versus CTX				
ENSURE	-1.0788	0.2113	29.9%	0.34 [0.22 , 0.51]
EURTAC	-0.9943	0.1919	36.3%	0.37 [0.25 , 0.54]
OPTIMAL	-1.83	0.24	23.2%	0.16 [0.10 , 0.26]
TORCH	-0.51	0.3541	10.6%	0.60 [0.30 , 1.20]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.31 [0.25 , 0.39]**
Heterogeneity: Chi² = 12.06, df = 3 (P = 0.007); I² = 75%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 10.05 (P < 0.00001)				
1.2.2 Erlotinib versus vinorelbine				
CHEN	-0.6	0.4993	100.0%	0.55 [0.21 , 1.46]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.55 [0.21 , 1.46]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 (P = 0.23)				



Analysis 1.3. Comparison 1: Erlotinib versus CTX, Outcome 3: Tumour response

Study or Subgroup	Erlotinib Events	Erlotinib Total	Control Events	Control Total	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
1.3.1 Erlotinib versus CTX						
ENSURE	69	110	36	107	43.3%	1.86 [1.38 , 2.52]
EURTAC	50	86	13	87	15.3%	3.89 [2.28 , 6.63]
GTOWG	1	6	2	4	2.8%	0.33 [0.04 , 2.56]
OPTIMAL	68	82	26	72	32.8%	2.30 [1.66 , 3.17]
TORCH	8	19	5	20	5.8%	1.68 [0.67 , 4.24]
Subtotal (95% CI)		**303**		**290**	**100.0%**	**2.26 [1.85 , 2.76]**
Total events:	196		82			
Heterogeneity: Chi² = 9.34, df = 4 (P = 0.05); I² = 57%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 8.05 (P < 0.00001)						
1.3.2 Erlotinib versus vinorelbine						
CHEN	2	9	4	15	100.0%	0.83 [0.19 , 3.67]
Subtotal (95% CI)		**9**		**15**	**100.0%**	**0.83 [0.19 , 3.67]**
Total events:	2		4			
Heterogeneity: Not applicable						
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.24 (P = 0.81)						



Comparison 2. Erlotinib plus CTX versus CTX

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
2.1 Overall survival	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1.1 Erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin versus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin plus placebo	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.48 [0.27, 0.85]
2.2 Progression-free survival	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.2.1 Erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin versus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin plus placebo	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.25 [0.16, 0.39]
2.3 Tumour response	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.3.1 Erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin versus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin plus placebo	1	97	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	5.74 [2.86, 11.50]

Analysis 2.1. Comparison 2: Erlotinib plus CTX versus CTX, Outcome 1: Overall survival

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI
2.1.1 Erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin versus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin plus placebo				
FASTACT 2	-0.73	0.29	100.0%	0.48 [0.27 , 0.85]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.48 [0.27 , 0.85]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.52 (P = 0.01)				



Analysis 2.2. Comparison 2: Erlotinib plus CTX versus CTX, Outcome 2: Progression-free survival

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI
2.2.1 Erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin versus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin plus placebo				
FASTACT 2	-1.39	0.23	100.0%	0.25 [0.16 , 0.39]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.25 [0.16 , 0.39]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 6.04 (P < 0.00001)				



Analysis 2.3. Comparison 2: Erlotinib plus CTX versus CTX, Outcome 3: Tumour response

Study or Subgroup	Erlotinib plus CTX Events	Erlotinib plus CTX Total	CTX Events	CTX Total	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
2.3.1 Erlotinib plus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin versus gemcitabine plus carboplatin or cisplatin plus placebo						
FASTACT 2	41	49	7	48	100.0%	5.74 [2.86 , 11.50]
Subtotal (95% CI)		**49**		**48**	**100.0%**	**5.74 [2.86 , 11.50]**
Total events:	41		7			
Heterogeneity: Not applicable						
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.92 (P < 0.00001)						



Comparison 3. Gefitinib versus CTX

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
3.1 Overall survival	6		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1.1 Gefitinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.04 [0.50, 2.20]
3.1.2 Gefitinib versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin	2		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.95 [0.77, 1.18]
3.1.3 Gefitinib versus docetaxel plus cisplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.25 [0.88, 1.77]

