RESEARCH

Systematic Reviews





Exploring the effectiveness of molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations as first-line treatment predictors in Asian breast cancer patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Nurul Wafiqah Saipol Bahrin¹, Siti Nur Idayu Matusin², Aklimah Mustapa², Lu Zen Huat¹, Sriyani Perera³ and Mas Rina Wati Haji Abdul Hamid^{1*}

Abstract

Background Breast cancer incidence has been on the rise significantly in the Asian population, occurring at an earlier age and a later stage. The potential predictive value of molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations has not been deeply explored in the Asian population. This study evaluated the effect of molecular subtype classification and the presence or absence of biomarkers and genetic variations on pathological complete response (pCR) after neoadjuvant treatment in Asian breast cancer patients.

Methods A systematic search was conducted in MEDLINE (PubMed), Science Direct, Scopus, and Cochrane Library databases. Studies were selected if they included Asian breast cancer patients treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy and contained data for qualitative or quantitative analyses. The quality of the included studies was assessed using the Newcastle Ottawa Scale. Following the random effects model, pooled odds ratios or hazard ratios with 95% confidence intervals for pCR were analysed using Review Manager Software. Heterogeneity between studies was assessed using Cochran's Q-test and l^2 test statistics.

Results In total, 19,708 Asian breast cancer patients were pooled from 101 studies. In the neoadjuvant setting, taxane-anthracycline (TA) chemotherapy showed better pCR outcomes in triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) (p<0.0001) and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 enriched (HER2E) (p<0.0001) than luminal breast cancer patients. Similarly, taxane-platinum (TP) chemotherapy also showed better pCR outcomes in TNBC (p<0.0001) and HER2E (p<0.0001). Oestrogen receptor (ER)-negative, progesterone receptor (PR)-negative, HER2-positive and high Ki-67 were significantly associated with better pCR outcomes when treated with either TA or TP. Asian breast cancer patients harbouring wildtype *PIK3CA* were significantly associated with better pCR outcomes when treated with metated with TA in the neoadjuvant setting (p=0.001).

Conclusions In the neoadjuvant setting, molecular subtypes (HER2E and TNBC), biomarkers (ER, PR, HER2, HR, Ki-67, nm23-H1, CK5/6, and Tau), and gene (*PIK3CA*) are associated with increased pCR rates in Asian breast cancer patients.

*Correspondence: Mas Rina Wati Haji Abdul Hamid rina.hamid@ubd.edu.bn Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2024. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.gr/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.gr/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedicated in a credit line to the data.

Hence, they could be further explored for their possible role in first-line treatment response, which can be utilised to treat breast cancer more efficiently in the Asian population. However, it needs to be further validated with additional powered studies.

Systematic review registration PROSPERO CRD42021246295.

Keywords Breast cancer, Molecular subtypes, Biomarkers, Genetic variation, Neoadjuvant treatment, Pathological complete response, Asian patients, Systematic review

Background

Breast cancer is one of the most prevalent and heterogeneous cancers that predominantly affect women. According to GLOBOCAN 2020 [1], 2.3 million women were diagnosed with breast cancer, and 685,000 had died from the disease. This is a trend expected to rise due to early screening and detection [1]. Early diagnosis of the disease and effective treatment are paramount to improve patients' condition, mortality, survival outcome, and prognosis [2].

Biomarkers are utilised to determine the type of systemic treatment to be administered to cancer patients [3]. Biomarkers can be genetic and non-genetic; they can be detected through gene sequencing and conventional immunohistochemistry (IHC). Clinically, gene sequencing is not always readily available compared to the assessment of IHC for the biomarkers. The most defined therapeutic molecular classification of breast cancer is based on the status of oestrogen receptors (ER), progesterone receptors (PR), human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2), and Ki-67 [4-6]. An extensive molecular classification of breast cancer characterising each subtype was first proposed by Perou et al. [6]. Through the expression of 496 intrinsic genes, breast cancer classification was subgrouped as luminal, HER2+, normallike, and basal-like [6]. Subsequently, the luminal subtype was further subgrouped into luminal A, luminal B, and luminal C [7]. After re-evaluation, the luminal subtype was reduced to luminal A and luminal B [8]. Despite the advances in molecular subtyping, the St. Gallen Consensus allows IHC assessment of ER, PR, HER2, and several biomarkers as a surrogate classification for the molecular subtype of breast cancer. The panel agreed to molecularly characterise the subtypes as luminal A, luminal B, HER2-enriched (HER2E), and triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) [5].

Biomarkers offer a wide range of potential uses in cancer, including risk assessment, screening, differential diagnosis, prognosis, treatment outcome prediction, and monitoring disease progression [9]. Biomarkers can be prognostic or predictive; the former allows insight into the overall cancer outcome of the patient regardless of the therapy given, while the latter provides information on whether a patient will benefit from a particular treatment [10]. Consequently, this allows the discernment of aggressive and non-aggressive breast cancer, especially in later stages. Due to this, biomarkers remain an area that is actively under investigation and validation [11]. The role of ER, PR, HER2, and Ki-67 in breast cancer remains important as biomarkers, nevertheless there are other expressions worth investigating. Amongst the investigated biomarkers include Tau, nm-23-H1, CK5/6, and epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) [12]. In this study, we defined these IHC-expressed markers as biomarkers.

Despite not being clinically available in most countries, nowadays, genetic biomarkers (henceforth referred to as genetic variations in this study) have gained significant interest in oncology practice, as they can be used for targeted treatment selections [13]. The variation in the genetic component is understood as the changes in the DNA sequence in an individual's genome, which occurs at different frequencies within an individual across the population [13]. Genetic variations can exist in various forms, such as single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP), short insertions or deletions, large mutations, null alleles, and transposable elements [13]. Some of the commonly mutated genes associated with breast cancer include TP53, PIK3CA, BRCA1, and BRCA2 [14]. Consequently, these genetic variations have been reported to affect drug metabolism and disease susceptibility [15].

The emergence of personalised and precision medicine (PPM) is thought to be a better-fit therapeutic approach for oncology. Separately, precision medicine is defined as a therapeutic approach based on selecting definite biomarkers that predict a targeted therapy's efficacy in a specific group of patients. Although the term personalised medicine is often interchangeably used as its synonym, it refers to the justification of the therapeutical choices for each patient [16]. Hence, it provides an opportunity to offer a better-fit treatment tailored to each patient, fitting the discovery that not all cancer is the same and varies heavily in each individual depending on their genetic changes [17, 18]. In this study, we used both precision and personalised terms and defined PPM as an emerging practice of medicine that uses an individual's genetic profile, derived from their disease diagnosis, which includes molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations,

to guide decisions made concerning their therapeutic approach or choice.

The efficacy of cancer treatment can be evaluated through pathological complete response (pCR), diseasefree survival (DFS), and overall survival (OS) [19]. pCR, defined as the absence of any residual disease in the breast and lymph nodes, can be used to predict DFS and OS since it is typically used as an endpoint for novel neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) to predict the therapeutic outcome in the long run [19]. In this study, we emphasised the attainment of pCR following NAC as the focused efficacy outcome.

Classifying breast cancer based on molecular subtypes is a growing clinical practice that warrants benefits [2, 20, 21] and it is primarily conducted in the West [22, 23]. There is limited information on this practice in the Asian population [24]. Breast cancer incidence in the Asian population occurs at an earlier age with later stages compared to the Western population [25]. Furthermore, there are differences in the genetic polymorphism, epigenetics, and environmental interplay, which may cause treatment outcomes to differ [25, 26]. Therefore, it is imperative to evaluate the association between breast cancer diagnoses and their response to treatment. This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to assess the involvement of PPM in breast cancer treatment in the Asian population by evaluating the association between breast cancer treatment response, specifically pCR and NAC treatment provided to breast cancer patients based on their breast cancer molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variation characterisation.

Methods

Study design

This study protocol was registered at PROSPERO (CRD42021246295). The systematic review was conducted following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)-2020 checklist guideline (Additional file 1) [27].

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The type of studies included in this review consists of randomised trials, observational studies, case-control studies, and cohort studies written in the English language. All Asian breast cancer aged ≥ 18 years, who underwent systemic neoadjuvant chemotherapy treatment reporting the involvement of somatic genetic polymorphisms or biomarkers or molecular subtype classification on breast cancer treatment response were included. Studies were excluded if one or more of the following reasons were met: (1) non-Asian breast cancer cohort studies or non-breast cancer patients; (2) breast

cancer patients undergoing other treatment that is not related to drug, i.e., radiotherapy, herbal medicine, and surgery; (3) studies with incomplete data for qualitative and/or quantitative synthesis. Fig. 1 shows how the studies were searched and identified in the various databases and registers.

Literature searches

The search was electronically performed in the MED-LINE (PubMed), Science Direct, Scopus, and Cochrane Library databases to retrieve articles that studied the role of molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations in the outcome of breast cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. Search terms were constructed based on patients, interventions and comparison, and outcomes (Additional file 2). The search term strategies were adapted for different databases utilising a combination of Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) and keywords that are relevant which can be found in the titles and abstract. Articles available from 1st January 2000 to 31st March 2021 were searched on MEDLINE, Science Direct, Scopus and the Cochrane Library. The search strategy was conducted from 24th March 2021 to 31st March 2021, with the finalised MeSH terms and search strategies were run again and harvested on the 31st of March 2021 to ensure the same results were generated. The search strategy can be found in detail for MEDLINE (Supplementary Table 2.2 in Additional file 2), Science Direct (Supplementary Table 2.3 in Additional file 2), Scopus (Supplementary Table 2.4 in Additional file 2), and the Cochrane Library (Supplementary Table 2.5 in Additional file 2).

Data extraction

The retrieved search results were uploaded to Rayyan [28] for automated detection of duplicate records after manual removal with Mendeley, followed by initial eligibility screening of the abstracts and titles, applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The full-text articles for the remaining abstracts were retrieved and read for eligibility screening, applying the same inclusion and exclusion criteria. Two independent reviewers (NWSB and SNIM) conducted the eligibility screening. Any conflict was resolved by a third independent reviewer (AM). The included studies were randomly distributed amongst three independent reviewers (NWSB, SNIM, and AM) to extract relevant data using a standardised data extraction format using Microsoft Excel (Additional file 3).

For each study, the extracted parameters include the article information (article title, first author, year published, journal published, country, and year of recruitment), study design, study population and sample size, characteristics of patients in three variables (molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations),



Fig. 1 The PRISMA flowchart of literature search and study eligibility strategy

and the pCR data in selected variables. Notably, in the absence of molecular subtype classification in the included studies, whenever possible, they were approximated through the available biomarkers detected through IHC data [5]. In this study, the molecular subtype classification is defined as luminal A (ER+, PR+, HER2-, and low Ki-67), luminal B (ER+, PR+, HER2+/HER2-, and high Ki-67), HER2E (ER-, PR-, and HER2+), and TNBC (ER-, PR-, and HER2-). Due to limited resources, the same reviewers (NWSB,

SNIM, and AM) checked the data extraction process. Each reviewer is assigned a different article from the one they extracted in the previous stage. Notably, the reference lists of all selected publications and review articles were checked to identify further eligible studies missed in the MEDLINE (PubMed), Science Direct, Scopus, and Cochrane Library search.

All extracted data from selected parameters which include the study ID, country, quality assessment score, molecular subtypes, number of patients, number of pCR events in breast cancer patients treated with each NAC treatment, and crude and adjusted reported pCR association were combined and evaluated by the reviewer (NWSB) using standardised data synthesis excel sheets (Additional file 4). Two independent reviewers (SNIM and AM) cross-checked the synthesised data.

Risk of bias in individual studies

The quality of all included studies was appraised independently by two reviewers (NWSB and SNIM) using a quality score system based on the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) adapted for case-control studies or cohort studies (Additional file 5), with scores ranging from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). NOS utilised three domains: (1) selection, (2) comparability, and (3) exposure for casecontrol studies or outcomes for cohort studies [29]. The selection domain of case-control studies was appraised based on the description of study subjects and setting, while the exposure domain was appraised based on exposure measurement. Comparatively, the selection domain of cohort studies was appraised based on the description of study subjects and settings as well as the exposure measurement. The outcome domain was appraised by the outcome and follow-up assessment. The comparability domain of both case-control and cohort studies was appraised based on study design, analysis, and characterisation. Studies with an overall score of 0-3 were considered low quality, 4-5 were deemed medium quality, and 6 or above were regarded as high quality. Any discrepancies were resolved by consensus.

Data analysis and synthesis

Data analysis was done using Review Manager Software (RevMan version 5.4.1) [30]. The odds ratio (OR), hazards ratio (HR), and their corresponding 95% confidence interval (95% CI) were assessed to evaluate the association between treatment response (pCR) and NAC treatment provided to breast cancer patients based on their molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations. The strength of associations was estimated by calculating pooled ORs/HRs and 95% CIs, by which significance was stated using the *p*-value. A *p*-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Two methods provided in RevMan were used. The first method utilises dichotomous outcomes parameters to measure the OR depicting the association between pCR and selected variables using the Mantel-Haenszel method [31] under the random effect model. The second method utilises the inverse-variance approach to evaluate the studies' pooled association data, included under the random effects model using the DerSimonian and Laird method [32]. The preference for the favoured variable significantly associated with treatment response was based on the most frequent report in the pooled included studies (Supplementary Table 4.6 in Additional file 4). In any case of discordance of the 95% CI value entered intoRevMan obtained from the study, the software-generated value was used. Both crude and adjusted results were included in the analysis when available. For both methods, whenever possible or required, subgroup analysis was conducted. By convention, a pooled OR/HR <1 represents a worse treatment response, while a pooled OR/HR >1 represents a better treatment response for breast cancer patients.

Meta-bias assessment

The between-study heterogeneity was assessed by Cochran's chi-square-based *Q*-test and I^2 index. It is considered statistically significant when *p*-value <0.05 and/ or I^2 index >50% [33]. The publication bias assessment was done when at least six studies were pooled for meta-analysis. The evaluation was made through visual inspection of funnel plot asymmetry and fail-Safe N test using the Rosenthal approach. Rank correlation and regression tests, using the standard error of the observed outcomes as predictors, are also used to check for funnel plot asymmetry.

Results

Article selection

A total of 8963 records were identified using different databases including MEDLINE, PubMed, ScienceDirect, Scopus and Cochrane Library. In total, 2284 records were excluded because of duplication, the removal was conducted through both manual removal and using an automation tool known as Rayyan. Then 6564 records were excluded after the initial title and abstract screening due to unmet inclusion criteria. Of the remaining 115 records, the full-text articles were carefully read, and 14 records were excluded due to insufficient pCR data and inaccessibility. Finally, 101 studies fulfilled the eligibility criteria and were included in the systematic review and meta-analysis (Fig. 1).

Overview of included studies

Altogether, 19,708 Asian breast cancer patients were gathered from the 101 studies, with an average of 195 patients per study (Supplementary Table 4.1 in Additional file 4). The study population comprised 91 studies from Eastern Asia (China [8, 12, 34-115], Hong Kong [116, 117], Korea [118], and Japan [119-122]), 7 studies from Western Asia (Egypt [123], Iran [124], Turkey [125, 126], and Saudi Arabia [127-129]), 2 studies from Southeast Asia (Indonesia [130], Singapore and Malaysia [131]), and 1 study from South Asia (India [132]). The recruitment period for the patients enrolled in the studies ranged from 1991 to 2020. Most of the study cohorts followed hospital-based study design (76.2%) and clinical trials (14.9%), while 8.9% were not reported. 61.3% of the hospital-based study designs were conducted in unicenter, while 14.9% were in multicenter. Of the 101 studies, only 65 studies provided molecular subtype data (n=11361) - TNBC (29.2%), HER2E (20.7%), luminal B (13.2%), and luminal A (7.2%), while 1.6% were missing. Several studies did not categorise their luminal subtype into luminal A or B. Hence, they were reported as luminal-like (24.9%) in this study. Only 69 studies provided data on biomarkers, comprising the routinely analysed biomarkers-ER (25.1%), PR (25.1%), HR (5.7%), HER2 (27.4%), and Ki-67 (15.5%)-and several non-conventional biomarkers investigated specifically for the study including EGFR (11.0%), CK5/6 (8.0%), Tau (11.7%), Androgen Receptor (AR) (8.6%), PDL1 (3.6%), P-glycoprotein (P-gp) (3.3%), DNA topoisomerase II-alpha (TopoIIa) (3.2%), p53 (9.8%), and others (0.8-4.0%) (Supplementary Table 3.1 in Additional file 3). Meanwhile, 7 studies provided information on genetic variations and differential expression, where the common genetic variations reported were from TP53 (15.7%), PIK3CA (24.6%), MYC (5.8%), ERRB2 (5.8%), CCDN1 (5.8%), BRCA1 (15.7%), BRCA2 (15.7%), and others (10.9%).

All the patients in the studies received NAC, and 25.0% of patients received follow-up adjuvant therapy. Collectively, NAC taxane-anthracycline (TA), taxane-platinum (TP), and taxane-anthracycline-platinum (TAP) combination were mentioned in 41.5%, 18.6%, and 1.5% of the studies, respectively. Meanwhile, 18.3% were treated with NAC anthracycline-based chemotherapy, 14.0% were treated with NAC taxane-based chemotherapy, and 8 studies did not provide specific treatment information. Some patients were treated concomitantly with targeted therapy and endotherapy (23.0%). The definition of pCR used in the included studies was mostly not reported according to any guideline (71.3%), with only 28.7% reported pCR following the Miller-Payne grading

(17.8%), Kuerer et al. (1.9%), RECIST (2.9%), and other grading systems (6.1%) including the Ribero classification, Japanese Breast Cancer Society v2007, USFDA guideline, WHO criteria, and pathological TNM system.

Furthermore, 33 of the included studies conducted the multivariate analysis. Most of the included variables used to adjust the multivariate analysis were the commonly reported biomarkers (ER, PR, HER2, and Ki-67), age, tumour size and grade, age at diagnosis, lymph node stage, histological grade, body mass index (BMI), chemotherapy regimens, chemotherapy cycles, and other biomarkers and genetic variations unique to the study.

Quality of the included studies

The quality assessment of the studies was presented in Supplementary Tables 6.1 and 6.2 (Additional file 6). Fourteen (14) case-control studies and 87 cohort studies were included in our systematic review. NOS scores for the 87 cohort studies ranged from 5 to 9 stars, and NOS scores for the 14 case-control studies ranged from 4 to 9 stars. No study was excluded since all studies scored \geq 4 stars.

A summary of the risk of bias assessed on each question using the NOS for cohort and case-control studies is shown in Supplementary Figures 6.1 and 6.2 (Additional file 6). We considered both breast cancer treatment and characterisation as the most important factors for adjustment in the comparability domain because our study eligibility criteria required adjustment for the involvement of somatic genetic polymorphisms or biomarkers or molecular subtypes in breast cancer treatment response. Following this consideration, only 33% (n=29/87) cohort studies earned a star for comparability regarding pCR and breast cancer treatment, while 94% (n=82/87) cohort studies earned a star regarding pCR and breast cancer characterisation. As for case-control studies, 79% (n=11/14) studies earned a star for comparability regarding pCR and breast cancer treatment, while 93% (n=13/14) studies earned a star regarding pCR and breast cancer characterisation. Notably, when both adjustment factors were combined, only 31% (n=27/87) cohort studies and 71% (n=10/14) case-control studies earned both stars in the comparability domain. Amongst the cohort studies, evaluation of the selection of the nonexposed cohort was the question with the lowest count of stars, with only 32% (n=28/87) of the studies having a low risk of bias. Meanwhile, amongst the case-control studies, apart from the first adjustment in the comparability domain, the lowest count of stars was for the question evaluating the selection of controls, with 79% (n=11/14) of studies showing a low risk of bias.

Association of breast cancer characterisation and treatment response

The molecular subtypes classification of breast cancer, presence or absence of specific biomarkers, and genetic variations in the breast cancer diagnosis can be utilised to predict the pCR outcome in patients treated with specific chemotherapeutic agents. Five molecular subtypes, fourteen biomarkers, and eleven genetic variations were qualitatively evaluated for their predictive value in Asian breast cancer patients (Supplementary Table 4.2.2 in Additional file 4). Meanwhile, of the 101 studies, 60 studies provided data that could be used for meta-analysis (Figs. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 in the manuscript and Supplementary Figures 7.1–7.8 in Additional file 7). All the qualitative and meta-analyses results are presented by the molecular classification, biomarkers, and genetic characterisation of Asian breast cancer patients. Additionally, meta-analysis results using the Mantel-Haenszel method listed under each breast cancer characteristic are grouped according to the chemotherapeutic agents. Meta-analysis results using the inverse-variance method are presented separately since it is pooling the reported association data, for which they are presented by the breast cancer characteristics as well.

Molecular subtype classification

Qualitatively, most studies with molecular subtype classification provide data on the pCR rates of patients treated with TA and TP regimens. When treated with TP, luminal A had the lowest pCR rate of 7.7% (n=4), while the highest pCR rate was observed in HER2E at 52.4% (n=7). In comparison, the pCR rates in the other subtypes were 32.5% (*n*=3), 28.1% (*n*=4), and 41.7% (*n*=7) for luminallike, luminal B, and TNBC, respectively. However, when treated with NAC TA, the highest pCR rate was observed in TNBC at 30.4% (*n*=20), and similarly, the lowest pCR rate was observed in luminal A at 4.3% (n=5). Comparatively, the pCR rates in luminal-like, luminal B, and HER2E were 9% (*n*=6), 12% (*n*=5), and 27.8% (*n*=9), respectively. Our findings suggest that patients with TNBC and HER2E subtypes treated with NAC TP and TA were more likely to obtain pCR, while luminal A was less likely to obtain pCR with both regimens.

Under meta-analysis, the role of molecular subtypes was examined in NAC TA-treated (Figure 2 and Supplementary Figure 7.1 in Additional file 7) and TP-treated (Figures 3 and 4 and Supplementary Figure 7.1 in Additional file 7) breast cancer patients.

Taxane-anthracycline (TA) chemotherapy

Our study first compares the effect of HER2E and luminal subtypes on pCR outcomes in TA-treated patients (Fig. 2A-D). In the analysis of four pooled studies [34, 35, 98, 100] comparing HER2E and luminal-like subtypes, 494 were identified with HER2E subtype and 764 patients with luminal-like subtype. Despite the large number of patients with luminal-like subtypes, our findings significantly associate patients with HER2E subtypes with better pCR outcomes (OR: 4.08; 95% CI; 2.78-6.00; p < 0.0001; Fig. 2A). When HER2E patients were compared with patients with luminal A subtype, patients with HER2E subtypes were also found to be significantly more likely to achieve pCR (OR 5.27; 95% CI 1.16–23.86; p=0.03; Fig. 2B). Similarly, when HER2E was analysed against luminal B, HER2E was significantly associated with pCR (OR 2.78; 95% CI 1.42-5.44; p=0.003; Fig. 2C). To confirm and elucidate the effect of luminal subtypes on pCR outcome in NAC TA-treated breast cancer patients, we combined all luminal data (luminallike, luminal A, and luminal B) as luminal, combined and compared it against HER2E patients. Nine studies [34, 35, 71, 80, 84, 95, 98, 100, 113] were pooled, yet our findings still showed that HER2E subtype was significantly associated with pCR outcome in NAC TA-treated patients (OR 3.89; 95% CI 2.69-5.64; p<0.0001; Fig. 2D).

Similarly, analyses conducted comparing the effect of TNBC and luminal subtypes on pCR outcome in TAtreated patients (Fig. 2E–H) significantly associate TNBC with better pCR outcome compared to luminal-like (OR 4.45; 95% CI 2.79–7.11; p<0.0001; Fig. 2E), luminal A (OR 11.66; 95% CI 3.64-37.38; p<0.0001; Fig. 2F), luminal B (OR 3.89; 95% CI 2.20–6.87; p<0.0001; Fig. 2G), and luminal, combined (OR 4.59; 95% CI 3.35–6.29; p<0.0001; Fig. 2H).