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
3.1.4 Gefitinib versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin	2		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.84 [0.63, 1.11]
3.2 Progression-free survival	6		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.2.1 Gefitinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.54 [0.27, 1.10]
3.2.2 Gefitinib versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin	2		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.39 [0.32, 0.48]
3.2.3 Gefitinib versus docetaxel plus cisplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.49 [0.34, 0.71]
3.2.4 Gefitinib versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin	2		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.59 [0.46, 0.74]
3.3 Tumour response	6	996	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.74 [1.53, 1.97]
3.3.1 Gefitinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin	1	42	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.26 [1.17, 4.34]
3.3.2 Gefitinib versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin	2	489	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.83 [1.54, 2.18]
3.3.3 Gefitinib versus docetaxel plus cisplatin	1	117	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.93 [1.26, 2.94]
3.3.4 Gefitinib versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin	2	348	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.51 [1.23, 1.86]

Analysis 3.1. Comparison 3: Gefitinib versus CTX, Outcome 1: Overall survival

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI
3.1.1 Gefitinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin				
First-SIGNAL	0.042	0.38	100.0%	1.04 [0.50 , 2.20]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**1.04 [0.50 , 2.20]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.11 (P = 0.91)				
3.1.2 Gefitinib versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin				
IPASS	0	0.14	59.6%	1.00 [0.76 , 1.32]
NEJSG	-0.12	0.17	40.4%	0.89 [0.64 , 1.24]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.95 [0.77 , 1.18]**
Heterogeneity: Chi^2 = 0.30, df = 1 (P = 0.59); I^2 = 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.45 (P = 0.65)				
3.1.3 Gefitinib versus docetaxel plus cisplatin				
WJTOG3405	0.2247	0.1781	100.0%	1.25 [0.88 , 1.77]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**1.25 [0.88 , 1.77]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.26 (P = 0.21)				
3.1.4 Gefitinib versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin				
Han 2017	0.0296	0.2887	25.5%	1.03 [0.58 , 1.81]
Patil 2017	-0.2485	0.1691	74.5%	0.78 [0.56 , 1.09]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.84 [0.63 , 1.11]**
Heterogeneity: Chi^2 = 0.69, df = 1 (P = 0.41); I^2 = 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.22 (P = 0.22)				



Analysis 3.2. Comparison 3: Gefitinib versus CTX, Outcome 2: Progression-free survival

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI
3.2.1 Gefitinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin				
First-SIGNAL	-0.61	0.36	100.0%	0.54 [0.27 , 1.10]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.54 [0.27 , 1.10]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.69 (P = 0.09)				
3.2.2 Gefitinib versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin				
IPASS	-0.73	0.15	50.0%	0.48 [0.36 , 0.65]
NEJSG	-1.14	0.15	50.0%	0.32 [0.24 , 0.43]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.39 [0.32 , 0.48]**
Heterogeneity: Chi² = 3.74, df = 1 (P = 0.05); I² = 73%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 8.82 (P < 0.00001)				
3.2.3 Gefitinib versus docetaxel plus cisplatin				
WJTOG3405	-0.72	0.19	100.0%	0.49 [0.34 , 0.71]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.49 [0.34 , 0.71]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.79 (P = 0.0002)				
3.2.4 Gefitinib versus pemetrexed plus carboplatin				
Han 2017	-1.0498	0.2729	18.8%	0.35 [0.21 , 0.60]
Patil 2017	-0.4155	0.1315	81.2%	0.66 [0.51 , 0.85]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.59 [0.46 , 0.74]**
Heterogeneity: Chi² = 4.38, df = 1 (P = 0.04); I² = 77%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.52 (P < 0.00001)				



Analysis 3.3. Comparison 3: Gefitinib versus CTX, Outcome 3: Tumour response



Comparison 4. Gefitinib plus CTX versus CTX

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
4.1 Overall survival	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
4.1.1 Gefitinib plus pemetrexed and carboplatin versus pemetrexed and carboplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
4.2 Progression-free survival	2		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
4.2.1 Gefitinib plus pemetrexed and cisplatin or carboplatin versus pemetrexed and cisplatin or carboplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.20 [0.05, 0.75]
4.2.2 Gefitinib plus pemetrexed and carboplatin versus pemetrexed and carboplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.16 [0.09, 0.29]
4.3 Tumour response	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
4.3.1 Gefitinib plus pemetrexed and carboplatin versus pemetrexed and carboplatin	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected

Analysis 4.1. Comparison 4: Gefitinib plus CTX versus CTX, Outcome 1: Overall survival



Analysis 4.2. Comparison 4: Gefitinib plus CTX versus CTX, Outcome 2: Progression-free survival



Analysis 4.3. Comparison 4: Gefitinib plus CTX versus CTX, Outcome 3: Tumour response



Comparison 5. Afatinib versus CTX

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
5.1 Overall survival	2		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.91 [0.75, 1.10]
5.1.1 Afatinib versus pemetrexed plus cisplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.88 [0.66, 1.17]
5.1.2 Afatinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.93 [0.72, 1.22]
5.2 Progression-free survival	2		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.42 [0.34, 0.53]
5.2.1 Afatinib versus pemetrexed plus cisplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.58 [0.43, 0.78]
5.2.2 Afatinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.28 [0.20, 0.39]
5.3 Tumour response	2	709	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.71 [2.12, 3.46]
5.3.1 Afatinib versus pemetrexed plus cisplatin	1	345	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.48 [1.74, 3.54]
5.3.2 Afatinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin	1	364	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.92 [2.08, 4.09]

Analysis 5.1. Comparison 5: Afatinib versus CTX, Outcome 1: Overall survival

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI
5.1.1 Afatinib versus pemetrexed plus cisplatin				
LUX-Lung 3	-0.1278	0.1468	46.0%	0.88 [0.66 , 1.17]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**46.0%**	**0.88 [0.66 , 1.17]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.87 (P = 0.38)				
5.1.2 Afatinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin				
LUX-Lung 6	-0.0683	0.1356	54.0%	0.93 [0.72 , 1.22]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**54.0%**	**0.93 [0.72 , 1.22]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.50 (P = 0.61)				
Total (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.91 [0.75 , 1.10]**
Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.09, df = 1 (P = 0.77); I² = 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.96 (P = 0.34)				
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 0.09, df = 1 (P = 0.77), I² = 0%				



Analysis 5.2. Comparison 5: Afatinib versus CTX, Outcome 2: Progression-free survival

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI
5.2.1 Afatinib versus pemetrexed plus cisplatin				
LUX-Lung 3	-0.54	0.15	56.2%	0.58 [0.43 , 0.78]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**56.2%**	**0.58 [0.43 , 0.78]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.60 (P = 0.0003)				
5.2.2 Afatinib versus gemcitabine plus cisplatin				
LUX-Lung 6	-1.27	0.17	43.8%	0.28 [0.20 , 0.39]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**43.8%**	**0.28 [0.20 , 0.39]**
Heterogeneity: Not applicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 7.47 (P < 0.00001)				
Total (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.42 [0.34 , 0.53]**
Heterogeneity: Chi² = 10.37, df = 1 (P = 0.001); I² = 90%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 7.64 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 10.37, df = 1 (P = 0.001), I² = 90.4%				



Analysis 5.3. Comparison 5: Afatinib versus CTX, Outcome 3: Tumour response



Comparison 6. Cetuximab plus CTX versus CTX

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
6.1 Overall survival	2		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
6.1.1 Cetuximab plus paclitaxel or docetaxel plus carboplatin versus paclitaxel or docetaxel plus carboplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.62 [0.54, 4.84]
6.1.2 Cetuximab plus vinorelbine plus cisplatin versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.48 [0.77, 2.82]
6.2 Progression-free survival	2		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
6.2.1 Cetuximab plus paclitaxel or docetaxel plus carboplatin versus paclitaxel or docetaxel plus carboplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.17 [0.36, 3.80]
6.2.2 Cetuximab plus vinorelbine plus cisplatin versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.92 [0.53, 1.60]
6.3 Tumour response	2	81	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.43 [0.83, 2.47]
6.3.1 Cetuximab plus paclitaxel or docetaxel plus carboplatin versus paclitaxel or docetaxel plus carboplatin	1	17	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.50 [0.63, 32.38]

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
6.3.2 Cetuximab plus vinorelbine plus cisplatin versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin	1	64	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.19 [0.67, 2.11]

Analysis 6.1. Comparison 6: Cetuximab plus CTX versus CTX, Outcome 1: Overall survival



Analysis 6.2. Comparison 6: Cetuximab plus CTX versus CTX, Outcome 2: Progression-free survival