To further explore the effect of molecular subtypes on the pCR outcome of NAC TA-treated breast cancer patients, the TNBC subtype was compared to the HER2E subtype revealing that neither was associated with pCR (OR 1.17; 95% CI 0.80-1.70; p=0.43; Supplementary

(See figure on next page.)

Fig. 2 Pooled pCR outcome of TA-treated Asian breast cancer patients according to molecular subtypes. Forest plots describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the association of pCR outcome in NAC TA-treated breast cancer patients between (**A**) HER2E and luminal-like; (**B**) HER2E and luminal A; (**C**) HER2E and luminal B; (**D**) HER2E and luminal, combined; and (**E**) TNBC and luminal-like; (**F**) TNBC and luminal A; (**G**) TNBC and luminal B; and (**H**) TNBC and luminal, combined. *I*² and *p*-value for *X*² of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis

MOLECULAR SUBTYPES

	nacy		•						
A Study or Subgroup	HER2	E Total I	Luminal-I	ike Total	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H Random 95% Cl	Year	Odds Ratio	
rang L, 2019	10	25	13	190	14.0%	9.08 [3.41, 24.15]	2019	M-H, Kaliuolii, 95% Cl	
3i Z, 2019	49	210	19	274	35.2%	4.08 [2.32, 7.19]	2019		
I Z, 2020	74	251	33	289	48.3%	3.24 [2.06, 5.10]	2020		
unong 3, 2020	'	8	1	11	2.5%	4.00 [0.35, 45.38]	2020		
otal (95% CI)		494		764	100.0%	4.08 [2.78, 6.00]		•	
otal events	140		72						
leterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.03; Chi ²	= 3.55,	df = 3 (P =	= 0.31);	I* = 16%			0.002 0.1 1 10	500
Stiol overall ellect.	2 - 7.10 (1	- < 0.00	001)					Favours Luminal-like Favours HER2E	
3	HER2	E	Luminal	A		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio	
tudy or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Mang 1, 2015	2 7	31	3	61	20.4%	17 50 [2 04 149 95]	2015	· · · · ·	_
tou P, 2018	10	33	1	20	23.5%	8.26 [0.97, 70.46]	2018		
ie F, 2019	10	28	0	20	16.8%	23.27 [1.27, 425.39]	2019		
/ang LC, 2020	3	27	0	11	15.9%	3.29 [0.16, 69.02]	2020		
otal (95% CI)		125		117	100.0%	5 27 [1 16 23 96]			
otal events	32	120	5		100.070	5127 [1110, 25100]			
leterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.33; Chi	r = 7.31	, df = 4 (P	e = 0.12); I² = 459	К		0.002 0.1 1 10	500
est for overall effect.	2 = 2.16 ((P = 0.0	3)					Favours Luminal A Favours HER2E	
J	HER2 Events	2E Total	Lumina Events	I B Total	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H Random 95% Cl	Vear	Odds Ratio	
Thena V 2015	2	6	2 CVCINS	o	9 2%	0.93 (0.09.7.69)	2015	M-H, Randoll, 55% Cl	
Vang J, 2016	2	31	17	127	29.7%	1.89 (0.70, 5 05)	2016		
Iou P, 2018	10	33	14	90	31.7%	2.36 [0.93, 6.02]	2018		
le F, 2019	10	28	5	82	22.9%	8.56 [2.60, 28.12]	2019		
√ang LC, 2020	3	27	1	26	7.5%	3.13 [0.30, 32.17]	2020		-
otal (95% CI)		125		333	100.0%	2.78 11 42 5 441			
intal events	32	123	40	333	.00.0%	2.10 [1.42, 3.44]		-	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.14; Ch	i² = 5.2	B, df = 4 (F	P = 0.28	5); I ² = 24	%		has at	100
est for overall effect	Z = 2.99	(P = 0.0	103)		.,			UUT U.T 1 10 Favours Luminal B Favours HER2E	100
)			-			0.11.5		areas cannar of around HENZE	
Study or Subarous	HER2E	Lu	minal, con Evente	Toto	Wointr	Odds Ratio	Year	Odds Ratio	
Zheng Y, 2015	2	6	6	13	3.1%	0.58 [0.08, 4.39]	2015		
Nang J, 2016	7	31	18	188	11.1%	2.75 [1.04, 7.28]	2016		
Mou P, 2018	10	33	15	110	12.0%	2.75 [1.10, 6.91]	2018		
rang L, 2019 Xie F. 2019	10	25	13	190	8.1%	9.08 [3.41, 24.15] 10.78 [3.29, 35.27]	2019		-
Bi Z, 2019	49	210	19	274	22.4%	4.08 [2.32, 7.19]	2019		
Wang LC, 2020	3	27	1	37	2.4%	4.50 [0.44, 45.85]	2020		_
BI Z, 2020 Subong J, 2020	74	251	33	289	27.6%	3.24 [2.06, 5.10]	2020		
canong 5, 2020	,	0			2.2 %	4.00 [0.35, 45.36]	2020		
Total (95% CI)		619		1214	100.0%	3.89 [2.69, 5.64]		•	
Total events	172 0.00: Chi#-	10.01	117 M = 0 /P = 1	0.213-18	- 26%				
Test for overall effect 2	Z = 7.19 (P	< 0.0000	01)	v.21), f*	- 20 %		í	0.01 0.1 1 10	100
-		_						ravoura cumman, comunited i ravours MER2E	
Study or Sub-	TNB	C	Luminal	-like	Mointe	Odds Ratio	Ven	Odds Ratio	
Yang 2010	Events	30	Lvents 12	100	16 7%	3 40 H 19 0 00	2010	m-n, Kandom, 95% Cl	
					10	0.10 [1.10, 0.00]			
Bi Z, 2019	36	108	19	274	38.6%	6.71 [3.63, 12.40	2019		
Bi Z, 2019 3i Z, 2020	36 33	108 107	19 33	274 289	38.6% 44.7%	6.71 [3.63, 12.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.98]	2019		
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Iotal (95% CD	36 33	108 107 245	19 33	274 289 753	38.6% 44.7%	6.71 [3.63, 12.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.98]	2019	+	
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Fotal (95% CI) Fotal events	36 33 75	108 107 245	19 33 65	274 289 753	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%	6.71 [3.63, 12.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11]	2019 2020 	_ + [−]	
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Fotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	36 33 75 = 0.05; Ch	108 107 245 i ² = 2.78	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F	274 289 753 P = 0.25	38.6% 44.7% 100.0 %); I ² = 289	6.71 [3.63, 12.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11]	2019 2020 	→ →	
3i Z, 2019 3i Z, 2020 Fotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	36 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27	108 107 245 i ² = 2.78 (P < 0.0	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001)	274 289 753 9 = 0.25	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ² = 289	6.71 [3.63, 12.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11]	2019 2020 	0.01 0.1 1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNRC	100
31 Z, 2019 31 Z, 2020 Fotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect:	36 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27	108 107 245 i ² = 2.78 (P < 0.0	19 33 65 8, df = 2 (F 0001)	274 289 753 P = 0.25	38.6% 44.7% 100.0 %); I ² = 289	6.71 [3.63, 12.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11]	2019 2020	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC	100
BI Z, 2019 BI Z, 2020 Fotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect:	36 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB	108 107 245 i ² = 2.78 (P < 0.0	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina	274 289 753 P = 0.25	38.6% 44.7% 100.0 %); I ² = 289	6.71 [3.63, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio	2019 2020	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio	100
BI Z, 2019 BI Z, 2020 Fotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect: tudy or Subgroup	36 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events	108 107 245 P = 2.78 (P < 0.0 C Total	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina Events	274 289 753 P = 0.25 Al A Total	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ² = 289 Weight	6.71 [3.63, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C	2019 2020	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio	100
31 Z, 2019 31 Z, 2020 Total 95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau [#] = Test for overall effect: tudy or Subgroup theng Y, 2015 theng Y, 2015	36 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events 2 5	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 21	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 00001) Lumina Events 3 1	274 289 753 P = 0.25 al A <u>Total</u> 5 61	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ² = 289 Weight 11.4% 27.6%	6.71 [3.63, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.98 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 0dds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 3.57 [0.11, 111.71 18 75 [2.04, 172.02	2019 2020 <u>1 Yea</u> 1 2019	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
31 Z, 2019 31 Z, 2020 fotal (95% CI) Fotal events - Heterogeneity: Tau [#] = Fest for overall effect: * * * * * * * * * * * * *	36 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events 2 5 17	108 107 245 i ² = 2.78 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 21 37	19 19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina Events 3 1 1	274 289 753 P = 0.25 al A <u>Total</u> 5 61 20	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ² = 289 <u>Weight</u> 11.4% 27.6% 30.4%	6.71 [3.63, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] % Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 3.57 [0.11, 111.71 18.75 [2.04, 172.07] 16.15 [19.6, 133.51	2019 2020 Yea 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio	
31 Z, 2019 31 Z, 2020 fotal (95% CI) fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect: tudy or Subgroup heng Y, 2015 √ang J, 2016 lou P, 2018 is F, 2019	36 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB <u>Events</u> 2 5 5 17 8	108 107 245 i ² = 2.78 (P < 0.0 i ² C Total 2 21 37 32	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina <u>Events</u> 3 1 1	274 289 753 P = 0.25 Al A Total 5 61 20 20	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ² = 289 <u>Weight</u> 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 16.0%	6.71 [3.63, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 M-H, Random, 95% C 3.57 [0.11, 111.71 18.75 [2.04, 172.07 16.15 [1.96, 133.51 14.22 [0.77, 261.61	 2019 2020 2020 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio	100
ki Z, 2019 ki Z, 2020 'otal (95% CI) 'otal events Heterogeneity. Tau ^a = 'est for overall effect ' tudy or Subgroup heng Y, 2015 fang J, 2016 lou P, 2018 le F, 2018 kang LC, 2020	36 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB <u>Events</u> 2 5 5 17 8 3	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 21 37 32 19	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina <u>Events</u> 3 1 1 0 0	274 289 753 P = 0.25 al A <u>Total</u> 5 61 20 20 11	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ^P = 289 Weight 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 16.0% 14.5%	6,71 [3,63, 12,40] 3,46 [2,00, 5,98] 4,45 [2,79, 7,11] 6 0 0dds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 3,57 [0,11, 111,71] 18,75 [2,04, 172,07] 18,75 [2,04, 172,07] 16,15 [1,96, 133,51] 4,22 [0,77, 261,61] 4,58 [0,23, 103,76]	 2019 2020 2020 2021 2011 <li< td=""><td>0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio</td><td>100</td></li<>	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio	100
31 Z, 2019 31 Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events telerogeneity: Tau ² = rest for overall effect: • tudy or Subgroup heng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2015 Vang J, 2018 ie F, 2019 rang LC, 2020 or al (95% CP)	366 333 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events 2 5 177 8 3	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 21 37 32 19	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 00001) Lumina Events 3 1 1 0 0	274 289 753 7 = 0.25 al A Total 5 61 20 20 11	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); P = 289 Weight 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 16.0% 14.5%	6.71 [3.63, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.98 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 0dds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% C 3.57 [0.11, 111.71 8.75 [2.04, 172.07 16.15 [1.95, 133.57 14.22 [0.77, 261.61 4.88 [0.23, 103.76 116.65 [1.35.4]	 2019 2020 2020 2021 2016 2016 2017 2018 2018 2020 	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio	100
N Z, 2019 N Z, 2020 otal (95% CI) otal sevents Heterogeneity: Tau*= settor overall effect: tudy or Subgroup faring J, 2015 faring J, 2015 faring J, 2016 lou P, 2018 lef, 2019 arig LC, 2020 otal (95% CI) notal events	366 333 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events 2 5 177 8 3 3	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 2 1 37 32 19 111	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 00001) Lumina Events 3 1 1 0 0	274 289 753 P = 0.25 bl A Total 5 61 20 20 11 117	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ² = 289 <u>Weight</u> 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0%	6.71 [3.63, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.98 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 0dds Ratio 3.67 [0.11, 111, 71 18.75 [2.04, 172, 07 16.15 [1.96, 133, 61 4.28 [0.23, 103, 72 11.66 [3.64, 37, 38	 2019 2020 2020 2011 <li< td=""><td>0.01 0.1 1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl</td><td>100</td></li<>	0.01 0.1 1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
31 Z, 2019 31 Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Theng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2016 Mou P, 2018 Use F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Teterogenetic. Tau ² =	5 366 333 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events 2 5 17 8 3 3 3 5 = 0.00: Ch	108 107 245 i ² = 2.78 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 21 37 32 19 111 i ² = 1.0	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina Events 3 1 1 0 0 0 5, df = 4 (0	274 289 753 P = 0.25 Al A Total 5 61 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ² = 289 <u>Weight</u> 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0%	6.71 [3.63, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.98 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 0.45 Ratio M.H, Random, 95% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 7] 18.75 [2.04, 172.07 16.15 [1.95, 133.57 14.22 [0.77, 26.16] 4.89 [0.23, 103.76 11.66 [3.64, 37.38	 2019 2020 2020 2014 <li< td=""><td>0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI</td><td></td></li<>	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ⁺ = Fest for overall effect Study or Subgroup heng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2015 Vang J, 2018 ie F, 2019 Vang L, 2020 otal (95% CI) otal events Test for overall effect fest for overall effect	366 336 333 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events 2 5 17 8 3 3 3 5 = 0.00; Ch : Z = 4.13	108 107 245 i ^P = 2.78 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 21 37 32 19 111 i ^P = 1.0 (P < 0.0	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina <u>Events</u> 3 1 1 0 0 5 5, df = 4 (0 001)	274 289 753 P = 0.25 AI A Total 5 61 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); ² = 289 <u>Weight</u> 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0% 0); ² = 09	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 55% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71] 18.76 [2.04, 172.00] 16.15 [1.96, 13.35 11] 4.88 [0.23, 103, 76] 11.66 [3.64, 37.38] 6	2019 2020 1 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 20	0.01 0.1 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI	100
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ⁹ = Study or Subgroup theng Y, 2015 Yang J, 2015 Yang J, 2016 Hou P, 2018 Use F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ⁹ = Set for overall effect	5 366 333 75 2 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 7 7 8 3 3 3 5 5 7 7 7 8 3 3 5 5 5 7 7 8 3 3 5 5 5 7 7 5 5 7 7 5 5 7 7 5 7 5 7 5	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 6C Total 2 21 32 19 111 ii ² = 1.0 (P < 0.0	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina Events 3 1 1 0 0 0 5, df = 4 (0 0001)	274 289 753 P = 0.25 Al A <u>Total</u> 5 61 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ^P = 289 <u>Weight</u> 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0%	6.71 [3.83, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.98 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio MH, Random, 3552 3.57 [0.11, 117 18.75 [2.04, 172.07 16.15 [1.95, 133.61 4.22 [0.77, 32.61 4.22 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.25 [0.77, 32.61]{0.	2019 2020 2020 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% CI	100
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 fotal (95% CI) Total events teterogeneity, Tau ² = fest for overall effect E Study or Subgroup heng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2018 die F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 total (95% CI) Total events teterogeneity, Tau ² = eist for overall effect S Subdro Subbrout	0 366 33 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events 2 5 17 8 3 3 3 5 = 0.00; Ch : Z = 6.27 5 17 8 3 3 3 5 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 5 5 17 5 5 5 17 5 5 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 7	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 (C Total 2 2 10 37 32 19 111 111 112 111 (P < 0.0 (C Total	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina 2 5, df = 4 (0 0001) Lumina Evente Evente	274 289 753 al A Total 5 61 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9 al B Total	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); ² = 289 <u>Weight</u> 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0% 0); ² = 09 Weight	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.99] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 55% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71 18.75 [2.04, 17.20] 16.15 [1.95, 13.35 14.22 [0.77, 261.61 4.88 [0.23, 10.376 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 Odds Ratio M-H, Random 65% C	2019 2020 Yea 2011 2011 2011 2011 2021 2021 Yea	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	100
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Fest for overall effect Hudy or Subgroup theng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2015 Vang J, 2018 is F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 vang LC,	366 336 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events 2 5 17 8 3 3 3 5 = 0.00; Ch : Z = 4.13 3 5 = 0.00; Ch : Z = 4.13 TNB Events Z = 4.13	108 107 245 P = 2.7{ (P < 0.0 C Total 2 21 37 32 19 111 i ^p = 1.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 21 37 32 19 11 11 2 21 37 32 19 11 11 2 12 11 2 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina 5 5, df = 4 (0 0001) Lumina Events	274 289 753 P = 0.25 al A Total 5 61 20 20 111 117 P = 0.9 al B Total 8	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); * = 289 Weight 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0% 0;; * = 09 Weight 2.9%	6.71 [3.83, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.99] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M.H., Random, 55%. C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71] 8.75 [2.04, 172.00] 1.61 [5] (1.96, 13.35] 1.4.28 [0.23, 10.3, 76] 1.4.28 [0.23, 10.3, 76] 1.6.6 [3.64, 37, 38] 6 Odds Ratio M.H., Random, 55%. C 7.88 [0.28, 212, 11]	2019 2020 2020 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2021 2021	0.01 0.1 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI	100
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Total (95% Ct) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ⁹ = Test for overall effect Etro yoursall effect Theng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Vang LC, 2020 Total events Evest for overall effect Statevors Subgroup Theng Y, 2015	366 336 33 25 25 25 177 8 3 35 5 0.00; Ch 22 5 177 8 3 3 5 5 177 8 2 5 177 8 3 3 5 5 177 8 2 5 177 8 2 5 177 8 2 5 177 5 2 5 5 177 5 2 5 5 177 5 5 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	108 107 245 107 245 (P < 0.0 0C 21 37 32 21 37 32 19 111 i ^p = 1.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 2 21 37 32 19 111 2 21 2 21 2 21 2 21 2 21 2 21	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina Events 5, df = 4 (0 0001) Lumina Events 3 17 3 17	274 289 753 a A Total 5 61 20 20 111 117 P = 0.9 a B Total 8 2 Total 8 2 Total 8 3 C	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ^P = 289 <u>Weight</u> 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 14.5% 14.5% 100.0% 0); I ^P = 09 <u>Weight</u> 2.9% 25.5%	6.71 [3.83, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.98 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6	1 Year 1 Year 1 2019 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2012 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% Cl Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% Cl	100
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Total events Heterogenety, Tau ² = Test for overall effect itudy or Subgroup Meng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2018 de F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Vatal events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Vatal events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Vatal overts Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Vatal overts Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Vatal overts Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Vatal overts Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Vatal overts	o 366 337 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 7 TNB Events 3 3 5 = 0.00; Ch : Z = 4.13 7 TNB Events 2 5 17 8 3 3 2 5 17 8 3 2 5 17 8 3 2 5 17 8 3 3 2 5 17 7 5 17 17 8 3 3 2 5 17 17 8 3 3 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 19 111 11 ² = 1.0 (P < 0.(C C Total 2 19 111 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina Events 3 1 1 0 0 5, df = 4 (0 0001) Lumina Events 3 17 14	274 289 753 P = 0.25 61 5 61 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9 8 8 8 127 90	38.6% 44.7% 100.0%); I ² = 289 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0% 0); I ² = 09 Weight 2.5% 43.5%	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.90] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 59% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71 18.75 [2.04, 172.00] 16.15 [1.95, 13.35 14.22 [0.46, 172.00] 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 59% C 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11 2.02 [0.66, 6.24] 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11 2.02 [0.66, 6.24] 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11 2.02 [0.66, 5.24] 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11 2.02 [0.56, 5.24] 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11] 7.86 [0	 2019 2020 2020 2011 2011 2011 2011 2012 2011 2011 2012 2011 2011 2012 2011 	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio	100 — —
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Total (95% Ct) Total versts Heterogeneity, Tau* Test for overall effect : <u>Hutly or Subgroup</u> Uheng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2015 Vang J, 2018 die F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Vang LC, 2020 Vale verst Vale verste verstor overall effect : <u>Hutly or Subgroup</u> <u>Heng Y, 2015</u> Vang J, 2015 Vang J, 2015 Vang J, 2018 die F, 2019	0 366 375 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events 2 2 5 17 8 3 3 5 = 0.00; Ch : Z = 4.13 TNB Events 2 2 5 17 8 3 3 5 = 0.00; Ch 2 5 17 8 3 3 5 5 17 8 3 3 5 5 17 8 3 3 5 5 17 8 3 3 5 5 17 8 3 3 5 5 17 8 3 3 5 5 17 8 3 3 5 5 17 8 3 3 5 5 17 8 3 3 5 5 17 8 3 5 5 17 8 3 3 5 5 17 8 3 5 5 17 8 17 8 17 8 17 8 17 8 17 8 17 8 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 8 17 17 17 8 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 19 111 11 11 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 19) 111 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina Events 5, df = 4 (0 0001) Lumina Events 3 1 5, df = 4 (0 0001) 3 17 14 5 5 5, df = 4 (0 0001)	274 289 753 753 al A <u>Total</u> 5 61 20 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9 8 8 8 127 90 822 20	38.6% 44.7% 100.0% Weight 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 14.5% 100.0% Weight 2.9% 25.5% 22.2%	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	 2019 2020 2020 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2021 2011 2021 2011 <li< td=""><td>0.01 0.1 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI</td><td>100 </td></li<>	0.01 0.1 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI	100
BI Z, 2019 BI Z, 2020 Total (95% Ct) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect E titudy or Subgroup Theng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Mang J, 2018 de F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Vang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Mang J, 2018 Mang J, 2019 Mang J, 2019 Mang J, 2019 Mang J, 2019	366 336 33 75 = 0.05; Ch : Z = 6.27 TNB Events 2 5 17 8 3 3 5 = 0.00; Ch : Z = 4.27 17 8 3 3 5 = 0.00; Ch : Z = 6.27 17 8 3 3 5 = 0.00; Ch : Z = 6.27 17 8 5 5 5 5 5 17 7 8 3 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 7 8 7 8	$\begin{array}{c} 108\\ 107\\ 245\\ \mathbf{P}^{2}=2.76\\ (\mathbf{P}^{2}<0.0\\ \mathbf{C}\\ \mathbf{Total}\\ 22\\ 19\\ 111\\ \mathbf{iP}^{2}=1.0\\ (\mathbf{P}^{2}<0.0\\ \mathbf{C}\\ \mathbf{Total}\\ 2\\ 21\\ 37\\ 32\\ 19\\ 111\\ 2\\ 2\\ 111\\ 2\\ 2\\ 111\\ 2\\ 2\\ 111\\ 2\\ 2\\ 111\\ 2\\ 2\\ 1111\\ 1111\\ 1111\\ 1111\\ 1111\\ \mathbf{11111\\ 111\\ 1111\\ 1111\\ \mathbf{$	19 33 65 65 67 2 (F 200001) Lumina 1 1 0 0 0 5 5 (df = 4 (1) 2 5 0001) Lumina 2 5 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	274 289 753 P = 0.25 al A Total 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9 B Total 8 127 90 82 26	38.6% 44.7% 100.0% Weight 11.4% 30.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0% ₩eight 2.9% 2.5.5% 5.9%	6.71 [3.83, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.99 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 0 0dds Ratio MH, Random, 35% C 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 0dds Ratio MH, Random, 95% C 7.86 [0.29, 217.11] 2.02 [0.66, 5.24 6 [3.64, 37.38] 6	1 Year 1 Year 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2012 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% CI	
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Test for overall effect Heterogeneity, Tau ² = (heng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2018 de F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Vatal events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = vist for overall effect Huty or Subgroup Theng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2018 de F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Vang LC, 2020 Vang LC, 2020	о о о о о о о о о о о о о о	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 2 19 111 i ² = 1.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 2 19 111 2 2 11 37 32 2 19 111	19 33 65 65 63, df = 2 (F 00001) Lumina Events 3 3 5, df = 4 (I 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1	274 289 753 P = 0.25 1A Total 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9 8 127 8 127 8 226 333	38.6% 44.7% 100.0% ₩eight 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 14.5% 100.0% ₩eight 2.9% 2.2% 5.5% 43.5% 5.9%	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.90] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 59% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71 18.75 [2.04, 172.07] 6 Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 59% C 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 59% C 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11 2.02 [0.66, 62, 40] 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11 2.02 [0.66, 62, 40] 5.513 [1.53, 17, 12, 40] 5.513 [1.53, 17, 12] 5.513 [1.53, 12] 5.513 [1.53] [1.	2019 2019 2020 2020 1 Year 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Total (95% Ct) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ⁺ = Study or Subgroup Trest for overall effect Study or Subgroup Nang L, 2015 Vang J, 2018 Vang J, 2018 Vang L, 2020 Vang LC, 2020 Vang LC, 2020 Vang LC, 2020 Vang Chi Study or Subgroup Study or Subgroup Study or Subgroup Study or Subgroup Vang L , 2015 Vang J, 2016 Nang V, 2018 Vang L, 2018 Vang L	0 36 33 37 57 50 50 57 77 8 33 35 5 0.00, Ch Events 2 2 5 5 77 8 3 3 5 5 17 7 8 3 3 5 5 1.2 - 8.27 · 2 2 2 5 5 1.2 - 8.27 · 2 - 8.27 · 2 - 8.27 · 7 8 8 3 3 - 8 - 8 - 8 - 8 - 8 - 8 - 8 - 8	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 21 37 2 21 37 32 21 9 111 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 19 111 11 37 2 19 111 11 37 11 37 11 11 11 11 37 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	19 33 65 6, df = 2 (F 200001) Lumina F <u>events</u> 3 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 5, df = 4 (f 0001) Lumina F <u>events</u> 3 1 7 1 4 5 5 1 4 0	274 289 753 P = 0.25 al A Total 5 61 20 20 20 11 117 117 P = 0.9 al B Total 8 127 90 0 82 26 333	38.6% 44.7% 100.0% 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 11.4% 100.0% 100.0% ₩eight 14.5% 100.0%	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.99] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 55% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71] 8.75 [2.04, 172.07] 16.15 [1.95, 13.35] 14.22 [0.7, 261 61] 4.88 [0.23, 103, 76] 14.22 [0.7, 261 61] 4.88 [0.23, 103, 76] 14.22 [0.63, 13.51] 14.20 [0.65, 624 4.51 [0.52, 17.11] 4.58 [0.45, 43.06] 5.13 [1.53, 17, 17] 4.59 [0.45, 43.06] 3.89 [2.20, 6.87]	1 Yea 1 Yea 1 2019 1 2011	0.01 0.1 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI	
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = test for overall effect est for overall effect test for overall effect Study or Subgroup total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Study or Subgroup Cheng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2016 Vang LC, 2020 Vang J, 2016 Mang J, 2016 Nang J, 2018 Nang J, 2018 Nang J, 2018 Nang J, 2018 Nang LC, 2020 Total events Total events Teterogeneity: Tau ² =	36 33 375 50 005; Ch	108 107 245 7 = 2.7? (P < 0.0 7 2 2 10 7 32 19 111 11 37 32 19 111 11 37 32 19 111 11 37 32 19 111 11 37 32 19 111 11 37 32 19 111 11 37 32 19 111 11 37 32 19 111 11 37 32 11 37 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	19 33 65 3, df = 2 (F 0001) Lumina <u>Events</u> 3 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 5, df = 4 (0, 001) Lumina <u>Events</u> 3 17 14 5, df = 4 (5, df = 4	274 289 753 754 Total 5 61 120 20 111 117 P = 0.9 8 8 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 754 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 755 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 757 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0%); P = 289 Weight 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 14.5% 100.0% Weight 2.9% 22.5% 5.9% 100.0% 5.9% 100.0%	6.71 [3.83, 12.40 3.46 [2.00, 5.99 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 0 0dds Ratio MH, Random, 35% C 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 0dds Ratio MH, Random, 95% C 7.86 [0.29, 217.11] 2.02 [0.66, 5.24 4.81 [1.95, 10.35] 6 0dds Ratio MH, Random, 95% C 3.89 [2.20, 6.87 6	1 Yea 1 Yea 2020 1 1 2020 1 2020 1 2020 1 2021 1 2011 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 fotal (95% CI) Total events leterogeneity, Tau ² = fest for overall effect - itudy or Subgroup Mang LC, 2020 ital events leterogeneity, Tau ² = set for overall effect - itudy or Subgroup theory Y, 2015 Vang LC, 2020 ital (95% CI) Total events leterogeneity, Tau ² = letoroy enail effect - ital (95% CI) Total events letoroy enail effect - fest for overall effect - - Fest for overall effect	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	108 107 245 (P < 0.0 C Total 17 32 19 111 17 7 32 19 111 11 17 7 32 21 37 32 21 19 111 11 17 11 37 32 19 111 11 11 17 17 18 18 19 19 111 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	19 33 65 6, df = 2 (F 20001) Lumine Events 3 1 1 0 0 5 5, df = 4 (1 Lumine Events 3 17 14 5 1 40 0 5 40 0 5 1 1 40 5 1 1 40 5 1 1 40 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	274 289 753 P = 0.25 al A Total 5 61 20 20 111 117 P = 0.9 8 127 90 82 26 333 P = 0.7	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0% 111.4% 27.6% 30.4% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 100.0% 2.5.5% 5.9% 100.0% (); ^p = 09	6.71 [3.83, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.99] 4.45 [2.07, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 59% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71] 8.57 [0.11, 111, 71] 8.75 [2.04, 172, 00] 1.61, 5[1, 95, 133, 51] 1.4, 22 [0.77, 261, 61] 4.88 [0, 23, 103, 76] 11.66 [3.64, 37, 38] 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 59% C 7.86 [0, 28, 217, 11] 2.02 [0.66, 62, 40] 5.13 [1.53, 17, 13] 5.13 [1.53, 17, 13] 5.13 [1.53, 17, 14] 3.89 [1.20, 6.87] 6	1 Year 1 Year 1 2019 1 2010 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2012 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2012	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI M-H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC	100
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² Fest for overall effect Heterogeneity , Tau ² Fest for overall effect Heterogeneity , Tau ² Sest for overall effect Heterogeneity , Tau ² Sest for overall effect Heterogeneity , Tau ² Study or Subgroup Nang L, 2015 Vang J, 2015 Vang J, 2015 Vang J, 2015 Vang J, 2018 Ge F, 2019 Vang L, 2015 Vang J, 2018 Ge F, 2019 Vang L, 2018 Ge F, 2019 Vang L, 2018 Ge F, 2019 Vang L, 2020 Vang L,	36 33 75 0.05; Ch.05; Ch.05; Ch.05; Ch.05; Ch.05; Ch.05; Ch.05; Ch.07; Ch.05; Ch.07; Ch.05; Ch.07;	108 107 245 IP = 2.74 (P < 0.0 IC Total 2 2 11 37 32 19 111 IP = 1.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 P < 0.0 IT 137 32 19 111 IP = 1.0 (P < 0.0 IT 137 137 137 137 137 137 137 137	19 19 33 85 3, df = 2 (F (Events 3 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	274 289 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753 753	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0% 11.4% 27.6% 11.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0% 0); I [*] = 09 Weight 2.9% 43.5% 22.2% 43.5% 22.2% 5.9% 6); I [*] = 09	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.99] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71] 8.57 [0.11, 111, 71] 8.75 [0.20, 172, 02] 1.16 [1.5 [1.96], 1.32 51] 4.88 [0.23, 103, 76] 1.4.88 [0.23, 103, 76] 1.4.68 [3.64, 37, 38] 6 Odds Ratio MH, Random, 55% C 4.61 [4.5], 0.41, 21, 0.2	1 Year 1 Year 1 2019 2 2020 1 2011 2 2011 1 2011 2 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011	Odds Ratio 0.01 0.1 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% Cl 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio	100
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = est for overall effect est for overall effect tauty or Subgroup heng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2016 total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = est for overall effect S Heterogeneity: Tau ² = est for overall effect S Vang J, 2016 Hour P, 2018 total events S Vang J, 2016 Hour P, 2018 total events S Vang J, 2016 Hour P, 2018 tota P, 2018 tota P, 2018 Vang J, 2016 Hour P, 2018 Vang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = est for overall effect H H H H H H H H	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	108 107 245 P = 2.7(P < 0.0 C Total 2 2 10 2 10 10^{2} 10^{2	19 19 33 65 65 67 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	274 289 753 P = 0.25 al A Total 5 61 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9 8 127 90 8 226 333 P = 0.7 mbined Total	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0%); [F = 28' 11.1.4% 30.4% 11.1.4% 20.5% 100.0% 0); [F = 09 Weight 14.5% 100.0% 0); [F = 09 100.0% 6); [F = 09	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.99] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 0 0dds Ratio MH, Random, 35% C 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 0dds Ratio MH, Random, 95% C 3.89 [2.20, 6.87 6 0dds Ratio MH, Random, 95% C 14.69 [3.64, 37.38 6 0dds Ratio MH, Random, 95% C 14.69 [3.64, 37.38 6 0 (3.64, 37.38 7 10 (3.64, 37.38 6 0 (3.64, 37.38 7 10 (3.64, 37.38 7 10 (3.64, 37.38 6 0 (3.64, 37.38 7 10 (3.64, 37.38 10 (3.64, 37.38) 10	1 Year 1 Year 2010 2010 1 2011 2011 2011 1 2011 2 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 2 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% Cl Godds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% Cl	100
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 fotal (95% CI) fotal events leterogeneity, Tau ² = fest for overall effect itudy or Subgroup thorp, 7, 2015 Vang LC, 2020 otal events leterogeneity, Tau ² = letfor overall effect leterogeneity, Tau ² = leterogeneity, Tau ² = letfor overall effect leterogeneity, Tau ² = leterogeneity, Tau ² = letoroverall effect leterogeneity, Tau ² = letoroverall effect letoroverall effect letoroveral	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	$\begin{array}{c} 108\\ 107\\ 245\\ P = 2.74\\ (P < 0.0\\ C\\ \hline Total\\ 37\\ 32\\ 21\\ 37\\ 32\\ 19\\ 111\\ P = 1.8\\ (P < 0.0\\ C\\ 21\\ 137\\ 32\\ 19\\ 111\\ 107\\ 12\\ 19\\ 111\\ 107\\ 12\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10$	19 19 33 65 65 00001) Lumina Events 3 3 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Lumina 5, off = 4 (l 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	274 289 753 6 = 0.25 6 1 200 200 111 117 P = 0.9 8 127 90 82 26 333 9 P = 0.7 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0%); ² = 28° 11.4% 27.6% 11.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 100.0% 0; ² = 09 25.5% 5.9% 100.0% 6; ² = 0 9 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10%	6.71 [3.8, 12.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 55% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71 18.75 [2.04, 17.20] 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71 18.75 [2.04, 17.20] 14.22 [0.77, 261, 61 4.88 [0.23, 103, 76] 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 55% C 3.89 [2.20, 6.87 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 55% C 5.77 [0.23, 14.32]	1 Year 1 Year 1 2011 1 2012 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2014 1 2024	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl Guoss O.1 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl Guoss O.1 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl Guoss O.1 Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Fest for overall effect Futudy or Subgroup theong Y, 2015 Vang J, 2016 total P, 2018 is F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Vang LC, 2020 Total events de F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Study or Subgroup Vang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Study or Subgroup Zhang Y, 2016 Vang J, 2018 Vang J, 2018 Vang J, 2018 Vang J, 2018 Vang J, 2018	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	$\begin{array}{c} 108\\ 107\\ 245\\ P^{2}=2.7(\\ P^{2}<0.0\\ C\\ \hline \mbox{Total} \\ 21\\ 37\\ 22\\ 19\\ 101\\ P^{2}=1.0\\ (P^{2}<0.0\\ C\\ C\\ C\\ 10\\ P^{2}=1.8\\ (P^{2}<0.0\\ C\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10$	19 19 33 65 66 67 68 68 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	274 289 753 P = 0.25 61 701 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9 8 127 90 8 226 333 P = 0.7 90 82 226 333 P = 0.7 11 117	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0% Weight 11.4% 30.4% 10.0% 14.5% 100.0% Weight 14.5% 100.0% Weight 4.5% 100.0% 1.45% 100.0% 1.45% 100.0% 1.45% 100.0% 1.45% 100.0% 1.45%	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.99] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 0 0dds Ratio M.H., Random, 95% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71] 18.75 [2.04, 172, 07] 16.15 [1.96, 133, 51] 14.22 [0.77, 261 61] 4.88 [0.23, 103, 76] 11.66 [3.64, 37, 38] 6 0 0dds Ratio M.H., Random, 95% C 3.89 [2.20, 6.87] 6 0 0dds Ratio M.H., Random, 95% C 3.89 [2.21, 143, 77] 4.89 [0.45, 44] 0.57 [0.21, 143, 77] 4.89 [0.45, 44] 0.57 [0.21, 143, 77] 6 0 0 0 0 5.77 [0.21, 143, 77] 5.77 [0.21, 143, 77	1 Year 1 Year 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI	
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 fotal (95% CI) Total events leterogeneity, Tau ² = fest for overall effect - itudy or Subgroup Mang LC, 2020 fotal events leterogeneity, Tau ² = set for overall effect - itudy or Subgroup Theng Y, 2015 Vang LC, 2020 fotal (95% CI) "total events leterogeneity, Tau ² = 'est for overall effect - itudy or Subgroup Theng Y, 2015 Vang LC, 2020 fotal (95% CI) "total events leterogeneity, Tau ² = 'est for overall effect - - <i>Subdy or Subgroup</i> Theng Y, 2015 Vang LC, 2020 fotal (95% CI) "total events leterogeneity, Tau ² = 'est for overall effect - - <i>Subdy or Subgroup</i> Theng Y, 2016 Mang J, 2018 Mong F, 2019	a 6 36 37 57 50 50 50 50 50 17 17 18 18 18 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	108 107 245 107 245 107 245 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107	19 19 33 65 66 60 00001) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	274 289 753 P = 0.25 al A Total 200 11 117 P = 0.9 al B Total 8 8 7 90 82 26 333 P = 0.7 " " " " " "	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0% Weight 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 14.5% 100.0% Weight 14.5% 100.0% Weight 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 11.4% 11.4% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 100.0% 10.0% 14.5% 100.0% 10.0%	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.99 4.45 [2.07, 7.11] 6 0 0dds Ratio M-H, Random, 59% C 1.5 [1.9] (3.57) [0.11, 111, 71 18.75 [2.04, 172, 00] 16.15 [1.9] (3.13, 51 14.22 [0.77, 261, 61 4.88 [0.23, 103, 76] 11.66 [3.64, 37, 38 6 0 dds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11 2.02 [0.66, 6.24] 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11 2.02 [0.45, 240] 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11] 7.86 [0.29, 217, 11] 7.86 [0.29, 217, 214] 7.86 [0.29, 217, 214]	1 Year 1 Year 2011 2011 1 2011 2011 2011 1 2011 2011 2011 1 2021 1 2021 1 2021 2011 2021 Year 2018 2019 2019	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	
ai Z, 2019 ai Z, 2020 Total events teterogeneity, Tau ² = Test for overall effect F titudy or Subgroup theng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2015 Vang J, 2018 die F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 total (95% CI) total events est for overall effect S total events total events to	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	108 107 245 P=2.74 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 2 19 111 P=1.0 (P < 0.7 C Total 19 111 P=1.0 (P < 0.7 2 2 19 111 P=1.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 19 111 P=1.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 19 111 P=1.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 2 19 19 111 P=1.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 2 19 19 111 P=1.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 2 19 19 111 P=1.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 2 19 19 111 P=1.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 2 19 19 111 P=1.0 (P < 0.0 C Total 2 19 19 111 107 2 19 107 2 19 107 2 19 107 107 2 107 2 2 19 107 2 2 19 107 2 2 19 107 2 2 19 107 2 2 19 107 2 2 19 107 2 2 19 2 10 2 10 2 2 10 3 2 2 19 3 2 2 19 2 10 2 2 10 2 2 10 3 2 2 10 3 2 2 10 3 2 2 10 3 2 2 10 3 2 2 10 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	19 33 65 63, df = 2 (F Events 3 3 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 5, df = 4 (1 Events 5, df = 4 (1 Events 17 14 5 17 14 5 17 16 17 17 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	274 289 753 P = 0.25 61 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9 8 127 8 127 20 8 127 20 8 333 8 226 333 333 P = 0.7 11 117 10 119	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0% Weight 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 11.4.5% 100.0% 0); ² = 09 Weight 2.5.% 5.9% 100.0% 0; ² = 09 4 Weight 10.0% 0; ² = 09 4 10.0% 13.1% 2 = 0.5% 10.0%	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.98] 4.45 [2.07, 7.11] 6 0 0dds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71 18.75 [2.04, 172.00] 16.15 [1.96, 13.35 1 14.22 [0.77, 261 61 4.88 [0.23, 103, 76 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 0dds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% C 3.89 [2.20, 6.87 6 0dds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% C 3.89 [2.20, 6.87 6	1 Year 1 Year 2011 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 2015 2018 2018 2019 2019 2019	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl Galage 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl Galage 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl Galage M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
si Z, 2019 si Z, 2020 Total eysk, CI) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = test or overall effect : tutdy or Subgroup theng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2016 ter, 2019 Vang V, 2017 Vang J, 2016 ter, 2019 Vang J, 2016 ter, 2019 Vang J, 2016 Vang J, 2017 Vang J, 2018 ter, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Votal events telerogeneity, Tau ² = 'sest or overall effect : : : : : : : :	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	108 107 245 107 245 107 245 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107	19 19 33 65 66 67 67 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	274 289 753 2 = 0.25 31A Total 5 61 20 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9 31B Total 8 8 7 22 6 333 333 P = 0.7 5 127 90 8 22 26 333 7 127 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0% 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 11.4% 30.4% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 5.9% 5.9% 5.9% 6); P = 09 10.0% 6); P = 09 10.0% 6); P = 09 10.0% 10.	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.99] 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 0 0dds Ratio M.H. Random, 595: CI 7.86 [0.28, 171 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 0dds Ratio M.H. Random, 595: CI 3.89 [2.20, 6.87 6 0dds Ratio M.H. Random, 595: CI 5.77 [0.23, 14.327] 2.46 [0.97, 601] 5.87 [0.23, 12.07] 6 0dds Ratio M.H. Random, 595: CI 5.77 [0.23, 14.327] 2.46 [0.97, 601] 5.87 [0.23, 12.07] 2.46 [0.97, 601] 5.87 [0.23, 12.07] 2.46 [0.97, 601] 5.87 [0.23, 12.07] 2.46 [0.97, 601] 5.87 [0.23, 12.07] 0.47 [1.48, 21.54] 3.40 [1.18, 31, 24.07] 0.47 [1.48, 21.54] 3.40 [1.48, 31, 24.07] 0.47 [1.48, 21.54] 3.40 [1.48, 31, 24.07] 0.47 [1.48, 21.54] 3.40 [1.48, 31, 24.07] 0.47 [1.48, 21.54] 0.47 [1.48, 21.54] 0.45 [1.48	1 Year 1 Year 1 2019 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2012 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2012 1 2012 1 2012 1 2011 2018 2018 2019 2019 2019 2019	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% Cl 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% Cl 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H, Random, 95% Cl	
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Mang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Study or Subgroup Study or Subgroup	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	108 107 245 107 245 107 245 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 108 107 108 107 108 107 108 107 108 107 108 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107	10 10 33 85 84 85 84 87 84 85 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 9	274 289 753 P = 0.25 al A Total 5 61 20 20 20 20 111 117 P = 0.9 8 Total 8 127 90 8 22 2333 P = 0.7 10 11 117 P = 0.9 10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 44.7% 44.7% 44.7% 44.7% 44.7% 44.7% 40.0% 4.7% 4	6.71 [3.8,].2.40 3.46 [2.00,598 4.45 [2.07,97] 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 55% C 11.61 [51,95] 14.22 [0.4, [72,07] 15.15 [1.95,].3.57 14.22 [0.4, [72,07] 16.15 [1.95,].3.57 14.22 [0.4, [72,07] 16.15 [1.95,].3.57 14.22 [0.47, 261,61 4.88 [0.2, 10, 17] 11.66 [3.64, 37, 38 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 55% C 3.89 [2.20, 6.87 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% C 3.89 [2.20, 6.87 6	1 Year 1 Year 1 2014 2 2020 1 2020 1 2014 2 2011 2 2011 1 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2015 2 2018 2 2019 2 2019 2 2019 2 2020	0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total versts Heterogeneity, Tau* Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2016 Vang J, 2018 Vang L, 2020 Vang L, 2020 Vang L, 2020 Vang L, 2020 Vang L, 2018 Vang L	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	$\begin{array}{c} 108\\ 107\\ 245\\ P=2.77\\ 245\\ P=2.77\\ 2\\ 2\\ 21\\ 32\\ 19\\ 111\\ 111\\ 111\\ 111\\ 111\\ 111\\ 111$	19 19 33 65 65 65 67 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	274 289 753 29 = 0.25 6 14 Total 117 117 P = 0.9 al B Total 117 P = 0.9 al B Total 8 127 90 0 82 26 333 P = 0.7 11 117 90 82 26 333 26 127 11 111 110 111 110 111 111 110 111 111	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0% Weight 11.4% 27.6% 30.4% 27.6% 30.4% 11.4,5% 100.0% 0); P = 09 Weight 2.6,5% 5.9% 5.9% 5.9% 100.0% 13.6% 8 8.6% 8 8.6% 8 1.0% 13.8% 2 6.6% 8 1.0% 8 1.0% 13.8% 8 1.0% 8 1.0% 8 1.0% 8 1.0% 13.8% 8 1.0% 13.8% 8 1.0% 13.8% 8 1.0% 13.8% 1.0% 13.8% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0	6.71 [3.8,].2.40 3.46 [2.00,598] 4.45 [2.07,7.11] 6 Odds Ratio MH, Random, 95% Cl 3.57 [0.11,111,71 18.75 [2.04,172.00] 16.15 [1.96,133.51 14.22 [0.77,261 61 4.88 [0.23,103,76 11.66 [3.64,37.38 6 Odds Ratio MH, Random, 95% Cl 4.61 [1.63,21,11 2.02 [0.66,62,43,11 4.69 [0.45,49,06] 5.13 [1.53,17,17 4.69 [0.45,49,06] 3.89 [2.20,6.87 6 Odds Ratio MH, Random, 95% Cl 3.89 [2.20,43,27] 2.99 [0.87,00] 5.77 [0.22,143,27] 2.99 [0.87,00] 5.31 [1.53,11,24] 4.40 [1.93,11,24] 6.47 [1.94,21,14] 3.40 [1.18,9,10] 6.75 [0.65,69 97] 3.46 [2.00,598]	1 Year 1 Year 1 2011 2 2011 1 2011 2 2011 1 2011 2 2011 1 2011 2 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2011 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio	
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2015 Vang J, 2016 die F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Vang J, 2016 die F, 2019 Vang LC, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2016 Vang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2016 Vang LC, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Test for overall effect Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2016 Mou P, 2018 Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2019 Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2019 Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2019 Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2019 Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2019 Mang LC, 2020 Total (95% CI)	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	$\begin{array}{c} 108\\ 100^{-}\\ 100^{-}\\ 100^{-}\\ 245\\ 245\\ 245\\ 245\\ 245\\ 245\\ 241\\ 37\\ 322\\ 19\\ 111\\ 37\\ 322\\ 19\\ 111\\ 37\\ 322\\ 19\\ 111\\ 37\\ 322\\ 19\\ 101\\ 111\\ 37\\ 322\\ 19\\ 101\\ 101\\ 37\\ 323\\ 30\\ 310\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 1$	19 19 33 65 66 67 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	274 289 753 81 A Total 5 6 10 11 117 P = 0.9 318 70 8 127 9 8 20 20 20 20 11 117 P = 0.9 318 8 127 26 333 P = 0.7 5 10 11 117 117 117 118 118 118 118 118 118	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 44.7% Weight 11.4% 27.6% 11.4% 27.6% 100.0% 11.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0% Weight 10.00% 14.5% 5.9% 100.0% Weight 10.0% 14.5% 5.9% 100.0% 14.5% 5.9% 100.0% 14.5% 5.9% 100.0% 14.5% 5.9% 100.0% 14.5% 5.9% 100.0% 14.5% 5.9% 100.0% 14.5% 5.9% 100.0% 14.5% 5.9% 100.0% 14.5% 5.9% 100.0% 14.5% 10.0% 14.5% 10.0% 14.5% 10.0% 10.5% 10	6.71 [3.63, [2.40] 3.46 [2.00, 5.99 4.45 [2.07, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 59% C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71 18.75 [2.04, 17.20] 16.15 [1.95, 133.51 14.22 [0.77, 261, 61 4.88 [0.23, 103, 76] 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 59% C 7.86 [0.28, 217, 11 2.02 [10.66, 624 4.61 [1.95, 10.33 5.13 [1.53, 17, 11] 4.69 [0.45, 4.806 3.89 [2.20, 6.87 6 Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% C 5.77 [0.21, 143.37] 2.95 [0.37, 90] 5.53 [2.31, 254] 4.64 [1.94, 2154] 3.64 [1.19, 31, 124] 5.71 [3.3, 124] 5.71 [3.51 [3.51 [3.51 [3.51 [3.51 [3.51 [3.51 [3.51 [3.51 [3.51 [3.51 [3.51	1 Year 1 Year 1 2019 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 1 2011 20115 2016 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2020 2020	0.001 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 60.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 60.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 60.005 0.1 10 Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Bi Z, 2019 Bi Z, 2020 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogoneily, Tau*= Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2015 Wang J, 2016 Wang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogoneily, Tau*= Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2015 Wang J, 2016 Wang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogeneily, Tau*= Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2018 Wang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogeneily, Tau*= Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2018 Wang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogeneily, Tau*= Test for overall effect Wang J, 2018 Wang LC, 2020 Total events Heterogeneily, Tau*= Study or Subgroup Zheng Y, 2018 Wang LC, 2020 Bi Z, 2020 Hetal (95% CI) Total events Bi Z, 2019 Wang LC, 2020 Bi Z, 2020 Hetal (95% CI) Total events	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	$\begin{array}{c} 108\\ 107\\ 108\\ 107\\ 245\\ 107\\ 245\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108$	19 33 85 84 85 84 84 85 84 85 84 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	274 289 753 P = 0.25 14 753 20 20 20 20 20 20 211 117 P = 0.9 333 8 127 90 8 226 333 8 226 333 8 226 333 P = 0.7 11 117 117 127 90 8 226 333 117 100 127 100 110 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000	38.6% 44.7% 44.7% 100.0% Weight 11.4% 27.6% 27.6% 11.4% 16.0% 14.5% 100.0% 14.5% 100.0% 0); ² = 09 Weight 2.9% 2.2,2% 5.9% 100.0% 10	6.71 [3.8, 12.40] 3.46 [2.00, 598 4.45 [2.79, 7.11] 6 Odds Ratio M.H., Random, 55%, C 3.57 [0.11, 111, 71 18.75 [2.04, 17.20] 16.15 [1.95, 13.35 1 14.22 [0.77, 261, 61 4.88 [0.23, 10.376 11.66 [3.64, 37.38 6 Odds Ratio M.H., Random, 55%, C 3.89 [2.20, 6.87 6 Odds Ratio M.H., Random, 55%, C 3.11, 12.41 4.57 [1.63, 12.40] 6.77 [1.63, 12.40] 6.75 [1.63, 6.89] 3.40 [2.00, 5.80] 4.59 [3.35, 6.29]	1 Yea 1 Yea 2019 2010 1 2011 2011 2011 1 2011 2011 2020 1 Year 2011 2021 1 2021 1 2021 2011 2021 2018 2018 2019 2020 2020 2020	0.01 0.1 10 Favours Luminal-like Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Favours Luminal B Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	