Analysis 6.3. Comparison 6: Cetuximab plus CTX versus CTX, Outcome 3: Tumour response



Comparison 7. Icotinib versus CTX

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
7.1 Overall survival	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
7.1.1 Icotinib versus cisplatin/pemetrexed plus pemetrexed maintenance therapy	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
7.2 Progression-free survival	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
7.2.1 Icotinib versus cisplatin/pemetrexed plus pemetrexed maintenance therapy	1		Hazard Ratio (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected

Analysis 7.1. Comparison 7: Icotinib versus CTX, Outcome 1: Overall survival



Analysis 7.2. Comparison 7: Icotinib versus CTX, Outcome 2: Progression-free survival

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Hazard Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI
7.2.1 Icotinib versus cisplatin/pemetrexed plus pemetrexed maintenance therapy			
CONVINCE	-0.4943	0.1784	0.61 [0.43 , 0.87]



ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 1. Adverse events - most commonly occurring grade 3 & 4

Study	Definition of AE	Population	Top AE (listed according to intervention)	Second top AE (listed according to intervention)	Third top AE (listed according to intervention)	Top 3 AEs (listed according to comparator)
Afatinib trials						
LUX-Lung 3	Grade >= 3 CTC (V3) AEs that were reported in > 10% of participants in either group and if there was a >= 10% difference between the groups	EGFR M+ only	Rash/acne: 16.2% (AFA) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Diarrhoea: 14.4% (AFA) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Paronychia: 11.4% (AFA) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 18% vs 0.4% Fatigue: 12.6% vs 1.3% Leukopenia: 8.1% vs 0.4%
LUX-Lung 6	CTC (V3) Events were included if reported for >= 1% of participants in any treatment group.	EGFR M+ only	Rash/acne: 14.6% (AFA) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Diarrhoea: 5.4% (AFA) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Stomatitis/mucositis: 5.4% (AFA) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 26.5% vs 0.4% Vomiting: 19.4% vs 0.8% Leukopenia: 15.1% vs 0.4%
Erlotinib trials						
CHEN	Incidence rate >= 10%	Unselected population	Rash: 64.9% (ERL) vs NR (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Diarrhoea: 29.8% (ERL) vs NR (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Mouth ulceration: 14% (ERL) vs NR (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Anorexia: 26.3% vs NR Diarrhoea: 12.3% vs NR Vomiting: 10.5% vs NR
ENSURE	Grade ≥ 3 ≥ 5% in either arm	EGFR M+ only	Rash:	Neutropenia, leukopenia, anaemia:	-	Neutropenia: 25% vs 0.9%

Table 1. Adverse events - most commonly occurring grade 3 & 4 *(Continued)*

			6.4% (ERL) vs 1% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	All 0.9% (ERL) vs 25%, 14.4%, 12.5% respectively (cytotoxic chemotherapy)		Leukopenia: 14.4% vs 0.9% Anaemia: 12.5% vs 0.9%
EURTAC	Grade 3/4 CTC (V3) Common AEs	EGFR M+ only	Rash: 13% (ERL) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Fatigue: 6% (ERL) vs 20% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Diarrhoea: 5% (ERL) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 22% vs 0% Fatigue: 20% vs 6% Thrombocytopenia: 14% vs 0%
FASTACT 2	Grade 3/4 CTC (V3) Most commonly reported	Unselected population	Neutropenia: 29% (ERL) vs 25% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Thrombocytopenia 14% (ERL) vs 14% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Anaemia: 11% (ERL) vs 9% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 25% vs 29% Thrombocytopenia: 14% vs 14% Anaemia: 9% vs 11%
GTOWG	Grade 3/4	Unselected population	Rash: 12% (ERL) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Diarrhoea: 6% (ERL) vs 2% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Constitutional symptoms: 3% (ERL) vs 5% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 36% vs 0% Leukocytes: 33% vs 0% Haemoglobin: 11% vs 0.7%
OPTIMAL	Grade 3/4 CTC (V3) AEs occurred in 3% or more in either treatment group	EGFR M+ only	Increased ALT: 4% (ERL) vs 1% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Skin rash: 2% (ERL) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Diarrhoea: 1% (ERL) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 42% vs 0% Thrombocytopenia: 40% vs 0% Anaemia: 13% vs 0%
TOPICAL	CTC (V3) Specific AEs grade 3 or 4	Unselected population	Dyspnoea: 59% (ERL) vs 64% (PLA)	Fatigue: 23% (ERL) vs 23% (PLA)	Diarrhoea: 8% (ERL) vs 1% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Dyspnoea: 64% vs 59% Fatigue: 23% vs 23% Anorexia: 5% vs 5%
TORCH	Worst toxicity experienced with first-line treatment alone	Unselected population	Skin rash: 11% (ERL) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Pulmonary toxicity: 9% (ERL) vs 6% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Fatigue: 8% (ERL) vs 12% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 21% vs 0% Thrombocytopenia: 12% vs 0% Fatigue: 12% vs 8%
Gefitinib trials						
First-SIGNAL	Grade 3 or 4 CTCAE (V3)	Unselected population	Rash:	Anorexia:	AST:	Anorexia: 57.3% vs 13.9%

Table 1. Adverse events - most commonly occurring grade 3 & 4 *(Continued)*

			29.3% (GEF) vs 2% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	13.8% (GEF) vs 57.3% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	11.3% (GEF) vs 2% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 54% vs 1.9% Fatigue: 45.3% vs 10.1%
Han 2017 (GEF vs CTX)	Grade 3 to 4 CTCAE (V4) treatment-related	EGFR M+ only	Rash: 9.8% (GEF) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Liver dysfunction: 2.4% (GEF) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	None	Neutropenia: 12.5% vs 0% Fatigue: 5% vs 0%
Han 2017 (GEF+CTS vs CTX)	Grade 3 to 4 CTCAE (V4) treatment-related	EGFR M+ only	Rash: 10% (GEF + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 0% (CTX)	Liver dysfunction: 10% (GEF + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 10% (GEF + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 12.5% vs 10% Fatigue: 5% vs 7.5%
INTACT 1	Grade 3/4 CTCAE Commonly occurring AEs	Unselected population	Thrombocytopenia*: 5.8% (GEF + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 5.6% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Rash: 3.6% (GEF + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 1.1% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Diarrhoea: 3.6% (GEF + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 2.3% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Thrombocytopenia*: 5.6% vs 5.8% Leukopenia: 2.5% vs 3.3% Diarrhoea: 2.3% vs 3.6%
INTACT 2	Grade 3/4 CTCAE (V2) Common drug-related AEs	Unselected population	Diarrhoea: 9.9% (GEF + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 2.9% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 6.7% (GEF + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 5.9% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Rash: 3.2% (GEF + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 1.5% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 5.9% vs 6.7% Diarrhoea: 2.9% vs 9.9% Vomiting: 2.3% vs 2%
IPASS	Grade 3, 4, or 5 CTCAE (V3) At least 10% of participants in either treatment group and at least a 5% difference between arms	Unselected population	Diarrhoea: 3.8% (GEF) vs 1.4% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Any neutropenia: 3.7% (GEF) vs 67.1% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Rash: 3.1% (GEF) vs 0.8% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Any neutropenia: 67.1% vs 3.7% Leukopenia: 35% vs 1.5% Anaemia: 10.6% vs 2.2%
NEJSG	Grade >= 3 CTCAE (V3) At least 10% of participants in either treatment group and at least a 5% difference between arms	EGFR M+ only	ATE: 26.3% (GEF) vs 0.9% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Rash: 5.3% (GEF) vs 2.7% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Appetite loss: 5.3% (GEF) vs 6.2% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 65.5% vs 0.9% Arthralgia: 7.1% vs 0.9% Neuropathy: 6.2% vs 0% Appetite loss: 6.2% vs 5.3%