Fig. 2 (See legend on previous page.)

MOLECULAR SUBTYPES

Taxane-nlat	tinum			NO	LECU	ILAR SUBIY	PES	•
A	HER2E		Luminal-li	ke		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup 4.1.1 HER2E vs Lumi	Events Te nal-like	otal	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Wang RX, 2017	147	280	90	269	45.2%	2.20 [1.56, 3.10]	2017	-
Zhou L, 2017	11	21	23	93	30.5%	3.35 [1.26, 8.90]	2017	
Subtotal (95% CI)		321	11	382	24.3%	1.69 [0.70, 4.11]	2020	
Total events	165		124					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	: 0.42; Chi ² =	6.73	, df = 2 (P =	= 0.03); I² = 70%			
restion overall ellect.	2-1.10(1-	- 0.20	<i>"</i>					
4.1.2 HER2E vs Lumi	nal-like (Sub	grou	p- assess	ed out	tcome)			
Zhou L, 2017	11	21	23	93	11.1%	3.35 [1.26, 8.90]	2017	-
Subtotal (95% CI)	147	301	30	362	100.0%	2.30 [1.66, 3.19]	2017	
Total events	158		113					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi ² =	0.63	df = 1 (P =	= 0.43); I ² = 0%			
restion overall ellect.	Z = 5.02 (P	< 0.0t	001)					
Test for subgroup diff	foroncos: Ch	i² - 0	41 df = 1	(P = 0	52) IZ-0	196		Favours Luminal-like Favours HER2E
	lerences. On	0	41. 01-1	(1 = 0	.527.1 = 0			
В	HER2E		Luminal	A		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events T	otal	Events	Fotal	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Lv M. 2011	2	6	0	9	9.7%	10.56 [0.41, 268.69]	2010	
Zhu T, 2015	10	13	2	19	26.8%	28.33 [4.02, 199.60]	2015	
Xu Y, 2020	10	13	0	3	10.0%	21.00 [0.86, 515.50]	2020	
Total (95% CI)		47		01	100.0%	12 11 14 41 33 261		
Total events	28		7	51	100.0%	12.11[4.41, 55.20]		-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Chi ² =	= 1.37	, df = 3 (P	= 0.7	1); I ^z = 0%			
Test for overall effect	Z = 4.84 (P	< 0.0	0001)					Favours Luminal A Favours HER2E
С	HER2E		Luminal	в		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events T	otal	Events 1	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Chen XS, 2010a	6	15	2	9	19.4%	2.33 [0.36, 15.30]	2010	
Lv M, 2011	2	6	1	12	9.7%	5.50 [0.38, 78.57]	2011	
Zhu 1, 2015	10	13	19	54	35.1%	7.89 [1.95, 31.93]	2015	
Au 1, 2020	10	15	25	75	33.8%	7.54 [1.80, 28.87]	2020	_
Total (95% CI)		47		160	100.0%	5.92 [2.59, 13.54]		•
Total events	28		45					
Heterogeneity: Tau* =	= 0.00; Chi* =	= 1.23	8, df = 3 (P	= 0.7	5); I* = 0%))		0.01 0.1 1 10 100
n	2 = 4.21 (- 0.0				odda Batta		Favours Luminal B Favours HER2E
Study or Subgroup	HERZE Events Total	E	vents	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	fear	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
4.4.1 HER2E vs Lumina	l, combined							
Chen XS, 2010a	6 15		7	69	13.7%	5.90 [1.62, 21.56] 2	010	
LVM, 2011 Zhu T. 2015	10 13		21	21	5.6%	9.84 [2.47 39.19] 2	015	
Zhou L, 2017	11 21		23	93	17.1%	3.35 [1.26, 8.90] 2	017	
Wang RX, 2017	147 280		90	269	23.9%	2.20 [1.56, 3.10] 2	017	-
Li K. 2020	7 20		11	20	13.9%	0.44 [0.12, 1.57] 2	020	
Subtotal (95% CI)	368		1221	633	100.0%	3.37 [1.66, 6.84]		◆
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau? = 0	193 51: ChiP = 17	27 dt	176 = 6 (P = 0)	0.08\·P	= 65%			
Test for overall effect Z	= 3.37 (P = 0.)	0008)	- 0 0 - 0.	000),1	- 00 %			
4.4.2 LIED2E ve Lumina	L combined /	Subar	010 3660	ead o	utcome)			
Chen XS, 2010a	6 15	Juny	7	69	15.9%	5.90 [1.62, 21.56]	2010	
Lv M, 2011	2 6		1	21	5.1%	10.00 [0.72, 138.68]	011	
Zhu T, 2015 Zhou L. 2017	10 13		21	83	22.3%	9.84 [2.47, 39.19] 2 3.35 [1.26, 8.90] 2	2015	
Wang RX, 2017	147 280		90	269	42.1%	2.20 [1.56, 3.10]	017	+
Subtotal (95% CI)	176		142	535	100.0%	3.80 [2.02, 7.13]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.	.21; Chi ^a = 7.2	6, df=	142 4 (P = 0.1)	2); f==	45%			
Test for overall effect Z	= 4.15 (P < 0.	0001)						
							+	
							D.I	avours Luminal, combined Favours HER2E
Test for subgroup differ	ences: Chi* =	0.06.	df = 1 (P =)	0.81), 1	I* = 0 %			
F	Luminal	2	Luminal			Odde Patio		Odde Patio
Study or Subgroup	Events T	otal	Events T	otal	Weight I	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Chen XS, 2010a	2	9	5	60	33.0%	3.14 [0.51, 19.37]	2010	
Lv M, 2011	1	12	0	9	10.0%	2.48 [0.09, 68.14]	2011	
Zhu T, 2015	19	64 75	2	19	44.9%	3.59 [0.75, 17.08]	2015	
Au 1, 2020	23	75	0	3	12.1%	3.13 [0.10, 03.11]	2020	
Total (95% CI)		160		91	100.0%	3.26 [1.14, 9.26]		-
Total events	45		7					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Chi ² =	0.04	, df = 3 (P :	= 1.00	$); ^2 = 0\%$		1	0.01 0.1 1 10 100
	2 - 2.21 (1-	- 0.0.	"					Favours Luminal A Favours Luminal B
F	TNBC		Lumina	A		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Chan VS 2010a	events	otal	Events	rutal	66.0%	5 50 (4 59 40 47	1 1 2010	M-ri, random, 95% CI
Ly M. 2011	8	18	0	00	9.7%	15.38 [0 78 304 07	1 2010	
Zhu T, 2015	8	14	2	19	26.3%	11.33 [1.86, 69.08	2015	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Xu Y, 2020	6	17	0	3	8.9%	3.96 [0.18, 89.19	2020	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Total (95% Ch		73		04	100.0%	7 14 13 03 40 04	1	
Total evente	30	15	7	91	100.0%	7.14 [2.82, 18.04		-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² :	= 0.00; Chi ² :	= 0.8	2, df = 3 (F	= 0.8	34); I ² = 09	16		
Test for overall effect	Z = 4.15 (P	< 0.0	1001)					Favours Luminal A Favours TNBC
G								
Study or Subaroun	Events T	otal	Events	B Total	Weight	M.H. Random 95% C	Year	Udds Ratio M.H. Bandom, 95% Cl
Chen XS. 2010a	8	24	200000	. o.al	15.4%	1.75 [0 29 10 44	2010	
Lv M, 2011	8	18	1	12	9.7%	8.80 [0.93, 83.35	2011	
Zhu T, 2015	8	14	19	64	34.9%	3.16 [0.96, 10.34	2015	
Xu Y, 2020	6	17	23	75	40.0%	1.23 [0.41, 3.74	2020	
Total (95% CI)		73		160	100 0%	2.1911.09.4.44		
Total events	30		45	.50	100.0%	2.10[1.03, 4.4]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Chi ² :	= 2.94	1, df = 3 (P	= 0.4	0); I ² = 09	6		
Test for overall effect	Z = 2.19 (P	= 0.0	3)					Eavours Luminal B Eavours TNBC
								1 avours Lummar D 1 avours mubb

Fig. 3 Pooled pCR outcome of TP-treated Asian breast cancer patients according to molecular subtypes. Forest plots describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the association of pCR outcome in NAC TP-treated Asian breast cancer patients between (A) HER2E and luminal-like; (B) HER2E and luminal A; (C) HER2E and luminal B; (D) HER2E and luminal, combined; (E) Luminal B and luminal A; (F) TNBC and luminal A; (G) TNBC and luminal B. l^2 and p-value for X^2 of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis

Figure 7.1A in Additional file 7). Similarly, an analysis between luminal A and luminal B showed that neither was associated with better pCR outcome when treated with NAC TA (OR 2.47; 95% CI 0.79–7.73; p=0.12; Supplementary Figure 7.1B in Additional file 7).

Taxane-platinum (TP) chemotherapy

In the analysis pooling three studies [45,64,102] comparing HER2E and luminal-like subtypes, 321 patients were identified with HER2E subtype, and 382 patients were luminal-like. When treated with NAC TP, neither HER2E nor luminal-like patients were associated with pCR (OR 1.69; 95% CI 0.70–4.11; *p*=0.25; Fig. 3A). However, in the analysis pooling four studies [41, 69, 97, 115] comparing HER2E and luminal A subtypes, HER2E was significantly associated with pCR outcome (OR 12.11; 95% CI 4.41–33.26; p<0.0001; Fig. 3B). Similarly, when comparing against luminal B and luminal, combined, HER2E was significantly associated with pCR outcome (OR 5.92; 95% CI 2.59-13.54; p<0.0001; Fig. 3C and OR 3.37; 95% CI 1.66–6.84; *p*=0.0008; Fig. 3D, respectively). Substantial heterogeneity was reported for two of the pooled analyses: (1) in studies comparing HER2E and luminal-like (Fig. 3A); and (2) in studies comparing HER2E and luminal, combined (Fig. 3D). Although all three and seven studies pooled in the two analyses were performed in the Chinese population, the primary outcome assessed in Li et al. [57] and Xu et al. [97] focused on the contribution of genetic mutations or long non-coding RNAs (lncR-NAs) as a predictor of pCR status in the recruited population. Consequently, pooled analysis excluding Li et al. eliminates the heterogeneity in the first analysis revealing significant association (OR 2.30; 95% CI 1.66–3.19; p<0.00001), while pooled analysis excluding Li et al. and Xu et al. in the second analysis decreased the heterogeneity, and maintaining the significant association (OR 3.80; 95% CI 2.02–7.13; *p*<0.0001).

Notably, when HER2E and TNBC patients were compared, neither was associated with pCR (OR 1.46; 95% CI 0.63–3.37; p=0.38; Supplementary Figure 7.1C in Additional file 7). We then compared luminal B and luminal A patients and found that luminal B patients were significantly associated with better pCR outcomes (OR 3.26; 95% CI 1.14–9.26; p=0.03; Fig. 3E). Similar to NAC TA-treated patients, analyses conducted comparing the effect of TNBC and luminal subtypes on pCR outcome in TP-treated patients also significantly associate TNBC with better pCR outcome compared to luminal A (OR 7.14; 95% CI 2.82–18.04; p<0.0001; Fig. 3F), luminal B (OR 2.19; 95% CI 1.09–4.41; p=0.03; Fig. 3G), and luminal, combined (OR 3.79; 95% CI 1.94–7.40; p<0.0001; Fig. 4A).

Our study compared the effect of chemotherapeutic agents on the pCR outcome in TNBC patients (Fig. 4B). Pooled analysis involving two studies [69, 108] showed that TNBC patients were significantly more likely to achieve pCR when treated with NAC TP (n=25/62) compared to NAC TA (n=7/48) (OR 3.76; 95% CI 1.43-9.87; p=0.007).

Biomarkers

Qualitatively, most studies with biomarkers data comprise of routinely analysed biomarkers-ER, PR, HER2, and Ki-67. In ER- and ER+ patients, anthracyclinebased chemotherapy showed pCRrate of 27.2% (n=4) vs 15.3% (*n*=4). Meanwhile, TP, TA, and TAP chemotherapy showed pCR rate of 48.1% (n=6) vs 19.4% (n=5), 25.0% (*n*=6) vs 9.0% (*n*=7), and 29.7% (*n*=1) vs 12.9% (*n*=1), respectively. As for PR- and PR+ patients, anthracycline-based, TP, TA, and TAP chemotherapy showed pCR rate of 28.3% (n=2) vs 13.9% (n=2), 46.6% (n=5) vs 21.8% (n=5), 20.6% (n=4) vs 8.2% (n=4), and 25% (n=1)vs 13.3% (n=1), respectively. Collectively, ER- and PRbreast cancer patients were likely to benefit more from TP regimen than TA, TAP, and anthracycline-based chemotherapy. Notably, some studies combined their report of ER and PR as hormone receptors (HR). Analysis of HR+ and HR- patients showed pCR rate of 11.9% (n=1) vs 10% (n=1), 33.1% (n=2) vs 49.3% (n=2), 31.3% (n=2) vs 50.7% (n=3), and 12.4% (n=5) vs 23.2% (n=5) when treated with anthracycline-based, taxane-based, TP, and TA chemotherapy, respectively. Our findings suggested that HR+ breast cancer patients achieved a better pCR rate when treated with a single-based chemotherapeutic agent, while HR- patients benefit more combination chemotherapy regimens.

In HER2+ and HER2- patients, anthracycline-based chemotherapy showed pCR rate of 10.5% (*n*=3) vs 19.3%

⁽See figure on next page.)

Fig. 4 Pooled pCR outcome of NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients according to molecular subtypes and biomarkers. Forest plots describing the random effect ORs and 95% Cls from studies assessing the association of pCR outcome in (**A**) NAC TP-treated Asian breast cancer patients between TNBC and luminal, combined; (**B**) between Asian TNBC patients treated with NAC TP and TA; Asian breast cancer patients treated with anthracycline-based chemotherapy with (**C**) ER; (**D**) PR; and (**E**) HER2 biomarkers; (**F**) Asian breast cancer patients treated with taxane-based chemotherapy and HR biomarker; (**G**) Asian breast cancer patients treated with TA and ER biomarker. *I*² and *p*-value for X² of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis

MOLECULAR SUBTYPES

A	TNB	С	Luminal	, combined		Odds Ra	atio			Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Event	s Total	Weight	M-H, Randor	m, 95% CI	Year		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Chen XS, 2010a	8	24		7 69	22.4%	4.43 [1.4	40, 14.04]	2010			
Lv M, 2011	8	18		1 21	8.1%	16.00 [1.75	5, 146.31]	2011			
Zhu T, 2015	8	14	2	1 83	22.0%	3.94 [1.3	22, 12.66]	2015			
Zhou L, 2017	11	17	2	3 93	23.8%	5.58 [1.8	86, 16.77]	2017			· · · · ·
Ku Y, 2020	6	17	2	3 78	23.7%	1.30 [0	.43, 3.95]	2020			
Total (95% CI)		90		344	100.0%	3.79 [1	.94, 7.40]			•	
Total events	41		7	5							
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.17; Chi	= 5.7	3, df = 4 (F	P = 0.22); I# = 3	30%			-	-	4	100
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect	= 0.17; Chi : Z = 3.90	P < 0.0	3, df = 4 (f 1001)	P = 0.22); I [#] = 3	30%			0.0 Fav	01 0.1 Iours Luminal,	combined Favours TNBC	100
Heterogeneity: Tau*: Test for overall effect	= 0.17; Ch t Z = 3.90	P < 0.0	3, df = 4 (f 1001)	P = 0.22); I# = 3	30%			0.0 Fav	01 0.1 ours Luminal,	combined Favours TNBC	100
Heterogeneity: Tau* Test for overall effect B	= 0.17; Chi : Z = 3.90 Taxane-p	1 ^a = 5.73 (P < 0.0	3, df = 4 (7 1001) n (TP) 1	P = 0.22); I [#] = :	30% cycline (T <i>l</i>	0	Odds	0.0 Fav	01 0.1 rours Luminal,	combined Favours TNBC	100
Heterogeneity: Tau ^z : Test for overall effect B Study or Subgroup	= 0.17; Chi t: Z = 3.90 (Taxane-p Event	1 [#] = 5.7: (P < 0.0 Natinum	3, df = 4 (f 1001) n (TP) 1 Total	P = 0.22); I [#] = 3 faxane-anthra Events	30% cycline (T <i>l</i> To	l) Ital Weight	Odds M-H, Ran	0.0 Fav Ratio dom, 95% CI	01 0.1 rours Luminal, Year	, combined Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C	100
Heterogeneity: Tau [#] : Test for overall effect B Study or Subgroup Lv M, 2011	= 0.17; Chi t Z = 3.90 (Taxane-p Event	P < 0.0 P < 0.0 Natinum ts B	3, df = 4 (f 1001) n (TP) 1 <u>Total</u> 18	P = 0.22); I [#] = 3 Taxane-anthra <u>Events</u> 1	30% cycline (T/ To	N) Ital Weight 5 16.4%	Odds M-H, Ran 3.20	0.0 Fav Ratio dom, 95% CI [0.30, 34.59]	01 0.1 rours Luminal, Year 2011	, combined Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C	100
Heterogeneity: Tau [#] : Test for overall effect B Study or Subgroup Lv M, 2011 Zhang P, 2016	= 0.17; Chi t Z = 3.90 (Taxane-p Event	P = 5.7 (P < 0.0 Natinum ts 8 7	3, df = 4 (f 1001) n (TP) 1 Total 18 44	P = 0.22); I [#] = : faxane-anthra <u>Events</u> 1 6	30% icycline (T/ To	N) tal Weight 5 16.4% 43 83.6%	Odds M-H, Ran 3.20 3.88	0.0 Fav Ratio dom, 95% CI [0.30, 34.59] [1.35, 11.15]	01 0.1 rours Luminal, Year 2011 2016	combined Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% C	100
Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect B Study or Subgroup Lv M, 2011 Zhang P, 2016 Total (95% CI)	= 0.17; Chi : Z = 3.90 (Taxane-p Event	P = 5.7: (P < 0.0 Natinun ts 8 17	3, df = 4 (f 1001) n (TP) 1 <u>Total</u> 18 44 62	P = 0.22); I [#] = : l'axane-anthra Events 1 6	30% cycline (1# To	l) tal Weight 5 16.4% 43 83.6% 48 100.0%	Odds <u>M-H, Ran</u> 3.20 3.88 3.76	0.0 Fav Ratio dom, 95% CI [0.30, 34.59] [1.35, 11.15] [1.43, 9.87]	01 0.1 rours Luminal, Year 2011 2016	combined Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C	100 1
Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect B Study or Subgroup Lv M, 2011 Zhang P, 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events	= 0.17; Chi t Z = 3.90 Taxane-p Event	P = 5.7 P < 0.0 Natinum ts 8 7	3, df = 4 (1 1001) n (TP) 1 Total 18 44 62	P = 0.22); # = : faxane-anthra Events 1 6 7	30% cycline (1/ To	l) tal Weight 5 16.4% 43 83.6% 48 100.0%	Odds M-H, Ran 3.20 3.88 3.76	0.0 Fav Ratio dom, 95% Cl [0.30, 34.59] [1.35, 11.15] [1.43, 9.87]	01 0.1 rours Luminal Year 2011 2016	, combined Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% C	100
Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect B Study or Subgroup Lv M, 2011 Zhang P, 2016 Total (95% Ct) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.17; Chi t Z = 3.90 (Taxane-p Event 1 : 0.00; Chi ²	P = 5.7: P < 0.0 Natinum ts 8 17 25 = 0.02,	3, df = 4 (1 1001) n (TP) 1 Total 18 44 62 df = 1 (P =	P = 0.22); IF = : faxane-anthra Events 1 6 7 c 0.88); IP = 0%	30% cycline (T# To	1) tal Weight 5 16.4% 43 83.6% 48 100.0%	Odds <u>M-H, Ran</u> 3.20 3.88 3.76	0.1 Fav Ratio dom, 95% CI [0.30, 34.59] [1.35, 11.15] 6 [1.43, 9.87]	01 0.1 nours Luminal Year 2011 2016	combined Favours TNBC Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% C	100