Table 1. Adverse events - most commonly occurring grade 3 & 4 *(Continued)*

Patil 2017	Grade 3 or Grade 4 CTCAE (V4.03) 'Worst grade toxicity' reported	EGFR M+ only	Rash: 69.7 (GEF) vs 28.4% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Raised SGPT: 54.5% (GEF) vs 51.1% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Raised SGOT: 53.1% (GEF) vs 40.4% (cytotoxic chemotherapy) Anaemia: 53.1% (GEF) vs 78.7% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Anaemia: 78.7% vs 53.1% Raised SGPT: 51.1% vs 54.5% Thrombocytopaenia: 40.4% vs 6.9% Raised SGOT: 40.4% vs 53.1%
WJ-TOG3405	Grade >= 3 CTCAE (V3) AEs occurred in 10% of either of the treatment groups	EGFR M+ only	ALT/AST: 27.5% (GEF) vs 2.3% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Rash: 2.3% (GEF) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Fatigue: 2.3% (GEF) vs 2.3% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 84% vs 0% Leucocytopenia: 50% vs 0% Anaemia: 17% vs 0%
Yu 2014	Grade 3+ Participants with at least 1 AE	Unselected population	Rash: 16% (GEF + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 0% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Vomiting: 10% (GEF) vs 8% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 10% (GEF) vs 12% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Neutropenia: 12% vs 10% Nausea: 8% vs 5% Vomiting: 8% vs 10%
Icotinib trials						
CONVINCE	Grade 3 or 4 CTCAE(V4) any drug-related AE	EGFR M+ only	Rash: 14.9% (ICO) vs 1.5% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Elevated AST: 8.1% (ICO) vs 10.9% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Diarrhoea: 7.4% (ICO) vs 4.4% cytotoxic chemotherapy Leukopenia: 7.4% (ICO) vs 43.8% cytotoxic chemotherapy	Nausea: 46% vs 2.7% Leukopenia: 43.8% vs 7.4% Neutropenia: 42.3% vs 3.4%
Cetuximab trials						
BMSO99	Grade 3/4 CTCAE (V3) Most frequent and relevant grade 3/4 AEs	Unselected population	Neutropenia: 62.5% (CET + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 56% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Leukopenia: 43.8% (CET + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 30.7% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Fatigue: 15.1% (CET + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 12.2% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Same AEs as intervention
FLEX	Grade 3/4 CTCAE (V2) AEs that were reported in > 5% of	EGFR M+ expressing	Neutropenia: 53% (CET + cytotoxic chemother-	Leukopenia: 25% (CET + cytotoxic chemotherapy) vs 19% (cyto-	Febrile neutropenia: 22% (CET + cytotoxic chemother-	Neutropenia: 52% vs 52% Leukopenia: 19% vs 25%

Table 1. Adverse events - most commonly occurring grade 3 & 4 *(Continued)*

	participants (G3/G4) or > 1% (G4) or AEs of special interest in either group	apy) vs 51% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	toxic chemotherapy)	apy) vs 15% (cytotoxic chemotherapy)	Anaemia: 16% vs 1%

AE: adverse event
AFA: afatinib
ATE: aminotransferase elevation
ALT: alanine aminotransferase
AST: aspartate aminotransferase
CET: cetuximab
CTC: common toxicity criteria
CTCAE: Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events
ERL: erlotinib
EGFR M+: epidermal growth factor receptor mutation positive
G3: Grade 3
G4: Grade 4
GEF: gefitinib
ICO: Icotinib
NR: not reported
PLA: placebo
SGOT: serum glutamic oxaloacetic transaminase
SGPT: serum glutamic aspartate aminotransferase
V2/3/4: Version 2,3 or 4
vs: versus
*Neutropenia was also reported as 5.8% for G3/4; as this rate was higher than the rate for all participants (5%) it was not included in the table.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials

#1 MeSH descriptor: [Carcinoma, Non-Small-Cell Lung] explode all trees

#2 lung:ti,ab

#3 (cancer* or carcin* or neoplasm* or tumour* or tumor*):ti,ab

#4 (non-small or nonsmall):ti,ab 4

#5 #2 and #3 and #4

#6 nsclc:ti,ab

#7 #1 or #5 or #6

#8 (tyrosine kinase inhibit* or monoclonal antibod* or EGFR or TKI*):ti,ab

#9 (erlotinib or tarceva):ti,ab

#10 (gefitinib or iressa):ti,ab

#11 (afatinib or gilotrif):ti,ab

#12 #8 or #9 or #10 or #11

#13 #7 and #12

Appendix 2. MEDLINE

1 exp Carcinoma, Non-Small-Cell Lung/

2 (lung and (cancer$ or carcin$ or neoplasm$ or tumour$ or tumor$) and ((non-small or nonsmall) and cell)).ti,ab.

3 nsclc.ti,ab.

4 1 or 2 or 3

5 (tyrosine kinase inhibit$ or monoclonal antibod$ or EGFR or TKI$).tw.

6 (erlotinib or tarceva).af.

7 (gefitinib or iressa).af.

8 (afatinib or gilotrif).af.

9 5 or 6 or 7 or 8

10 4 and 9

11 randomized controlled trial.pt.