BIOMARKERS

Anthracycline-based

С	ER	-	ER4			Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 ER- vs ER+								
Huang O, 2009	15	58	7	61	21.6%	2.69 [1.01, 7.19]	2009	
Yao L, 2011	70	241	50	265	33.6%	1.76 [1.16, 2.67]	2011	
Mohammadianpanah M, 2012	4	34	13	62	17.6%	0.50 [0.15, 1.68]	2012	
Wang Y, 2016	24	83	15	167	27.2%	4.12 [2.02, 8.40]	2016	
Subtotal (95% CI)		416		555	100.0%	1.95 [0.98, 3.89]		◆
Total events	113		85					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.32; Chi	² = 9.71, d	f= 3 (P	= 0.02); I	² = 69%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.06)							
1.1.2 ER- vs ER+ (Subgroup- Pe Huang O, 2009	opulation) 15	58	7	61	21.7%	2.69 [1.01, 7.19]	2009	
Yao L, 2011	70	241	50	265	46.9%	1.76 [1.16, 2.67]	2011	
Wang Y, 2016 Subtotal (95% CI)	24	83 382	15	167 493	31.4% 100.0%	4.12 [2.02, 8.40] 2.52 [1.43, 4.44]	2016	•
Total events	109		72					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.13; Chi	² = 4.25, d	f= 2 (P	= 0.12); 1	² = 53%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.21 (P = 0.001)						
Test for subgroup differences:	Chi² = 0.3	2, df = 1	(P = 0.5)	7), I² = 0	%			0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours ER+ Favours ER-
D								
D PI	R-	PF	(+		(Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup Events	s Total	Events	Total	Weigl	nt M-H,	Random, 95% CI Yes	ar	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Yao L, 2011 8	0 270	40	234	67.5	%	2.04 [1.33, 3.14] 201	11	
Wana V 2016 2	105	4.5	140	22.51	×	2 27 14 64 6 021 20	10	

Wang Y, 2016	26	105	13	146	32.5%	3.37 [1.64, 6.93]	2016			
Total (95% CI)		375		380	100.0%	2.40 [1.52, 3.80]				•
Total events	106		53							
Heterogeneity: Tau	² = 0.03; Chi ²	² = 1.36,	df = 1 (F	= 0.2	4); I ² = 27%			-		1 10
Test for overall effe	ct: Z = 3.74 (P = 0.00	02)					0.01	0.1 Favours PR+	Favours PR-
E	HER2.		HER24			Odds Ratio			Odds	Ratio

Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year		M-H, Rand	om, 95% Cl	
Yao L, 2011	96	373	17	116	74.3%	2.02 [1.15, 3.55]	2011				
Zhang S, 2012	13	93	1	26	5.5%	4.06 [0.51, 32.61]	2012			•	-
Wang Y, 2016	31	184	4	68	20.2%	3.24 [1.10, 9.56]	2016				
Total (95% CI)		650		210	100.0%	2.31 [1.42, 3.75]				•	
Total events	140		22								
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.00; Ch	i ² = 0.8	9, df = 2 ((P = 0.6	4); ² = 09	%		0.01	0,1	1 10	100
Test for overall effect	: Z = 3.37	(P = 0.1)	1008)						Favours HER2+	Favours HER2-	

100

Taxane-based

F	HR-		HR+	F.		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Zhang GC, 2012	28	50	17	52	31.6%	2.62 [1.17, 5.86]	2012	
Shao Z, 2019	47	102	39	117	68.4%	1.71 [0.99, 2.95]	2019	
Total (95% CI)		152		169	100.0%	1.96 [1.24, 3.08]		◆
Total events	75		56					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.00; Ch Z = 2.91 (P = 0.7	4, df = 1 ()04)	P = 0.3	9); I² = 09	6		0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours HR+ Favours HR-

Taxane-anthracycline

ER-	ER+		ER+ Odds Ratio					Odds	Ratio	
vents	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year		M-H, Rand	om, 95% Cl	
24	76	15	124	17.8%	3.35 [1.62, 6.92]	2013				
4	10	6	11	4.7%	0.56 [0.10, 3.15]	2015			-	
19	82	11	158	15.8%	4.03 [1.81, 8.96]	2016				
18	44	8	92	12.7%	7.27 [2.83, 18.64]	2017				
29	85	13	95	17.5%	3.27 [1.56, 6.83]	2018				
75	378	56	632	31.6%	2.55 [1.75, 3.70]	2018			-	
	675		1112	100.0%	3.19 [2.15, 4.75]				•	
169		109								
09; Chi	² = 8.4	3, df = 5 (P = 0.1	3); I ² = 41	%		0.01	01	1 10	100
= 5.72 (P < 0.0	0001)					0.01	Favours ER+	Favours ER-	100
	vents 24 4 19 18 29 75 169 09; Chi = 5.72 (ER- vents Total 24 76 4 10 19 82 18 44 29 85 75 378 675 169 09; Chi ² = 8.43 = 5.72 (P < 0.00)	ER- ER- ER- events Total Events 24 76 15 4 10 6 19 82 11 18 44 82 11 18 44 85 13 75 378 56 675 109 (Ch ² = 8.43, df = 5 (check of the state of	ER. ER. verts Total Events Total 24 76 15 124 4 10 6 11 19 82 11 158 18 44 8 92 29 85 75 378 56 632 675 1112 109 09 09 09 09 09 09 09 09 09 09 09 09 112 5.72 76 0.00001) 112 5.72 76 0.00001) 112 15.8 112 15.7 7.72 76 0.00001) 112 15.72 76 0.00001) 112 15.72 76 0.00001) 112 15.72 76 0.000001) 15.8 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9 16.9	ERC ERC* vents Total Weight 24 76 15 124 77.8% 4 10 6 11 4.7% 19 82 11 158 15.8% 29 85 13 95 17.5% 75 378 56 632 31.6% 675 1112 100.0% 109 00.0% 169 109 09 09 09 09 09 09 09 109 09	EK- Outs Katto Outs Katto verts Total Weight MH, Random, 95% Cl. 24 76 15 124 17.8% 3.35 (16.2, 9.2) 4 10 6 11 4.7% 0.56 (0.10, 3.16) 19 82 11 158 4.03 (1.81, 8.96) 29 85 13 95 17.5% 3.27 (1.56, 6.83) 75 378 56 632 31.6% 2.55 (1.75, 3.70) 675 1112 100.0% 3.19 [2.15, 4.75] 169 109 90; Ch"P = 8.4, 3.0f = 5(P = 0.13); P = 41 % = 5.72 (P < 0.00001)	ER. ER.* Odds Ratio Odds Ratio verts Total Weight MH, Random, 95% CI Year 24 76 15 124 17.8% .335 [162, 6.92] 2013 4 10 6 11 4.7% 0.56 [0.10, 3.15] 2015 19 82 11 158 15.8% 4.03 [1.81, 8.64] 2016 18 44 8 92 12.7% 7.27 [2.83, 18.64] 2018 79 85 13 95 17.5% 3.27 [1.56, 6.83] 2018 75 378 56 632 31.6% 2.55 [1.75, 3.70] 2018 675 1112 100.0% 3.19 [2.15, 4.75] 169 109 09	EK- Dotal Weight MH-Random, 95% CI Year 24 76 15 124 17.8% 3.95 [16,0.92] 2013 4 10 6 11 4.7% 0.56 [0.10, 3.15] 2015 19 82 11 156 15.8% 4.03 [18], 8.96] 2016 18 4.4 8 92 12.7% 7.27 [2.33, 18.64] 2017 29 85 13 95 17.5% 3.27 [1.56, 6.83] 2018 675 1112 100.0% 3.19 [2.15, 4.75] 2018 675 1112 100.0% 3.19 [2.15, 4.75] 5.00 169 109 0.0% 3.19 [2.15, 4.75] 5.01 25.72 (P < 0.00001)	EK- Deals Doda Katio Odds Katio Odds 24 76 15 tal Weight M-H, Random, 95% CI Year M-H, Rand 24 76 15 124 17.8% 3.35 [16.2, 6.92] 2013 M-H, Rand 4 10 6 11 4.7% 0.56 [0.10, 3.15] 2015	EK EKK Dodds Katto Odds Katto Odds Katto verits Total Weight M-H, Random, 95% CI Year M-H, Random, 95% CI 24 76 15 124 17.8% 3.35 (16.2, 6.92) 2013 4 10 6 11 4.7% 0.56 (0.10, 3.15) 2015 19 82 11 158 15.8% 4.03 (1.81, 8.96) 2016 29 85 13 95 17.5% 3.27 (1.56, 6.83) 2018 675 1112 100.0% 3.19 [2.15, 4.75] 100 1 069 109 0.01 0.1 1 1 95.72 (P < 0.00001)

Fig. 4 (See legend on previous page.)

BIOMARKERS

Taxane-antl	hracy	clin	е			OMARKERS				
Α	PR-		PR+			Odds Ratio		Oc	lds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Ra	ndom, 95% Cl	
Zheng Y, 2015	7	12	3	9	4.4%	2.80 [0.46, 16.93]	2015	-		
Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017	13	15	17	105	21.4%	1.83 [0.84, 3.98]	2010			
Chen R 2018	99	528	32	482	58.0%	3 25 [2.13, 4.94]	2017			
			•1			0.20 (2.00)				
Total (95% CI)	4.00	660	64	747	100.0%	3.11 [2.12, 4.56]			•	
Lotal events	136 0.02: Chi	2-22	61 8 df = 27	0-02	1.12-11	o/.				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.78 (P < 0.0	0, ui = 3 (10001)	r = 0.3	4),1 = 11	70		0.01 0.1	i 10	100
D								Favours Pr	R+ Favours PR-	
B Study or Subgroup	HR-	Total	HR+	Total	Weight	Odds Ratio	Vear	Od M H Ba	ds Ratio ndom 95% Cl	
8.3.1 HR- vs HR+	Lventa	Total	Lycins	Total	weight	M-1, Randoni, 3570 CI	rear	W-11, 134		
Li XR. 2011a	9	48	2	64	17.0%	7.15 [1.47, 34.86]	2011			
Wang J, 2014	18	93	26	216	25.9%	1.75 [0.91, 3.39]	2014			
Elnemr GM, 2016	5	33	20	68	21.8%	0.43 [0.14, 1.27]	2016		+	
Yang L, 2019	16	55	13	190	24.5%	5.59 [2.49, 12.55]	2019			
Xuhong J, 2020 Subtotal (95% CI)	7	237	7	549	10.8%	4.00 [0.35, 45.38]	2020	1.0	-	
Total events	55	251	68	545	100.070	2.56 [0.67, 0.55]				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.91; Chi	² = 16.7	1. df = 4	(P = 0.0	002); I ^z =	76%				
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.68 (P = 0.0	9)							
0.2.2.UD										
8.3.2 HK- VS HK+ (SUD	group- p	opulati	on)	64	1710/	7451447 04001	2014			
Wang J 2014	9	48	26	216	39.5%	1 75 [0 47, 34.80]	2011			
Yang L. 2019	16	55	13	190	34.6%	5.59 [2.49, 12.55]	2014			
Xuhong J, 2020	7	8	7	11	8.9%	4.00 [0.35, 45.38]	2020			_
Subtotal (95% CI)		204		481	100.0%	3.58 [1.62, 7.90]			-	
Total events	50		48							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.30; Chi 7 = 2.16 /	* = 6.02 P = 0.0	2, df = 3 (F	^o = 0.1	1); I* = 50	%				
restion overall ellect.	2 - 3.10 (r = 0.0	02)							
									1 10	100
								0.01 0.1	1 111	100
			NOTONIC MILL					Favours HF	R+ Favours HR-	
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: (Chi²= ().39, df=	1 (P = 1	0.53), I² =	0%		Favours HF	R+ Favours HR-	
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: (HER2	Chi² = (!+).39, df = HER2	1 (P =) 2-	0.53), I² =	0% Odds Ratio		Favours HF	R+ Favours HR-	
Test for subgroup diffe	HER2 Events	Chi ² = 0 ?+ Total).39, df = HER2 Events	1 (P =) 2- Total	0.53), I ² =	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	Favours HF Oo M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio Indom, 95% Cl	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup LiXR, 2011a Wang, 1, 2012	erences: 0 HER2 Events 2 22	Chi ² = 0 2+ <u>Total</u> 50 80).39, df = HER2 Events 9 22	1 (P = 1 2- <u>Total</u> 62 229	0.53), I ² = <u>Weight</u> 6.7% 13.4%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 (1.85.6.90)	Year 2011 2012	Favours HF Oo M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio Indom, 95% Cl	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014	HER2 HER2 Events 2 22 22	Chi ² = 0 ?+ <u>Total</u> 50 80 80	0.39, df = HER2 Events 9 22 22	1 (P = 1 2- <u>Total</u> 62 229 229	0.53), I ² = <u>Weight</u> 6.7% 13.4% 13.4%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.25 (0.05, 1.19) 3.57 (1.85, 6.90) 3.57 (1.85, 6.90)	Year 2011 2012 2014	Favours HF Or M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio andom, 95% Cl	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015	HER2 Events 2 22 22 5	Chi ² = 0 2+ <u>Total</u> 50 80 80 14	0.39, df = HER2 Events 9 22 22 5	1 (P = 1 2- <u>Total</u> 62 229 229 7	0.53), I ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 5.0%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015	Favours HF Or M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio Indom, 95% CI	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Elnemr GM, 2016	HER2 Events 2 22 22 22 5 9	Chi ² = 0 2+ <u>Total</u> 50 80 80 14 24	0.39, df = HER2 Events 9 22 22 5 16	1 (P = 1 2- <u>Total</u> 62 229 229 7 77	0.53), I ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 5.0% 10.6%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016	Favours HF	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio Indom, 95% CI	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2018	erences: 0 HER2 Events 2 22 22 5 9 10	Chi [≇] = 0 <u>P</u> + <u>Total</u> 50 80 80 14 24 72 72	0.39, df = HER2 Events 9 22 22 22 5 16 20	1 (P = 1 2- 62 229 229 7 77 168	0.53), I ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 5.0% 10.6% 12.1%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.25 (0.05, 1.19) 3.57 (1.85, 6.90) 3.57 (1.85, 6.90) 0.22 (0.03, 1.59) 2.29 (0.85, 6.17) 1.19 (0.53, 2.70) 1.19 (0.53, 2.70)	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016	Favours HF Oo M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio Indom, 95% Cl	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen P. 2019	erences: 0 HER2 Events 2 22 22 5 9 10 9	Chi ² = 0 2+ Total 50 80 14 24 72 36 255	0.39, df = HER2 Events 9 22 22 5 16 20 17	1 (P = 1 2- <u>Total</u> 229 229 7 77 168 100 514	0.53), I ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 5.0% 10.6% 12.1% 11.2%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.09 [0.54]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2016 2017	Favours HF	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio Indom, 95% CI	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang I, 2019	erences: 0 HER2 2 22 22 22 22 5 9 10 9 10 9 48 118	Chi ² = 0 2+ Total 50 80 80 14 24 72 36 366 68).39, df = HER2 Events 9 22 25 16 20 17 54 11	1 (P = 1 2- <u>Total</u> 229 229 7 77 168 100 514 177	0.53), I ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 11.2% 15.4% 12.1%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF	R+ Favours HR-	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019	erences: 0 HER2 Events 2 22 22 22 22 5 9 10 9 10 9 48 8 18	Chi ² = 0 2+ Total 50 80 80 14 24 72 366 366 68	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 22 22 5 16 20 17 54 11	1 (P = 1 2- Total 229 229 7 77 168 100 514 177	0.53), I ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 5.0% 10.6% 12.1% 15.4% 12.1%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 617] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF	R+ Favours HR-	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI)	erences: 0 HER2 Events 2 22 22 22 5 9 10 9 10 9 48 18	Chi ² = 0 2+ Total 50 80 80 14 24 72 36 366 68 790	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 22 22 5 16 20 17 54 11	1 (P = 1 2- Total 229 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563	0.53), I ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 5.0% 10.6% 12.1% 15.4% 12.1% 100.0%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 617] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF	R+ Favours HR-	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events	erences: 0 HER2 <u>Events</u> 22 22 22 5 9 10 9 48 18 145	Chi ² = 0 2+ <u>Total</u> 50 80 80 14 24 72 366 68 790	0.39, df = HER2 Events 9 222 5 16 20 17 54 11 176	1 (P = 1 2- Total 62 229 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563	0.53), I ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 5.0% 10.6% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 10.0%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF	R+ Favours HR-	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Teat for events	erences: 0 HER2 22 22 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch 7 22 22 5 9 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch	Chi ² = 0 2+ Total 50 80 80 14 24 72 366 68 790 i ² = 29.3	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 222 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 20	1 (P = 1 2- <u>Total</u> 229 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0.	0.53), 2 Weight 6.7% 13.4% 5.0% 10.6% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 10.4% 12.1% 100.0%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1, 19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73%	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF Or M-H, Rz	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio andom, 95% CI	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	erences: (HER2 2 22 22 22 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15	Chi ² = 0 2+ Total 50 80 14 24 72 366 68 790 i ² = 29.3 (P = 0.0	0.39, df = HER2 Events 9 22 22 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 13)	1 (P = 1 2- Total 62 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0.	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 11.2% 15.4% 12.1% 100.0% 100.0%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73%	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio andom, 95% CI	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D	erences: (HER2 2 22 22 22 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 mm23-	Chi ² = 0 Total 50 80 80 14 24 72 366 68 790 i ² = 29.9 (P = 0.00 H1-	0.39, df = HER2 Events 9 22 22 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 13) nm23-1	1 (P = 1 2- Total 62 229 229 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. H1+	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 11.2% 15.4% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ²:	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73%	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio indom, 95% CI	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup	erences: e HER2 2 22 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0 mm23- Events	Chi ² = 0 2+ <u>Total</u> 80 80 14 24 72 36 366 68 790 ^{[2} = 29.3 (P = 0.0 H1- <u>Total</u>	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 3) mm23-I Events	1 (P = 1) 2- Total 62 229 229 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. H1+ Total	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 13.4% 5.0% 10.6% 12.1% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ² Weight	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 (0.05, 1.19] 3.57 (1.85, 6.90] 0.22 (0.03, 1.59) 2.29 (0.85, 6.17] 1.19 (0.53, 2.70] 1.63 (0.65, 4.07] 1.29 (0.85, 1.95] 5.43 (2.41, 12, 26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF M-H, Ra 0.01 0.01 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rando	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio indom, 95% CI	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011a	erences: e HER2 2 22 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch 2 Events 9 9 10 9 9 10 10 9 10 10 9 10 10 9 10 10 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Chi [₽] = 0 ** Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 14 72 36 68 790 F ² = 29.: (P = 0.0 H1- Total 52 22 50 72 72 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 33 mm23-1 <u>Events</u> 2 2	1 (P = 1 Total 62 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. H1+ Total 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 12.1% 12.1% 12.1% 00003); ² Weight 52.9%	0% Odds Ratio 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.3, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 2.00 [1.25, 29.53] 7.00 [1.25, 29.53] 7.00 [1.25, 129.53]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF M-H, Ra 0.01 0.01 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rande	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio indom, 95% CI 10 R2- Favours HER2+ Ratio om, 95% CI	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Wang J, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b	erences: (HER2 2 2 2 2 2 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch 2 145 0.43; Ch 2 145 0.43; Ch 145 0.43; Ch 145 0.44; Ch 145 0.44; Ch 145 0.44; Ch 145 0.44; Ch 145 0.44; Ch 145 0.44; Ch 145 0.44; Ch 145 0.44; Ch 145 0.44; Ch 145 0.45; Ch 145; C	Chi ² = C Total 50 80 80 80 14 24 72 366 68 790 ¹² = 29 (P = 0.0 H1- <u>Total</u> 52 26	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 22 22 22 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 03 30 nm23-1 <u>Events</u> 2 2	1 (P = 1 2- Total 62 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. H1+ Total 60 15	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 5.0% 10.6% 12.1% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ²: Weight 52.9% 47.1%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 6.07 [1.25, 29.53] 7.58 [1.42, 40.55]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF M.H, Ra 0.01 0.01 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rand	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio mdom, 95% CI 1 10 12- Favours HER2+ Ratio pm, 95% CI	
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Elnemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b Total (95% Cl)	erences: (HER2 2 22 22 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch 2 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	Chi ² = C Total 50 80 80 14 24 72 366 68 790 ¹² = 29 (P = 0 H1- <u>Total</u> 52 26 78	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 03 30 nm23-I <u>Events</u> 2 2	1 (P = 1 2- <u>Total</u> 62 229 7 77 1563 (P = 0. H1+ <u>Total</u> 60 15 75	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 5.0% 12.1% 12.1% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ²: Weight 52.9% 47.1% 100.0%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 6.07 [1.25, 29.53] 7.58 [1.42, 40.55] 6.74 [2.13, 21.30]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF M.H, Ra 0.01 0.01 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rande	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio indom, 95% CI	- 100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Elnemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b Total (95% CI) Total events	erences: (HER2 2 22 22 22 25 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0 14 2 14 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Chi ² = C Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 22 5 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 03 3 mm23-1 <u>Events</u> 2 2	1 (P = 1 2- Total 62 229 7 77 1563 (P = 0. H1+ Total 60 15 75	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ²: Weight 52.9% 47.1% 100.0%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 6.07 [1.25, 29.53] 7.58 [1.42, 40.55] 6.74 [2.13, 21.30]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF M.H, Ra 0.01 0.01 Favours HEF Odds M.H, Rande	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio indom, 95% CI	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	erences: (HER2 2 22 22 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 mm23- Events 9 14 23 0.00; Ch	Chi ² = C Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 3) mm23-1 <u>Events</u> 2 2 4 4, df = 1 (1 (P = 1 2- Total 62 229 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. H1+ Total 60 15 75 P = 0.8	0.53), * = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 13.4% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 12.1% 10.0% 0003); *: Weight 52.9% 47.1% 100.0%	0% Odds Ratio 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 6.07 [1.25, 29.53] 7.58 [1.42, 40.55] 6.74 [2.13, 21.30]	Year 2011 2012 2014 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio mdom, 95% CI 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	erences: (HER2 2 22 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 14 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 14 23 0.00; Ch Z = 3.25	Chi ² = (C Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8	0.39, df = HER2 9 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 03 nm23-1 Events 2 2 2 4 4, df = 1 (001)	1 (P = 1 7 Total 62 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. 15 75 P = 0.8	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ²: 52.9% 47.1% 100.0% (\$5); ² = 05	0% Odds Ratio 0.25 (0.05, 1.19) 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 6.07 [1.25, 29.53] 7.58 [1.42, 40.55] 6.74 [2.13, 21.30] %	Year 2011 2012 2014 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF Od M-H, Ra 0.01 0.1 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rand 0.1 Favours nm23-H1+	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio mdom, 95% CI 10 10 10 10 Favours HER2+ Ratio 10 Favours mm23-H1-	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: E	erences: (HER2 2 22 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0 mm23- Events 9 14 23 0.00; Ch Z = 3.25 (CK5/6)	Chi ² = (C Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8	0.39, df = HER2 9 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 03 nm23-1 Events 2 2 2 4 4, df = 1 (001) CK5/6	1 (P = 1 7 Total 62 229 7 7 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. H1+ Total 60 15 75 P = 0.8	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ²: 52.9% 47.1% 100.0% (5); ² = 05	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 6.07 [1.25, 29.53] 7.58 [1.42, 40.55] 6.74 [2.13, 21.30] %	Year 2011 2012 2014 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019	Favours HF Or M-H, Ra 0.01 0.1 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rand 0.1 Favours nm23-H1+	R+ Favours HR- dds Ratio mdom, 95% CI 10 10 10 10 Favours HER2+ Ratio 10 Favours mm23-H1- ds Ratio	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: E Study or Subgroup	erences: (HER2 2 22 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 14 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 14 23 0.00; Ch Z = 3.25 CK5/6 Events	Chi ² = (C Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8	0.39, df = HER2 9 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 33 mm23-1 Events 2 2 2 4 4, df = 1 (001) CK5/6 Events	1 (P = 1 7 Total 62 229 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. H1+ Total 60 15 75 P = 0.8 + Total	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ²: 00003); ²: 00003); ²: 00003; ?: 00003; ?: 000	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] 7.78 [1.05, 3.02] 6.07 [1.25, 29.53] 7.58 [1.42, 40.55] 6.74 [2.13, 21.30] % Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI	Year 2011 2012 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2019	Favours HF Od M-H, Ra 0.01 0.1 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rand 0.1 Favours nm23-H1+ Od M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio mdom, 95% CI 10 R2- Favours HER2+ Ratio om, 95% CI 10 Favours nm23-H1- Ids Ratio ndom, 95% CI	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: E Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011b	erences: (HER2 2 22 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 14 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0 14 23 0.00; Ch Z = 3.25 CK5/6 Events 11	Chi ² = (Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 33) nm23-I <u>Events</u> 2 2 4 4, df = 1 (001) CK5/6 <u>Events</u> 4	1 (P = 1 7 Total 62 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0.8 (P = 0.8 * Total 18	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ²: Weight 52.9% 47.1% 100.0% (5); ² = 0; Weight 18.6%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] 7.58 [1.05, 3.02] 6.07 [1.25, 29.53] 7.58 [1.42, 40.55] 6.74 [2.13, 21.30] % Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 3.21 [0.81, 12.75]	Year 2011 2012 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 0.01 0.01 Year 2011	Favours HF Od M-H, Ra 0.01 0.1 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rando 0.1 Favours nm23-H1+ Od M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio mdom, 95% CI 10 R2- Favours HER2+ Ratio om, 95% CI 10 Favours nm23-H1- ids Ratio ndom, 95% CI	-
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Einemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011b Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: E Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011b Wang Z, 2021	erences: (HER2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 (nm23- Events 9 14 23 0.00; Ch Z = 3.25 (CK5/6 Events 11 21 23 23 24 22 25 9 10 9 48 18 145 23 24 24 24 25 9 10 9 48 18 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 145	Chi ² = (Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 33) nm23-I <u>Events</u> 2 2 4 4, df = 1 (001) CK5/6 <u>Events</u> 4 36	1 (P = 1 22 Total 62 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. H1+ Total 60 15 75 P = 0.8 ★ Total 18 138	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ²: Weight 52.9% 47.1% 100.0% (5); ² = 09 Weight 18.6% 81.4%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 (0.05, 1.19] 3.57 (1.85, 6.90] 0.22 (0.03, 1.59] 2.29 (0.85, 6.17] 1.19 (0.53, 2.70] 1.63 (0.65, 4.07] 1.29 (0.85, 1.95] 5.43 (2.41, 12.26] 1.78 (1.05, 3.02] 4.78 (1.05, 3.02] 5.43 (2.41, 12.26] 6.07 (1.25, 29.53] 7.58 (1.42, 40.55] 6.74 (2.13, 21.30] 6.74 (2.13, 21.30] 6.74 (2.13, 21.30] 7.58 (1.42, 40.55) 6.74 (2.13, 21.30] 7.58 (1.42, 40.55) 7.58 (1.42, 40.55	Year 2011 2012 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 0.01 <u>Year</u> 2011 2021	Favours HF Od M.H, Ra 0.01 0.1 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rando 0.1 Favours nm23-H1+ Od M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio indom, 95% CI 10 R2- Favours HER2+ Ratio pm, 95% CI 10 Favours nm23-H1- Ids Ratio ndom, 95% CI	-
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Elnemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: E Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011b Wang Z, 2021 Total (95% CD)	erences: (HER2 2 2 2 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 14 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.25 0.43; Ch Z = 3.25 0.45; Ch Z = 3.25 0.45; Ch Z = 3.25 14 0.43; Ch Z = 3.25 0.43; Ch Z = 3.25 0.45; Ch Z = 3.25; Ch Z = 3.55; Ch Z = 3	Chi ² = (C Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8	0.39, df = HER2 Events 9 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 33 2 2 2 4 4, df = 1 (001) CK5/6 Events 4 36	1 (P = 1 22 Total 62 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. H1+ Total 60 15 75 P = 0.8 * Total 18 138 138	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ²: Weight 52.9% 47.1% 100.0% (5); ² = 09 Weight 18.6% 81.4% 100.0%	0% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 6.74 [2.13, 21.30] % Odds Ratio M-H, Randorn, 95% CI 3.21 [0.81, 12.75] 1.65 [0.86, 3.19] 1.87 [1.03, 3.39]	Year 2011 2012 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 0.01 Year 2011 2021	Favours HF Od M.H, Ra 0.01 0.1 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rand 0.1 Favours nm23-H1+ Od M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio indom, 95% CI 10 R2- Favours HER2+ Ratio om, 95% CI Favours nm23-H1- Ids Ratio ndom, 95% CI	100
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Elnemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: E Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011b Wang Z, 2021 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total events	erences: (HER2 2 2 2 5 9 10 9 48 18 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 (mm23- Events 9 14 23 0.00; Ch Z = 3.25 (CK5/6 Events 1 21 22 5 9 14 23 0.00; Ch Z = 3.25 (CK5/6 Events 32 23 24 25 25 9 10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	Chi ² = (Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 14 24 72 36 68 83 66 68 790 F ² = 29.3 26 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78	0.39, df = HER2 <u>Events</u> 9 22 22 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 33 nm23-1 <u>Events</u> 2 2 4 4, df = 1 (001) CK5/6 <u>Events</u> 4 36	1 (P = 1 Total 62 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. H1+ Total 60 15 75 P = 0.8 * Total 18 138 138	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 10.6% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ² Weight 52.9% 47.1% 100.0% (5); ² = 0 Weight 18.6% 81.4%	0% Odds Ratio 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12, 26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 6.74 [2.13, 21.30] 6 Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 3.21 [0.81, 12,75] 1.65 [0.86, 3.19] 1.87 [1.03, 3.39]	Year 2011 2012 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 0.01 Year 2021	Favours HF Oo M.H, Ra 0.01 0.01 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rando 0.1 Favours nm23-H1+ Od M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio indom, 95% CI 10 R2- Favours HER2+ Ratio om, 95% CI 10 Favours nm23-H1- Ids Ratio indom, 95% CI	-
Test for subgroup diffe C Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Wang J, 2012 Wang J, 2014 Zheng Y, 2015 Elnemr GM, 2016 Wang J, 2016 Kong D, 2017 Chen R, 2018 Yang L, 2019 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011a Li XR, 2011b Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: E Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011b Wang Z, 2021 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: E Study or Subgroup Li XR, 2011b Wang Z, 2021 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	erences: (HER2 2 22 5 9 10 9 48 145 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.43; Ch Z = 2.15 0.00; Ch 2.15 0.43; Ch 2.15 0.00; Ch 3.25 0.00; Ch 3.25 0.0	Chi ² = (C Total 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8	0.39, df = HER2 Events 9 22 22 5 5 16 20 17 54 11 176 51, df = 8 03) nm23-I Events 2 2 2 4 4, df = 1 (001) CK5/6 Events 4 36	1 (P = 1 Total 62 229 229 7 77 168 100 514 177 1563 (P = 0. 41+ Total 60 15 75 P = 0.8 * Total 18 138 138 156	0.53), ² = Weight 6.7% 13.4% 13.4% 13.4% 10.6% 12.1% 100.0% 12.1% 100.0% 0003); ² 52.9% 47.1% 100.0% (5); ² = 0 Weight 18.6% 81.4%	0% Odds Ratio 0.25 [0.05, 1.19] 3.57 [1.85, 6.90] 0.22 [0.03, 1.59] 2.29 [0.85, 6.17] 1.19 [0.53, 2.70] 1.63 [0.65, 4.07] 1.29 [0.85, 1.95] 5.43 [2.41, 12.26] 1.78 [1.05, 3.02] = 73% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 6.07 [1.25, 29.53] 7.58 [1.42, 40.55] 6.74 [2.13, 21.30] % Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 3.21 [0.81, 12.75] 1.65 [0.86, 3.19] 1.87 [1.03, 3.39]	Year 2011 2012 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 0.01 Year 2011 2021	Favours HF Or M.H, Ra 0.01 0.1 Favours HEF Odds M-H, Rando 0.1 Favours nm23-H1+ Od M-H, Ra	R+ Favours HR- Ids Ratio mdom, 95% CI 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 Favours HER2+ Ratio pm, 95% CI 10 Favours nm23-H1- Ids Ratio ndom, 95% CI	100