12 controlled clinical trial.pt.

13 randomized.ab.

14 placebo.ab.

15 drug therapy.fs.

16 randomly.ab.

17 trial.ab.

18 groups.ab.

19 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18

20 exp animals/

21 humans.sh.

22 20 not 21

23 19 not 22

24 10 and 23

Appendix 3. Embase

1 exp lung non small cell cancer/

2 (lung and (cancer$ or carcin$ or neoplasm$ or tumour$ or tumor$) and ((non-small or nonsmall) and cell)).ti,ab.

3 nsclc.ti,ab.

4 1 or 2 or 3

5 (tyrosine kinase inhibit$ or monoclonal antibod$ or EGFR or TKI$).tw.

6 (erlotinib or tarceva).af.

7 (gefitinib or iressa).af.

8 (afatinib or gilotrif).af.

9 5 or 6 or 7 or 8

10 4 and 9

11 random.tw. or placebo.mp. or double-blind.mp.

12 10 and 11

Appendix 4. ISI Web of Science

Topic=(non small cell lung) AND Topic=((erlotinib or tarceva or gefitinib or iressa or tyrosine kinase inhibit* or monoclonal antibod* or EGFR)) AND Topic=(random*)

Timespan=All Years. Databases= Science Citation Index Expanded (SCI- EXPANDED): 1899-present; Conference Proceedings Citation Index-Science (CPCI-S): 1990-present. Refined by: Document Types=(Article Or Meeting Abstract Or Review Or Proceedings Paper)

WHAT'S NEW

Date	Event	Description
9 October 2020	New search has been performed	Background updated. A new author joined the review team: Marty Chaplin. Two authors left the team: Pooja Jain and Kerry Dwan
9 October 2020	New citation required but conclusions have not changed	New literature search ran on 27th July 2020. Three new studies identified and fully included (CONVINCE; Han 2017; Patil 2017). 1 new SoF added (Summary of findings 3), Grade approach applied. Conclusion unchanged.

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 2, 2013
Review first published: Issue 5, 2016

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

All review authors listed below contributed to the text or data sections, or both, and analysis. All review authors took part in the editing and production of the review.

J Greenhalgh: project co-ordination, data extraction, report writing

M Chaplin: statistical advisor

A Boland: project management

V Bates: data extraction, entry, and analysis

F Vecchio: searching, data extraction, entry, and analysis

Y Dundar: searching, article screening

JA Green: input into all aspects of the review

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Janette Greenhalgh: none known

Angela Boland: none known

Victoria Bates: none known

Fabio Vecchio: none known

Yenal Dundar: none known

Marty Chaplin: none known

John A Green: none known

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

- None, Other

External sources

- None, Other

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW

In this update, we have updated our background. We have added one new 'Summary of findings' table reporting results for the outcomes overall survival and progression-free survival for the comparison of ongefitinib versus pemetrexed + carboplatin with pemetrexed maintenance (Summary of findings 3).

We have added three new studies (CONVINCE; Han 2017; Patil 2017) and removed two trials we previously classified as awaiting classification, INSPIRE and ARCHER. Neither of these trials met our inclusion criteria as they included an EGFR treatment in both arms.

Progression-free survival has now become a primary outcome.

INDEX TERMS

Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)

Afatinib [adverse effects] [therapeutic use]; Antineoplastic Agents [adverse effects] [*therapeutic use]; Antineoplastic Combined Chemotherapy Protocols [therapeutic use]; Bias; Carboplatin [therapeutic use]; Carcinoma, Non-Small-Cell Lung [*drug therapy] [genetics] [mortality]; Cetuximab [adverse effects] [therapeutic use]; Crown Ethers [adverse effects] [therapeutic use]; ErbB Receptors [*genetics]; Erlotinib Hydrochloride [adverse effects] [therapeutic use]; Gefitinib [adverse effects] [therapeutic use]; Lung Neoplasms [*drug therapy] [genetics] [mortality]; *Mutation; Paclitaxel [therapeutic use]; Pemetrexed [therapeutic use]; Progression-Free Survival; Protein Kinase Inhibitors [adverse effects] [therapeutic use]; Quality of Life; Quinazolines [adverse effects] [therapeutic use]; Randomized Controlled Trials as Topic

MeSH check words

Aged; Female; Humans; Male; Middle Aged