Fig. 5 Pooled pCR outcome of TA-treated Asian breast cancer patients according to biomarkers. Forest plots describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the association of pCR outcome in NAC TA-treated breast cancer patients in biomarkers (**A**) PR; (**B**) HR; (**C**) HER2; (**D**) nm23-H1; and (**E**) CK5/6. I^2 and *p*-value for X^2 of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis

Taxano an	hrac	clin			E	BIOMARKER	RS	
	High Ki	-67	Low Ki-	67		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
tudy or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight M	I-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
IXR, 2011b	14	27	2	14	6.6%	6.46 [1.21, 34.55]	2011	
XR, 2011a	8	67	3	45	8.6%	1.90 [0.48, 7.58]	2011	(10.0
nemr GM, 2016	21	76	4	25	10.3%	2.00 [0.61, 6.53]	2014	
ang J, 2016	14	42	16	198	14.4%	5.69 [2.50, 12.92]	2016	
ing D, 2017	25	110	1	26	4.9%	7.35 [0.95, 57.00]	2017	
e F, 2019	23	134	0	285	2.9%	12.01 [0.71, 203.82]	2019	
ing L, 2019	25	187	4	58	11.1%	2.08 [0.69, 6.26]	2019	
ihong J, 2020	12	14	2	25	4.0%	9.00 [0.87, 92.76]	2020	
ang Z, 2021	57	188	0	7	2.8%	6.56 [0.37, 116.78]	2021	
ibtotal (95% CI)	220	1656	50	756	100.0%	2.98 [1.79, 4.97]		•
eterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.30; Chi 7 = 4 18 (² = 19.3 P < 0.0	37, df = 11	(P = 0	.05); I² = 43	1%		
5.2 Ki-67 (Subgro	up - 14% c	ut-off)						
ang Z, 2014	10	58	9	30	27.1%	0.49 [0.17, 1.37]	2014	
nemr GM, 2016	21	76	4	25	25.1%	2.00 [0.61, 6.53]	2016	
ing LC, 2020	6	38	1	25	14.0%	4.50 [0.51, 39.89]	2020	
btotal (95% CI)		887		375	100.0%	1.82 [0.65, 5.10]		•
terogeneity: Tau ² =	0.74; Chi	² = 10.9	30 95, df = 3 (P = 0.0	01); I² = 739	6		
5.3 Ki-67 (Subaro	up - 14% c	ut-off.	orimary o	biectiv	/e)			
emr GM, 2016	21	76	4	25	16.5%	2.00 [0.61, 6.53]	2016	+
en R, 2018	115	715	16	295	78.6%	3.34 [1.94, 5.75]	2018	
btotal (95% CI)	0	829		345	100.0%	3.12 [1.93, 5.04]		•
al events terogeneity: Tau² =	142 0.00; Chi	² = 0.71	21 1, df = 2 (P	= 0.70	0); I² = 0%			
st for overall effect.	Z= 4.64 (P < 0.0	0001)					
5.4 Ki-67 (Subgro (R. 2011a	up - 20% c	ut-off) 67	3	45	29.3%	1.90 (0.48.7.50)	2011	
F, 2019	23	134	0	28	7.0%	12.01 [0.71, 203.82]	2019	
ng L, 2019	25	187	4	58	46.5%	2.08 [0.69, 6.26]	2019	+
ang Z, 2020	12	14	0	5	6.8%	9.00 [0.87, 92.76] 6.56 [0.37, 116.78]	2020	
btotal (95% CI)		590		143	100.0%	2.88 [1.36, 6.10]		•
tai events terogeneity: Tau ² =	125 0.00; Chi	= 2.99	9 9, df = 4 (P	= 0.58	5); I² = 0%			
st for overall effect:	Z= 2.77 (P = 0.0	106)					
							ō	0.005 0.1 1 10 200
st for subaroup dif	ferences:	Chi² = (0.89, df= 3	3 (P = 0	0.83), I² = 04	%		Favours Low KI-67 Favours High KI-67
Faxane-pla	tinun	ı						
udu or Subarou	ER	Tete	ER	Tete	Mointe	Odds Ratio	CI Vec	Odds Ratio
ien XS, 2010a	Events 15	10tal 46	Events 6	10ta 67	2 16.9%	4.52 [1.59, 12 8	2] 2010	m-n, random, 95% CI
nen YZ, 2012	4	12	2 2	19	5.1%	4.25 [0.64, 28.2	25] 2012	·
u T, 2015	18	28	21	82	21.8%	5.23 [2.09, 13.1	0] 2015	
iou L, 2017	26	46	5 19 5 13	85	30.6%	4.52 [2.08, 9.8	30] 2017 121 2020	
ital (95% CI)	89	1//	61	314	100.0%	4.91 [3.20, 7.5	3]	-
eterogeneity: Tau²	= 0.00; Cł	ni ² = 0.2	20, df = 4	(P = 1.	00); I² = 0%	b		0.01 0.1 1 10 100
ist for overall effect	E Z = 7.27 PR	(P < 0.	.00001) PR	•		Odds Ratio		Favours ER+ Favours ER- Odds Ratio
udy or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Tota	Weight	M-H, Random, 95%	CI Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
ien XS, 2010a ien YZ, 2012	15	49	5 1	59	3.6%	3.90 (1.38, 11.0 7.50 (0.76, 74 1	3] 2010 6] 2012	
u T, 2015	17	24	22	86	18.6%	7.06 [2.59, 19.2	29] 2015	
ou L, 2017	26	47	19	84	31.7%	4.24 [1.96, 9.1	4] 2017	
т, 2020	18	39	21	72	28.7%	2.08 (0.93, 4.6	2020	·
tal (95% CI)	2.	174		317	100.0%	3.82 [2.48, 5.9	0]	•
tar events terogeneity: Tau ²	81 = 0.00; Cł	ni² = 4.0	69 01, df = 4	(P = 0.	41); I² = 0%	6		
st for overall effect	Z = 6.06	(P < 0.	00001)					Favours PR+ Favours PR-
dv or Subaroup	HR Evente	Total	HR- Evente	+ Total	Weight	Odds Ratio	CI Year	Odds Ratio
ig J, 2017	22	44	8	44	29.3%	4.50 [1.71, 11.8	34] 2017	
ng RX, 2017	147	280	90	269	70.7%	2.20 [1.56, 3.1	0] 2017	
al (95% CI) tal events	169	324	1 Q0	313	100.0%	2.71 [1.43, 5.1	4]	•
terogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.12; Ch	ni² = 1.8	87, df = 1	(P = 0.	17); I² = 46	%		0.01 0.1 1 10 100
st for overall effect	L Z = 3.06	(r = U.	1 or K	67		Odde Ratio		Favours HR+ Favours HR-
idy or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight M	I-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
1 Ki-67 (all) 1 T. 2015	36	89	3	21	19.9%	4.08 11.12 14 861	2015	
ou L, 2017	41	98	3	30	20.2%	6.47 [1.84, 22.79]	2017	
ig J, 2017	19	39	11	49	23.0%	3.28 [1.31, 8.23]	2017	
<, 2020	3/	21	12	19	19.6%	2.31 [0.47, 11.47] 0.23 [0.06, 0.88]	2020	
btotal (95% CI) al events	120	348	21	129	100.0%	2.20 [0.74, 6.59]		-
terogeneity: Tau ² = st for overall effort	1.14; Chi 7 = 1.41 /	² = 15.3 P = 0.4	30, df = 4 (6)	P = 0.0	004); I² = 74	1%		
.2 Ki-67 (Subarou	p - 20% cu	, = 0.1 It-off)	~)					
ou L, 2017	41	98	3	30	61.8%	6.47 [1.84, 22.79]	2017	
Y, 2020 btotal (95% CI)	37	101	2	10	38.2%	2.31 [0.47, 11.47]	2020	
al events	78		5	10				
terogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi	² = 0.99	9, df = 1 (P	= 0.32	2); I ^z = 0%			
scior overall effect.	L = 2.92 (r = 0.0	(60)					
							L L	0.01 0.1 1 10 100
								Favours Low Ki-67 Favours High Ki-67

Fig. 6 Pooled pCR outcome of NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients according to biomarkers. Forest plots describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the association of pCR outcome in (**A**) NAC TA-treated breast cancer patients in biomarkers Ki-67; NAC TP-treated breast cancer patients in biomarkers (**B**) ER; (**C**) PR; (**D**) HR; and (**E**) Ki-67. l^2 and *p*-value for X^2 of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis

Taxane-platinum HER2+ HER2-Odds Ratio Odds Ratio A Study or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weight M-H, Random, 95% CI Year M-H, Random, 95% CI 6.5.1 HER2+ vs HER2-Chen XS, 2010a 8 13 84 20.4% 2.73 [0.97, 7.68] 2010 24 Chen YZ, 2012 2.63 [0.35, 19.51] 2012 2 6 4 25 13.3% Zhu T, 2015 73 21.6% 7.14 [2.96, 17.24] 2015 24 37 15 78 22.6% Zhou L, 2017 0.51 [0.25, 1.07] 2017 22 23 53 Xu Y, 2020 24 46 15 65 22.0% 3.64 [1.61, 8.23] 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) 191 300 100.0% 2.44 [0.84, 7.06] Total events 80 70 Heterogeneity: Tau² = 1.16; Chi² = 23.64, df = 4 (P < 0.0001); l² = 83% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.64 (P = 0.10) 6.5.2 HER2+ vs HER2- (Subgroup- influential) Chen XS, 2010a 8 24 23.6% 2.73 [0.97, 7.68] 2010 13 84 Chen YZ, 2012 2 6 4 25 6.3% 2.63 [0.35, 19.51] 2012 Zhu T, 2015 24 37 15 73 32.4% 7.14 [2.96, 17.24] 2015 Xu Y, 2020 24 46 15 65 37.8% 3.64 [1.61, 8.23] 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) 113 247 100.0% 4.14 [2.51, 6.85] Total events 58 47 Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 2.38, df = 3 (P = 0.50); I² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.55 (P < 0.00001) 0.01 100 0.1 10 Favours HER2- Favours HER2+

BIOMARKERS

Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 0.78, df = 1 (P = 0.38), I² = 0%

В	Taxane-platinur	n (TP)	Taxane-anthracyclin	e (TA)		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
6.6.1 TP vs TA (HER2+	breast cancer)							
Chen W, 2015	27	39	8	25	25.1%	4.78 [1.62, 14.09]	2015	_ _
Huang L, 2015b	18	46	20	41	29.3%	0.68 [0.29, 1.58]	2015	
Zhang W, 2017	2	15	12	91	17.3%	1.01 [0.20, 5.06]	2017	_
Li S, 2018	10	39	15	100	28.3%	1.95 [0.79, 4.83]	2018	
Subtotal (95% CI)		139		257	100.0%	1.60 [0.66, 3.88]		-
Total events	57		55					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.51; Chi ² = 8.35,	df = 3 (P	°= 0.04); I ² = 64%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.04 (P = 0.30)						
6.6.2 TP vs TA (Subgr	oup-HER2+ brea	st cance	r, study design)					
Chen W, 2015	27	39	8	25	35.7%	4.78 [1.62, 14.09]	2015	
Zhang W, 2017	2	15	12	91	19.7%	1.01 [0.20, 5.06]	2017	
LI S, 2018	10	39	15	100	44.6%	1.95 [0.79, 4.83]	2018	
Subtotal (95% CI)		93		216	100.0%	2.36 [1.07, 5.20]		◆
Total events	39		35					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.15; Chi? = 2.87,	df = 2 (P	= 0.24); I ^e = 30%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.14 (P = 0.03	0						
								0.01 0.1 1 10 100
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Chi ^a = 0.	41. df= 1	(P = 0.52), I ^a = 0%					Favours TA Favours TP

GENETIC VARIATION

Taxane-anthracycline

С	PIK3CA wi	ldtype	PIK3CA m	utated		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio				
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl				
Yuan H, 2015	55	223	11	94	59.8%	2.47 [1.23, 4.97]	2015	-	-			
Yang L, 2019	22	138	8	109	40.2%	2.39 [1.02, 5.61]	2019	-	-			
Total (95% CI)		361		203	100.0%	2.44 [1.42, 4.19]		•				
Total events	77		19									
Heterogeneity: Tau ^a =	0.00; Chi ² =	0.00, df	= 1 (P = 0.96	i); I ^e = 0%			t t	101 01	10	100		
Test for overall effect	Z = 3.24 (P =	0.001)						Favours PIK3CA mutated Favours F	YK3CA wildtype	100		

Fig. 7 Pooled pCR outcome of NAC-treated Asian patients according to biomarkers and genetic variation. Forest plots describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the (**A**) Association of pCR outcome in NAC TP-treated Asian breast cancer patients in HER2; (**B**) Association between pCR in Asian patients with HER2+ biomarker treated with NAC TP and TA; and (**C**) Association of pCR outcome in NAC TA-treated Asian breast cancer patients in *PIK3CA* gene. l^2 and p-value for X^2 of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis

(n=4). Meanwhile, TP, TA, and TAP chemotherapy showed pCR rate of 44.6% (*n*=15) vs 24.3% (*n*=6), 20.1% (n=14) vs 11.3% (n=12) and 33% (n=1) vs 13.5% (n=1), respectively. One study [44] utilising CDK4/6 inhibitor on ER+/HER2- breast cancer patients and another study [118] utilising kinase inhibitor on ER+/HER2+ patients showed pCR rate of 5% (n=1) and 0% (n=1), respectively. Collectively, with the exception of anthracycline-based and targeted therapy, HER2+ breast cancer patients were likely to benefit more from TP, TA, and TAP regimens. Meanwhile, in patients with high and low Ki-67, anthracycline-based and taxane-based chemotherapy showed pCR rate of 12.2% (*n*=1) vs 11.4% (*n*=1) and 57.1% (*n*=1) vs 32.1% (n=1). When treated with TP and TA chemotherapy, the patients showed pCR rate of 39.9% (*n*=5) vs 24% (*n*=5) and 19.9% (*n*=12) vs 7.7% (*n*=12), respectively. Overall, breast cancer patients with high Ki-67 were likely to benefit more from taxane-based chemotherapy than TP, TA, and anthracycline-based regimen.

On the other hand, fourteen non-conventional biomarkers investigated in a few of the included studies were evaluated qualitatively. Three biomarkers—Bcl-2, Smac, and Survivin—were included for the evaluation of anthracycline-based chemotherapy. Anthracyclinebased chemotherapy showed pCR benefit of 26.1% (n=1) vs 4.3% (n=1) in Bcl-2- and Bcl2+ breast cancer patients, 35.0% (n=1) vs 8.6% (n=1) in high and low Smac, and 28.3% (n=1) vs 11.5% (n=1) in low and high Survivin. Only one biomarker—ZEB1—was evaluated for TP chemotherapy which revealed pCR rates of 36.1% (n=1) in patients with low ZEB1 and 12.8% (n=1) in patients with high ZEB1.

Ten biomarkers—Tau, P-gp, Topo-II, T-cadherin, CK5/6, EGFR, p53, LAG-3, cyclin D1, and nm23-H1were included for the evaluation of TA chemotherapy. Our findings showed pCR benefit of 31.3% (n=1) vs 4.5% (n=1) in Tau- and Tau+, 43.2% (n=1) vs 7.7% (n=1) in P-gp- and P-gp+, and 17% (*n*=1) vs 3.4% (*n*=1) in Topo-II- and Topo-II+ breast cancer patients. The pCR rates observed in T-cadherin- and T-cadherin+, CK5/6- and CK5/6+, EGFR- and EGFR+, and p53- and p53+ breast cancer patients were 45.2% (n=1) vs 7.4% (n=1), 40% (n=2) vs 25.6% (n=2), 45.5% (n=1) vs 28.1% (n=1), and 33.3% (n=1) vs 27.3% (n=1), respectively. As for breast cancer patients with low and high expression of LAG-3, the pCR rates was observed at 64.7% (n=2) vs 35.3% (n=2). Lastly, breast cancer patients with cyclin D1+ and nm23-H1+ reported pCR benefits of 45.8% (n=1) and 29.5% (n=2) than 29.4% (n=1) in cyclin D1- and 5.3% (n=2) in nm23-H1– breast cancer patients.

Under meta-analysis, the role of biomarkers was investigated in NAC anthracycline-based and taxanebased treated (Fig. 4), TA-treated (Figs. 4, 5 and 6 and Supplementary Figure 7.1 in Additional file 7), and TP-treated (Figs. 6 and 7) breast cancer patients.

Anthracycline-based and taxane-based chemotherapy

Four studies [53, 88, 102, 124] were pooled for the effect of ER on pCR outcome in anthracycline-treated patients, where ER was not associated with pCR (OR 1.95; 95% CI 0.98–3.89; p=0.06; Fig. 4C). Substantial heterogeneity was reported for the pooled analysis of ER- vs ER+, which could be explained by the study by Mohammadianpanah et al. [124] which was conducted in the Iranian population. In contrast, the other studies [53, 88, 102] were performed in the Chinese population. Subgroup analysis of ER- vs ER+ pooling studies in the Chinese population only showed that ER- patients were significantly associated with pCR (OR 2.52; 95% CI 1.43-4.44; p=0.001; Fig. 4C), supporting our hypothesis that the observed heterogeneity could be due to the difference in the Asian population. Notably, the observed moderate heterogeneity in the subgroup analysis can allude to by the differences in the population sizes of the three studies. Only two studies [88, 102] were pooled to analyse PR effect on pCR outcome in anthracycline-treated patients. Our findings showed that PR- patients were significantly associated with pCR (OR 2.40; 95% CI 1.52-3.80; p=0.0002; Fig. 4D). Meanwhile, an analysis of three pooled studies [88, 102, 109] on the effect of HER2 on pCR outcome in anthracycline-treated breast cancer patients revealed that patients with HER2- biomarker were significantly more likely to achieve pCR (OR 2.31; 95% CI 1.42–3.75; *p*=0.0008; Fig. 4E). Only one biomarker, HR, was evaluated for its effect on pCR outcome in Asian breast cancer patients treated with taxanebased chemotherapy (Fig. 4F). Two studies [74, 107] were pooled where patients with HR- biomarkers were significantly more likely to achieve pCR than HR- patients (OR 1.96; 95% CI 1.24–3.08; *p*=0.004).

Taxane-anthracycline (TA) chemotherapy

Eight biomarkers comprising ER, PR, HR, HER2, nm23-H1, CK5/6, EGFR, and Ki-67 were investigated for their effect on pCR outcome in Asian breast cancer patients treated with NAC TA. Six studies [45, 49, 52, 77, 81, 112] and four studies [36, 54, 80, 113] were pooled to evaluate the association of ER and PR, respectively. Both ER– (OR 3.19; 95% CI 2.15–4.75; p<0.0001; Fig. 4G) and PR– (OR 3.11; 95% CI 2.12-4.56; p<0.0001; Fig. 5A) were significantly associated with pCR outcome in TA-treated patients. Moderate heterogeneity was reported for the pooled analysis of ER– vs ER+. However, considering all the studies pooled for the analysis were performed in the Chinese population, the heterogeneity result was rejected.

In an analysis pooling five studies [60, 81, 98, 100, 127], HR was not associated with pCR outcome (OR 2.38; 95% CI 0.87-6.53; p=0.09; Fig. 5B). The observed substantial heterogeneity could be due to the study by Elnemr et al. [127] conducted in Saudi Arabia, while the other four studies were performed in China. Consequently, subgroup analysis of HR- vs HR+ removing the study by Elnemr et al. showed a decrease in the heterogeneity and significantly associated HR- with better pCR outcome when treated with TA (OR 3.58; 95% CI 1.62-7.90; p=0.002). An analysis of nine pooled studies [36, 54, 60, 80-82, 100, 113, 127] showed that HER2+ is significantly associated with pCR (OR 1.78; 95% CI 1.05–3.02; *p*=0.03; Fig. 5C) with substantial heterogeneity observed between the studies. Although the analysis also includes the study by Elnemr et al., which was conducted in Saudi Arabia, the heterogeneity could be influenced by the results pooled from seven studies that heavily pushed the effect of our analysis in one direction.

Our study synthesised meta-analysis data for other biomarkers apart from the commonly reported ones-ER, PR, HR, and HER2. In particular, two studies were evaluated for pCR outcome for nm23-H1 [12, 60] and CK5/6 [12, 90]. It was observed that nm23-H1- (OR 6.74; 95% CI 2.13–21.30; *p*=0.001; Fig. 5D) and CK5/6– (OR 1.87; 95% CI 1.03–3.39; *p*=0.04; Fig. 5E) are significantly associated with pCR. Two studies [12, 90] were pooled for analysis in the evaluation of pCR outcome with EGFR. Considerable heterogeneity was observed between the studies, perhaps alluded to the clinical differences between the studies of Li et al. [12] (n=22/41) and Wang et al. [90] (n=170/195) according to the distribution of patients with EGFR+. Despite that, EGFR is not associated with pCR outcome in TA-treated patients (OR 2.02; 95% CI 0.28–28.00; p=0.38; Supplementary Figure 7.1D in Additional file 7).

The proliferation index biomarker, Ki-67, was evaluated through an analysis of 12 pooled studies [12, 36, 54, 60, 80, 84, 90, 95, 98, 100, 111, 127], revealing significant association between pCR outcome and high Ki-67 (OR 2.98; 95% CI 1.79–4.97; p<0.0001; Fig. 6A). The observed moderate heterogeneity between the studies could be due to differences in the Ki-67 cut-off value. Subgroup analysis pooling four studies [36, 84, 111, 127] with 14% Ki-67 cut-off did not significantly associate Ki-67 with pCR outcome (OR 1.82; 95% CI 0.65–5.10; p=0.26). Significant heterogeneity was observed which could be explained by the primary research question addressed in the studies where Zhang et al. [111] focused on the prognostic value of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), P-gp, and Ki-67, while the other three studies focused on the correlation of Ki-67 expression and pCR. Furthermore, the results pooled from the three studies heavily pushed

the effect of our analysis in one direction. Thus, a pooled analysis excluding the study by Zhang et al. reveals null heterogeneity between the studies and a significant association between pCR and high Ki-67 with 14% cut-off value (OR 3.12; 95% CI 1.93–5.04; p<0.00001). Meanwhile, subgroup analysis pooling five studies [60, 90, 95, 98, 100] with 20% Ki-67 cut-off significantly associate pCR outcome with high Ki-67 (OR 2.88; 95% CI 1.36–6.10; p=0.006).

Taxane-platinum (TP) chemotherapy

Our study investigated five biomarkers comprising ER, PR, HR, HER2, and Ki-67 on their effect on pCR outcome in Asian breast cancer patients treated with NAC TP. Five studies [41, 43, 97, 114, 115] and two studies [100,102] were pooled to evaluate the association of ER and PR, and HR, respectively. pCR outcome was significantly associated with ER– (OR 4.91; 95% CI 3.20–7.53; p<0.00001; Fig. 6B), PR– (OR 3.82; 95% CI 2.48–5.90; p<0.00001; Fig. 6C), and HR– (OR 2.71; 95% CI 1.43–5.15; p=0.002; Fig. 6D).

Ki-67 was evaluated by analysing five pooled studies [47, 57, 97, 114, 115], showing that pCR outcome was not significantly associated with either high Ki-67 or low Ki-67 (OR 2.20; 95% CI 0.74–6.59; p=0.16; Fig. 6E). The observed considerable heterogeneity was perhaps due to differences in the Ki-67 cut-off value, and four of the five studies heavily pushed the effect of our analysis to one direction. Subgroup analysis pooling two studies [97, 114] with 20% Ki-67 cut-off indicates that pCR outcome is significantly associated with high Ki-67 (OR 4.37; 95% CI 1.62–11.75; p=0.003). This implicates the importance of having a standardised cut-off value for Ki-67, as at different cut-offs of 15 and 30%, neither Ki-67 biomarker was favoured as opposed to the 20% cut-off favours High Ki-67 to achieve pCR.

In the analysis of the effect of HER2 in breast cancer patients pooling five studies [41, 43, 97, 114, 115], pCR outcome was not significantly associated with neither HER2+ nor HER2– (OR 2.44; 95% CI 0.84–7.06; p=0.10; Fig. 7A). The observed substantial heterogeneity could be influenced by the results pooled from four of the five studies that heavily pushed the effect of our analysis in one direction. Consequently, a pooled analysis excluding the study by Zhou et al. [114] reveals null heterogeneity between the studies and a significant association between pCR and HER2+ (OR 4.14; 95% CI 2.51–6.85; p<0.00001).

Our study also evaluated the effect of chemotherapeutic agents on the pCR outcome in Asian breast cancer patients with HER2+ biomarker (Fig. 7B). Four studies [39, 51, 59, 110] were pooled and estimated. Our findings revealed neither NAC TP nor NAC TA was associated with pCR outcome in patients with HER2+ biomarker (OR 1.60; 95% CI 0.66–7.06; p=0.30). Substantial heterogeneity was reported which could be explained by the difference in the study design of the pooled studies. Of the four studies, Huang et al. [51] was the only study that conducted a randomised controlled trial (RCT) where the recruited HER2+ breast cancer patients were assigned to either TA or TP chemotherapy by the investigator. In contrast, HER2+ breast cancer patients recruited in the other three studies [39, 59, 110] were given either TA or TP regimen based on their preferences. Notably, subgroup analysis excluding Huang et al. decreased the heterogeneity I^2 and significantly associated HER2+ breast cancer patients with better pCR outcome when treated with TP (OR 2.36; 95% CI 1.07–5.20; p=0.03).

Genetic variations and differential expression

Eleven genes—*PIK3CA, TP53, EPIC1, TOP2A, ERBB2, MYC, CCND1, PCDH17, EPIC1, BRCA1,* and *BRCA2* were included for the qualitative evaluation of NAC regimens. No specific single variant vs wildtype was compared for most of the genes since most of the evaluated studies did not report them. Therefore, our analysis only compared wildtype (wt) and mutated (mt), where the mutated gene might contain single or multiple variants.

Breast cancer patient harbouring wt and mutated mtPIK3CA showed pCR rate of 19.4% (n=1) vs 14.1% (*n*=1) and 18.8% (*n*=1) vs 16.1% (*n*=1) when treated with anthracycline-based and taxane-based chemotherapy, respectively. Meanwhile, patients treated with TA chemotherapy showed a pCR rate of 21.3% (n=2) vs 9.4% (n=2). Thus, breast cancer patients with wtPIK3CA were likely to benefit more from TA regimen than anthracyclinebased and taxane-based chemotherapy. Interestingly, breast cancer patient harbouring wt and mt*TP53* showed pCR rate of 7.1% (n=1) vs 28.6% (n=1), 11.3% (n=1) vs 15.2% (*n*=1), and 6.1% (*n*=1) vs 16.1% (*n*=1) when treated with anthracycline-based, taxane-based, and TA chemotherapy, respectively. Our findings suggested that breast cancer patients with mtTP53 were likely to benefit more from anthracycline-based chemotherapy than taxanebased and TA regimen.

Our findings also showed that breast cancer patients with *TOP2A*, *ERBB2*, and *MYC* amplification (amp) achieved higher pCR rates than wt*TOP2A*, *ERBB2*, and *MYC* (56.3% (n=1) vs 13.8% (n=1), 28.4% (n=1) vs 6.1% (n=1), and 13.7% (n=1) vs 11.2% (n=1), respectively) when treated with TA regimens. On another note, breast cancer patients with wt*CCND1* and unmethylated (unm) *PCDH17* achieved higher pCR rate than those with *CCND1* amp andmethylated (m) *PCDH17* (13.8% (n=1) vs 2.7% (n=1) and 67.3% (n=1) vs 31.6% (n=1), respectively).

One included study by Mou et al. [71] focused on the effect of UGT2B7 rs7435335 on NAC TA efficacy. It was observed that patients with the genotype GA achieved higher pCR rate (42.3% (n=1)) than patients with the genotype GG (18.9% (n=1)). Another study by Xu et al. [96] analysed the effect of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mRNA expression in breast cancer patients treated with anthracycline-based and taxane-based chemotherapy. Our findings showed pCR benefit of 24.6% (*n*=1) vs 16.9% (*n*=1), 16.9% (n=1) vs 17.5% (n=1), and 14% (n=1) vs 20.8% (n=1) in anthracycline-based treated patients with low, intermediate, and high BRCA1 vs BRCA2 mRNA expression, respectively. Meanwhile, in taxane-based treated patients, our findings showed pCR benefit of 19.6% (n=1)vs 24.4% (n=1), 26.8% (n=1) vs 23.4% (n=1), and 21.4% (n=1) vs 18.9% (n=1) with low, intermediate, and high BRCA1 vs BRCA2 mRNA expression, respectively. Notably, breast cancer patients with low EPIC1 showed higher pCR rate (40.7% (n=1)) when treated with TP regimen than patients with high *EPIC1* (33.3% (n=1)).

Under meta-analysis, only one gene was analysed for its effect on pCR outcome in Asian breast cancer patients treated with NAC TA (Fig. 7).

Taxane-anthracycline (TA) chemotherapy

From the analysis of two studies [100, 106], 564 patients were pooled for *PIK3CA* analysis. It was observed that patients harbouring wt*PIK3CA* were significantly associated with better pCRoutcomes compared to patients with mt*PIK3CA* gene (OR: 2.44; 95% CI 1.42–4.19; p=0.001; Fig. 7).

The overall summary results of pooled pCR outcome of NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients of this study can be found in Table 1 whereby the favoured outcome for molecular subtypes with various NAC treatments were HER2E, TNBC, and Luminal B. The favoured outcome for biomarkers across different NAC treatments was ER-, PR-, HR- and high ki67. Lastly, the favoured outcome for genetic variation was the *PIK3CA* wildtype. The overall summary of the steps conducted in completing this systematic review is presented in Table 2.

Pooled reported association

Meta-analyses of pooled reported association of pCR were evaluated according to molecular classification, genetic variations, and biomarkers characterisation of the Asian breast cancer patients.

Molecular classification

An adjusted pooled analysis of TNBC against non-TNBC patients showed that TNBC patients were significantly associated with better response when treated

Table 1	Pooled pCR outcome of NAC-treated	Asian breast cance	r patients according to	o molecular subtypes	, biomarkers and	genetic
variation	S					

Treatments	Variables (molecular subtypes, biomarker, genetic variation)				
	Molecular subtypes	OR	95%CI	Overall P-value	Favoured outcome
Taxane-Anthracycline	Luminal-like vs HER2E	4.08	2.78,6.00	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	HER2E
	Luminal A vs HER2E	5.27	1.16, 23.86	P=0.03	HER2E
	Luminal B vs HER2E	2.78	1.42,5.44	P=0.0003	HER2E
	Luminal, combined vs HER2E	3.89	2.69,5.64	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	HER2E
	TNBC vs Luminal-like	4.45	2.79,7.11	<i>P</i> < 0.0001	TNBC
	TNBC vs Luminal A	11.66	3.64, 37.38	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	TNBC
	TNBC vs Luminal B	3.89	2.20, 6.87	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	TNBC
	TNBC vs Luminal, combined	4.59	3.35, 6.29	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	TNBC
Taxane-platinum	Luminal-like vs HER2E (the subgroup-assessed outcome)	2.30	1.66,319	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	HER2E
	Luminal A vs HER2E	12.11	4.41,33.26	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	HER2E
	Luminal B vs HER2E	5.92	2.59,13.54	<i>P</i> < 0.0001	HER2E
	Luminal, combined vs HER2E	3.37	1.66, 6.84	P= 0.0008	HER2E
	Luminal, combined vs HER2E (subgroup- assessed outcome)	3.80	2.02,7.13	<i>P</i> < 0.0001	HER2E
	Luminal B vs Luminal A	3.26	1.14, 9.26	P=0.03	Luminal B
	TNBC vs Luminal A	7.14	2.82,18.04	<i>P</i> < 0.0001	TNBC
	TNBC vs Luminal B	2.19	1.09,4.41	P=0.03	TNBC
	TNBC vs Luminal-like	3.79	1.94, 7.40	<i>P</i> < 0.0001	TNBC
Anthracycline-based	Biomarkers				
,	ER– vs ER+	1.95	0.98.3.89	P=0.06	ER-
	FR - vs FR + (subgroup-population)	2.52	1.43, 4.44	P=0.001	FR-
	PR- vs PR+	2.40	1.52, 3.80	P=0.0002	PR-
	HER2- vs HER2+	2.31	1.42.3.75	P=0.0008	HFR2-
Taxane-based	HR-vsHR+	1.96	1 24 3 08	P=0.004	HR-
Taxane-anthracycline	FR- vs FR+	3 1 9	2 15 4 75	P< 0.0001	FR-
	PB- vs PB+	3.11	212 4 56	P< 0.00001	PR-
	HR - vs HR +	2 38	0.87653	P=0.09	HR-
	HB- vs HB+ (Subgroup-population)	3 58	1 62 7 90	P=0.002	HR-
	HER2- vs HER2+	1 78	1.05 3.02	P=0.0008	HFR2+
	$nm^{2}-H1 - vs nm^{2}-H1 +$	6.74	2 13 21 30	P=0.001	nm23-H1_
	CK5/6- vs CK5/6+	1.87	1 03 3 39	P=0.04	CK5/6-
	High Ki67 vs low Ki67	2.98	1 79 4 97	P< 0.0001	hiah Ki67
	High Ki67 vs low Ki67	1.82	0.65.5.10	P=0.20	high Ki67
	(subgroup- 14% cut-off)	1.02	0.0075.110	. 0.20	ingittae,
	High Ki67 vs low Ki67 (subgroup- 14% cut-off, primary objective)	3.12	1.93,5.04	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	high Ki67
	High Ki67 vs low Ki67 (Subgroup- 20% cut-off)	2.88	1.36,6.10	P=0.006	high Ki67
Taxane-platinum	ER– vs ER+	4.91	3.20,7.53	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	ER—
	PR– vs PR+	3.82	2.45,5.90	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	PR-
	HR– vs HR+	2.71	1.43,5.41	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	HR-
	High Ki67 vs low Ki67	2.20	0.74,6.59	P=0.16	high Ki67
	High Ki67 vs low Ki67 (Subgroup- 20% cut-off)	4.37	1.62,11.75	<i>P</i> =0.003	high Ki67
	HER2- vs HER2+	2.44	0.84,7.06	<i>P</i> < 0.0001	HER2+
	HER2– vs HER2+ (Subgroup-influential)	4.14	2.51,6.85	<i>P</i> < 0.00001	HER2+
TP vs TA	In HER2+ breast cancer	1.60	0.66,3.88	P=0.30	TP
	Subgroup- HER2+ breast cancer study	2.36	1.07,5.26	P=0.03	TP
Taxane-anthracycline	Genetic variation				
	PIK3CA wildtype vs PIK3CA mutated	2.44	1.42,4.19	P=0.001	PIK3CA wildtype

Table 2 Steps conducted in the systematic review

Steps	Details
Research question	In Asian breast cancer patients, how does personalised and precision medicine (in terms of breast cancer molecular subtypes diagnosis, presence or absence of biomarkers and genetic variants affect breast cancer treatment response and outcome?
Inclusion criteria	Randomised trials, observational studies, case-control studies, and cohort studies of Asian breast cancer aged ≥18 years, who underwent systemic neoadjuvant chemotherapy treatment reporting the involvement of somatic genetic polymorphisms or biomarkers or molecular subtype classification on breast cancer treatment response. The studies are written in the English language.
Participants	Asian breast cancer patients
Outcome	<i>Outcome 1:</i> Treatment response <i>Outcome 2:</i> Survival
Search strategy	Databases: MEDLINE (PubMed), Science Direct, Scopus, and Cochrane Library. Date range: 01.01.2000 to 31.03.2021. Search terms: The search term strategies can be found in Additional file 2. The terms were adapted for different data- bases utilising a combination of Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) and keywords that are relevant which can be found in the titles and abstract.
Critical appraisal	The authors extracted data from the published reports independently. Disagreements were resolved by a third person. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) was used.
Data collection and synthesis	For each study, the extracted parameters include the article information (article title, first author, year published, journal published, country, and year of recruitment), study design, study population and sample size, characteristics of patients in three variables (molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations), and the pCR data in selected variables. Notably, in the absence of molecular subtype classification in the included studies, whenever possible, they were approximated through the available biomarkers detected through IHC data. Data analysis was done using Review Manager Software (RevMan version 5.4.1) [30]. The odds ratio (OR), hazards ratio (HR), and their corresponding 95% confidence interval (95% CI) were assessed to evaluate the association between treatment response (pCR) and NAC treatment provided to breast cancer patients based on their molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations. The strength of associations was estimated by calculating pooled ORs/HRs and 95% CIs, by which significance was stated using the <i>p</i> -value. A <i>p</i> -value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.
Process	Search (n=5746) Excluded with reasons [refer to Figure 1 for detailed reasons] (n=5610) Excluded after reviewing full-text (n=35) Included studies (n=101)
Results	 Where statistically appropriate, studies were pooled. Molecular subtypes: Meta-analysis demonstrated that when treated with taxane-anthracycline, Asian breast cancer patients diagnosed with HER2E or TNBC achieved better pCR compared to those who are diagnosed with Luminal breast cancer. Meanwhile, when treated with taxane-platinum, HER2E and TNBC Asian breast cancer patients achieved better pCR compared to those who are diagnosed with Luminal breast cancer. Meanwhile, when treated with taxane-platinum, HER2E and TNBC Asian breast cancer patients achieved better pCR compared to those who are diagnosed with Luminal breast cancer patients achieved better pCR compared with Luminal breast cancer patients, Luminal B Asian breast cancer patients achieved better pCR when treated with taxane-platinum. Biomarkers: Meta-analysis demonstrated that when treated with anthracycline-based treatment, ER-, PR- and HER2- Asian breast cancer. HR- Asian breast cancer patients are also demonstrated to respond better to taxane-based treatment. For Asian breast cancer patients treated with taxane-anthracycline, it was found that those who are diagnosed with ER-, PR-, HR-, HER2+, nm23-H1-, CK5/6- and high Ki67 biomarkers responded better to the treatment. As for Asian breast cancer patients treated with taxane-platinum, it was found that those who are diagnosed with ER-, PR-, HR-, HER2+ and high Ki67 biomarkers responded better to the treatment. As for Asian breast cancer patients responded better to the treatment. Genetic variation: Meta-analysis also demonstrated that when treated with taxane-anthracycline-based treatment, Asian breast cancer patients who had wildtype <i>PIK3CA</i> gene achieved better pCR compared to those who were with mutated <i>PIK3CA</i> gene.

with neoadjuvant chemotherapy (OR 3.02; 95% CI 1.54–5.95; p=0.001; Supplementary Figure 7.2A in Additional file 7). The observed moderate heterogeneity could be due to the study by Lv et al. [69] that did not specifically study TNBC vs non-TNBC patients. Moreover, the recruited patients were either treated with anthracycline-based or TP or TA regimens. Mean-while, Wu et al. [91] specifically recruited TNBC and non-TNBC patients, and all were treated with TA. Hence, Wu et al.'s result carried more weight than that of Lv et al. in this analysis. However, Lv et al. compensated for these differences by adjusting their multivariate analysis with molecular subtypes. Overall, this result should be taken with caution.

Genetic variations

Amongst pooled reported associations of pCR for genetic variations, our study evaluated the effect of *PIK3CA* and

TP53 genes in NAC-treated Asian BC patients. Notably, no specific or single variant vs wildtype was addressed for both genes as well. In the adjusted analysis of three [51, 100, 106] and two studies [51, 100] for *PIK3CA* and *TP53* genes, respectively, breast cancer patients harbouring mutation in the *PIK3CA* gene was associated with worse response (OR 0.64; 95% CI 0.42-0.98; p=0.04; Supplementary Figure 7.2B in Additional file 7) while *TP53* gene was not associated with pCR outcome (OR 1.34; 95% CI 0.59–3.05; p=0.49; Supplementary Figure 7.2B in Additional file 7).

Biomarkers

Amongst pooled reported associations of pCR for biomarkers, our study evaluated the effect of Tau, nm23-H1, ER, PR, HR, HER2, and Ki-67 biomarkers in NAC-treated Asian BC patients (Supplementary Figures 7.2–7.8 in Additional file 7). In an adjusted analysis of Tau pooling two studies [61, 83], the result suggests that Tau+ was associated with worse response in the neoadjuvant setting (OR 0.22, 95% CI 0.09–0.54, p=0.0008; Supplementary Figure 7.2C in Additional file 7). Meanwhile in adjusted analysis of nm23-H1 pooling two studies [12, 60], nm23-H1 was not associated with pCR outcome in TA-treated patients (OR 1.56, 95% CI 0.55–4.45, p=0.41; Supplementary Figure 7.2C in Additional file 7).

The association between pCR in NAC-treated breast cancer patients and ER was evaluated in Supplementary Figure 7.3 (Additional file 7). In the crude analysis of ER+ vs ER- pooling five studies [61, 94, 97, 112, 115], ER was not associated with pCR outcome (OR 0.39; 95% CI 0.13–1.15; p=0.09). The reported moderate heterogeneity between the studies was perhaps due to the difference in favoured outcomes in one study [112] compared to the rest. Moreover, the heterogeneity is attributable to the different NAC treatments received in each study, whereby the patients were either treated with TP or anthracycline-containing regimens. Therefore, subgroup analyses of ER- vs ER+ pooling studies with patients treated with anthracycline-containing chemotherapy [61, 112] and taxane-platinum chemotherapy [94, 97, 115] were conducted. Our analysis revealed that ER was not associated with pCR outcome when patients were treated with an anthracycline-containing agent (OR 1.19; 95% CI 0.07–19.28; p=0.90) with considerable heterogeneity observed between the studies. The heterogeneity is perhaps due to differences in the favoured outcome in each study caused by the addition of the taxane regimen with the anthracycline in Li et al. [61]. Contrarily, ER+ patients were significantly associated with worse response when treated with TP (OR 0.19; 95% CI 0.11–0.32; p<0.00001).

Meanwhile, adjusted analysis of ER+ vs ER- pooling fourteen studies [54, 56, 61, 68, 71, 72, 83, 94, 97, 102, 103, 106, 112, 131] also showed that ER was not associated with pCR outcome (OR 0.59; 95% CI 0.32-1.08; p=0.09; Supplementary Figure 7.3 in Additional file 7). The observed substantial heterogeneity between the studies was perhaps due to differences in the chemotherapeutic agents received in each study. Subgroup analysis pooling five studies [56, 72, 83, 106, 131] with patients treated in the neoadjuvant setting revealed that ER was not associated with pCR outcome (OR 0.47; 95% CI 0.19-1.14; p=0.09) with considerable heterogeneity reported between the studies probably due to clinical variances between the studies. Another two subgroup analyses pooling studies with patients treated with TP [94, 97] and TA [54, 61, 71] regimens indicate that ER+ was significantly associated with worse response (OR 0.21; 95% CI 0.06-0.70; p=0.01 and OR 0.34; 95% CI 0.19-0.61; p=0.0003, respectively). While subgroup analysis pooling studies with patients treated with anthracycline-based chemotherapy [102, 112] showed that ER was not associated with pCR response (OR 4.29; 95% CI 0.67-27.39; p=0.12). Substantial heterogeneity was reported probably due to the difference in effect size between the studies attributed to the study sample size, whereby Zhao et al. [112] recruited 98 locally advanced breast cancer patients while Yao et al. [102] recruited 538 breast cancer patients.

Meanwhile, analyses pooling studies based on the characteristics of the patients showed that ER was not associated with pCR in patients achieving a complete pathological response in the breast only (OR 0.93; 95% CI 0.18–4.85; p=0.94; Supplementary Figure 7.3 in Additional file 7). The observed heterogeneity between the studies is probably due to the smaller number of studies pooled (n=2) and each study favoured a different outcome. Notably, ER– patients were significantly associated with pCR in studies pooling anthracycline-treated patients (OR 2.78; 95% CI 1.61–4.78; p=0.0002; Supplementary Figure 7.3 in Additional file 7).

The role of the biomarker PR was assessed in Asian breast cancer patients subjected to neoadjuvant chemotherapy (Supplementary Figure 7.4 in Additional file 7). In an analysis with crude OR results pooling five studies [61, 94, 97, 112, 115], it was observed that patients with PR+ were significantly associated with worse response (OR 0.40; 95% CI 0.20–0.79; p=0.009). The observed substantial heterogeneity between the studies was perhaps due to the difference in the favoured outcome in one study [112] and differences in weightage and population size. Subgroup analysis pooling studies with TP-treated patients [94, 97, 115] revealed PR+ patients were significantly associated with worse response (OR 0.29; 95% CI 0.13–0.62; p=0.001). Although moderate heterogeneity was reported, all the three studies pooled for the subgroup analysis were conducted in the Chinese population with no clinical variances. Thus, the heterogeneity result was rejected. Meanwhile, in subgroup analysis pooling patients treated with anthracycline-containing NAC [61, 112], the biomarker PR was not associated with treatment response (OR 0.66; 95% CI 0.17–2.62; p=0.55).

PR was also not associated with treatment response in the adjusted analysis pooling eight studies [54, 56, 61, 94, 97, 102, 103, 106] (OR 1.01; 95% CI 0.64-1.60; p=0.97; Supplementary Figure 7.4 in Additional file 7). The observed moderate heterogeneity was probably due to differences in population size and differences in treatment given in each study. We then conducted four subgroup analyses focusing on the treatment regimen and found that PR was not associated with treatment response in breast cancer patients treated: (1) in the neoadjuvant setting (OR 1.01; 95% CI 0.47-2.18; p=0.99); (2) with TP (OR 0.94; 95% CI 0.34–2.58; p=0.91); and (3) TA regimens (OR 0.37; 95% CI 0.05–2.94; *p*=0.35), but PR- was significantly associated with better response in anthracycline-containing treated patients (OR 1.63; 95% CI 1.03–2.57; p=0.04). Meanwhile, in adjusted analysis pooling studies with anthracycline-treated patients [88, 96] revealed that PR was not significantly associated with treatment response (OR 1.43; 95% CI 0.74–2.77; *p*=0.29).

The association between treatment response and hormone receptors (HR) comprising ER and PR was assessed in Asian breast cancer patients (Supplementary Figure 7.5 in Additional file 7). In an analysis with crude OR pooling four studies [51, 62, 64, 116], it was observed that patients with HR+ were significantly associated with worse treatment response in the neoadjuvant setting (OR 0.47; 95% CI 0.24–0.92; p=0.03). In a subgroup analysis whereby all the recruited patients in the pooled studies [51, 64] were of HER2+, it was observed that HR+ were significantly associated with a worse response (OR 0.40; 95% CI 0.18-0.89; p=0.02). Excluding the aforementioned studies, subgroup analysis pooling two studies [62, 116] revealed that HR was not significantly associated with treatment response in the neoadjuvant setting (OR 1.16; 95% CI 0.22–6.22; *p*=0.87).

Similarly, analysis with adjusted OR pooling five studies [51, 60, 62, 64, 70] indicated that HR was not significantly associated with treatment response (OR 1.27; 95% CI 0.47–3.45; p=0.64; Supplementary Figure 7.5 in Additional file 7). The observed substantial heterogeneity was perhaps due to the clinical variance in the characteristics of the recruited breast cancer population in each study. Subgroup analysis pooling studies analysing HR+ vs HR– in the neoadjuvant setting [62, 70] showed that HR– were significantly associated with better treatment responses (OR 2.39; 95% CI 1.17–04.87; p=0.02). Meanwhile, subgroup analysis pooling studies with HER2+ patients [51, 64] revealed that HR+/HER2+ breast cancer were significantly associated with worse treatment responses in the neoadjuvant setting (OR 0.43; 95% CI 0.21–0.88; p=0.02).

The association between pCR outcome and HER2 was estimated in Supplementary Figure 7.6 (Additional file 7). In an analysis pooling crude OR of seven studies [61, 62, 77, 94, 97, 112, 115], it was observed that HER2+ breast cancer patients were significantly associated with better treatment response (OR 2.50; 95% CI 1.44-4.35; p=0.001). The moderate heterogeneity reported between the studies was perhaps due to the differences in treatment regimens given to the recruited breast cancer population in each study. Subsequently, two subgroup analyses pooling studies according to the chemotherapy regimens administered to the breast cancer patients revealed that HER2+ patients treated with TP regimen [94, 97, 115] were significantly associated with better response (OR 4.64; 95% CI 2.74–7.86; p<0.00001), while HER2 was not associated with treatment response in patients treated with anthracycline-containing regimen (84,141) (OR 2.08; 95% CI 0.90-4.78; p=0.09).

Similarly, in an analysis pooling adjusted OR of 12 studies [56, 60, 61, 70, 77, 83, 94, 97, 102, 103, 106, 131], it was observed that HER2+ breast cancer patients were significantly associated with better treatment response (OR 2.29; 95% CI 1.56–3.35; p<0.0001; Supplementary Figure 7.6 in Additional file 7). Substantial heterogeneity was reported, perhaps due to the clinical variances in each study, based on the treatment received by the patients and the characteristics of the recruited breast cancer population. Subgroup analysis pooling five studies in the neoadjuvant setting [56, 70, 83, 106, 131] showed patients with HER2+ were significantly associated with better response (OR 2.33; 95% CI 1.31-4.15; p=0.004). Some differences between the studies might explain the observed substantial heterogeneity: (1) two of the studies [56, 83] main objective was to investigate the association of Tau with response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy, while Yuan et al. [106] focused on the association of PIK3CA mutation status with response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy, and Lim et al. [131] and Lv et al. [70] assessed factors affecting neoadjuvant treatment response; (2) Lim et al. [131] was the only study including multi-ethnic cohort of breast cancer patients since it was conducted in Singapore and Malaysia, although one of the ethnicity included in Lim et al. was Chinese. Meanwhile, subgroup analyses pooling two studies of patients treated with TP [94, 97] and two studies of patients treated with anthracycline-containing chemotherapy [102, 103] indicate HER2+ patients were significantly associated with better treatment response (OR 7.07; 95% CI 2.88–17.40; p<0.0001 and OR 2.65; 95% CI 1.66–4.23; p<0.0001, respectively). However, subgroup analysis pooling two studies of patients treated with TA [60, 61] revealed that HER2 was not associated with treatment response (OR 1.08; 95% CI 0.47–2.51; p=0.85).

Notably, HER2 was also not associated with pCR in patients achieving a complete pathological response in the breast only (OR 1.96; 95% CI 0.78–4.89; p=0.15; Supplementary Figure 7.6 in Additional file 7) and in anthracycline-treated patients (OR 1.52; 95% CI 0.97–2.40; p=0.07; Supplementary Figure 7.6 in Additional file 7).

As for Ki-67, an analysis pooling crude OR of eight studies [46, 51, 61, 64, 94, 97, 115, 123] observed that patients with high Ki-67 were significantly associated with better treatment responses (OR 2.63; 95% CI 1.69–4.07; p<0.0001; Supplementary Figure 7.7 in Additional file 7). Subgroup crude analyses pooling studies with TNBC patients [46, 123] and patients treated with TP [94, 97, 115] and TA [46, 61] revealed that patients with high Ki-67 were significantly favoured to achieve better treatment responses (OR 4.42; 95% CI 1.41–13.85; p=0.01, OR 2.13; 95% CI 1.21–3.75; p=0.009, and OR 4.26; 95% CI 1.90–9.54; p=0.0004, respectively). Meanwhile, subgroup crude analysis pooling studies with HER2+ patients [51, 64] showed that Ki-67 was not associated with treatment response (OR 1.55; 95% CI 0.79–3.07; p=0.20).

Similarly, an analysis of adjusted OR pooling seven studies [12, 46, 51, 54, 94, 97, 110] showed that patients with high Ki-67 were significantly associated with better treatment response (OR 2.63; 95% CI 1.56-4.41; p=0.0003; Supplementary Figure 7.7 in Additional file 7). In subgroup adjusted analysis pooling studies with HER2+ patients [51, 110], breast cancer patients with high Ki-67 were significantly associated with better response in the neoadjuvant setting (OR 3.67; 95% CI 1.11–12.12; p=0.03). Congruent with the subgroup crude analysis, a subgroup adjusted analysis of pooled studies with TNBC patients [12, 46] also revealed patients with high Ki-67 were significantly associated with better treatment response (OR 2.16; 95% CI 1.00-4.64; p=0.05). Notably, the analysis was also influenced by the fact that the TNBC patients were treated with the TA regimen. Breast cancer patients with high Ki-67 were also significantly associated with better treatment response when treated with TA regimen (OR 2.24; 95% CI 1.34-3.74; p=0.002). However, in patients treated with NAC TP, Ki-67 was not associated with treatment response (OR 4.63; 95% CI 0.35-61.14; p=0.24).

Three biomarkers—ER, HR, and Ki-67—were evaluated by pooling studies reporting their association using hazards ratio (Supplementary Figure 7.8 in Additional file 7). Our pooled adjusted analysis of two studies [73, 80] showed that ER– patients were significantly associated with better treatment response (HR 2.75; 95% CI 1.25–6.05; p=0.01). Both crude and adjusted analysis of HR- vs HR+ and high vs low Ki-67 in HER2+ patients treated with taxane-containing chemotherapy showed that HR- patients and patients with high Ki-67 were significantly associated with a better response. However, in an adjusted result analysis of high vs low Ki-67 in patients treated with taxane-containing chemotherapy, Ki-67 was not significantly associated with treatment response (HR 1.26; 95% CI 1.26-8.25; p=0.81) with substantial heterogeneity. The significant heterogeneity might be explained by the variation in the taxane-based treatment regimen where Zhang et al. [107] included patients submitted to either single taxane-based regime or taxaneplatinum combination, while all patients recruited in Wang et al. [80] and Ding et al. [47] were submitted to taxane-anthracycline and taxane-platinum combination regimens, respectively. Moreover, Zhang et al. and Ding et al. incorporated trastuzumab as part of their neoadjuvant regimen while Wang et al. subjected their patients to trastuzumab in the adjuvant setting.

Publication bias

Publication bias assessment was done using the Jamovi Software (version 2.3) [133] (Supplementary Figures 8.1-8.13 in Additional file 8). The occurrence of publication bias was observed in two analyses.

First, in the overall analysis evaluating the association of pCR outcome with HER2+ and HER2– breast cancer patients submitted to TA chemotherapy, the regression test indicated funnel plot asymmetry (p=0.03) but not the rank correlation test (p=0.34). File drawer analysis indicated that at least 51 studies would be required to nullify the effect (p<0.001). Hence, there is less chance of publication bias in the analysis. As indicated in Fig. 5, subgroup analysis was not conducted for the overall analysis because although the effect is estimated to favour HER2+ significantly, in some studies the true effect may in fact favour HER2–.

Second, in the overall analysis evaluating the association of treatment response with PR– and PR+ breast cancer patients in the neoadjuvant setting, the rank correlation test indicated funnel plot asymmetry (p=0.03) but not the regression test (p=0.08). File drawer analysis suggested the presence of publication bias in the analysis, which could be explained by the heterogeneity observed between the pooled studies, specifically in the treatment regimens assessed in each study. Thus, four subsequent subgroup analyses—pooling two studies at each treatment regimen the patients were subjected to—were conducted for the overall PR– vs PR+ (adjusted results) analysis (Supplementary Figure 7.4 in Additional file 7).

Discussion

There are many options for breast cancer treatment. Often, this includes surgery, radiotherapy, and systemic therapy comprising chemotherapy with or without targeted therapy. Systemic treatment is commonly decided based on the target biomarkers, ensuring the treatment would be effective. Improvements in systemic therapy and targeted therapies utilising an individual's diagnosis have improved overall pCR rates in breast cancer patients. Studies reported pCR benefits of 44.4% (*n*=8/18) in TNBC patients treated with NAC TP than 0% (*n*=0/9) in Luminal A [69], 8.9% (n=56/632) in ER+ breast cancer patients treated with NAC TA than 19.8% (n=75/378) in ER– patients [36], and 24.7% (*n*=55/223) in breast cancer patients with wildtype PIK3CA gene treated with NAC TA than 11.7% (n=11/94) in mutated PIK3CA [106]. Preoperative chemotherapy or neoadjuvant chemotherapy is typically the standard of care in treating both operable and inoperable locally advanced breast cancer owing to its advantage for breast conservation surgery and aids in shrinking an inoperable tumour to improve resectability [134]. The success of neoadjuvant chemotherapy associated with treatment response (pCR) could be used as a prognostic value in managing breast cancer since the efficacy of a treatment often translates into a highly favourable overall survival and disease-free progression. Often, the best pCR outcomes were observed with TNBC, moderate for HER2E, and the worst for Luminal [134]. Notably, different breast cancer subtypes have different sensitivities to NAC and frequently, a combination of them is given to be effective.

We systematically evaluated the effect of breast cancer molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations on breast cancer treatment in Asian breast cancer patients, focusing on treatment response (pCR) in the neoadjuvant setting. In our study, the common NAC treatments used in the pooled analyses were TA, TP, anthracycline-based, and taxane-based chemotherapies with reported pCR rates of 2.7–64.7%, 7.7–60%, 4.3–35%, and 11.3-57.1%, respectively owing to the molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations present in the breast cancer patients. There were limited studies focused on breast cancer treatment in Asian breast cancer patients utilising the molecular subtypes classification of breast cancer clinically. In particular, most studies reported the association between breast cancer treatment response with biomarkers and/or genetic variations. From our study, the most frequent subtypes in the Asian population are TNBC and HER2E, followed by luminal B and luminal A. This trend was not consistent with previous studies on the Asian population conducted on 560 Malaysian breast cancer tumours [24] and 2791 Chinese women with breast cancer [76]. Notably, the subtype frequencies in our study might not reflect the entirety of the Asian population. Most of the studies included in this paper were mainly from the Chinese population and fewer of the others (Korean, Japanese, Malaysian, and Indian). Moreover, not all the studies included focused on all four subtypes. Some studies have a different definition of a luminal A, luminal B, and luminal-like subtype when using IHC as a surrogate to classify breast cancer since it is readily available and cost-effective than gene panels.

Our findings suggest Asian TNBC patients subjected to TA and TP in the neoadjuvant setting were observed to favour better response. In particular, although TNBC subtypes were reported to be more likely to benefit from NAC treatment compared to non-TNBC, it is significantly associated through statistical analysis with better response when treated with NAC TP than TA in our study. These findings are consistent with meta-analysis conducted in the general population by Pandy et al. [135] pooling 2415 breast cancer patients treated with NAC TA and TP, which revealed that there was an improvement in the pCR rates in TP-treated patients (44.6%) compared to TA-treated patients (27.8%). TNBC has a poor prognosis and is a more aggressive subtype, with a higher recurrence rate and metastasis (138). Due to the lack of receptor expression, it is not responsive to hormonal therapy [136]. While pCR was observed to be higher in TNBC, which often translates to a desirable long-term outcome [75], some studies have observed the opposite effect whereby there was no difference in survival in patients that have achieved pCR [137, 138]. Similarly, our study showed that HER2E patients were more likely to achieve pCR benefit from NAC TP (52.4%) than TA treatment (27.8%). HER2E is an aggressive subtype with a poor prognosis [139]. However, it can be sensitive to cytotoxic chemotherapy and slightly resistant to hormonal therapy and has shown some positive outcomes with targeted therapy [139–141].

Our study revealed that patients with luminal A subtype were less likely to benefit from TA (7.7%) and TP (4.3%) regimens in the neoadjuvant setting. Meanwhile, luminal B has a slightly better pCR rate when treated with TP (28.1%) and TA (12%) and similarly, luminallike treated with TP (32.5%) and TA (9%). Despite poor responses to NAC, luminal A has a good prognosis [142] with a significantly lower relapse rate than other subtypes, and usually responds well to hormonal therapy [141, 142]. Luminal B has a slightly worse prognosis than luminal A, with an increased chance of recurrence rate, decreased survival rate after relapse, and less sensitivity to hormonal therapy [141, 143]. Notably, the distinct characteristics of each subtype make it challenging to find a treatment that would be effective for all of them. Thus, a combination of chemotherapy, targeted therapy, and endocrine therapy is frequently utilised. Taken together, our study showed that each subtype responds differently to different single or combination of chemotherapeutic agents in the neoadjuvant setting.

Our study's evaluation of the effect of biomarkers on the pCR outcome suggested the commonly reported biomarkers ER, PR, HER2, and Ki-67 as predictors of the likelihood of better pCR outcomes in breast cancer patients. In particular, patients with negative expression of ER and PR, positive expression of HER2, and higher expression of Ki-67 are significantly associated with better pCR outcomes when treated with either TA or TP chemotherapeutic regimens in the neoadjuvant setting. Patients with negative expression of PR and HER2 are also significantly associated with better pCR outcomes when treated with an anthracycline agent, while patients with HR-negative (ER- and PR-) are significantly associated with better pCR outcomes when treated with taxane. In contrast, although Łukasiewicz et al. supported the expression of ER, PR, HER2, and Ki-67 as predictive and potential prognostic factors, the updated review on breast cancer specified that patients with higher expression of these biomarkers are those who are usually present significantly better clinical outcomes [144]. Unfortunately, Łukasiewicz et al. did not review the predictive or prognostic value of the biomarkers concerning specific chemotherapeutic regimens.

The proper Ki-67 cut-off value in positive hormone receptors (HR+) breast cancer was often discussed due to its importance in evaluating the aggressiveness of the cancer and to distinguish between luminal A and luminal B (HER2–) subtypes when IHC is used as a surrogate classification since both subtypes are of ER+ and HER2-[5, 144]. Furthermore, experts at the St Gallen Consensus Meeting have changed the threshold for Ki-67 over time, from 14% in 2011 to 20% in 2013 [5]. Without the establishment of an optimal Ki-67 cut-off value, it has become challenging to discern what constitutes truly a high or low proliferation of Ki-67 in some studies which led to low reproducibility for the Ki-67 marker. In resolving this issue, the International Ki67 in Breast Cancer Working Group (IKWG) agrees that without improvements in the standardisation of the Ki-67 cut-off value, routine, non-trial settings can reliably categorise very low Ki-67 as $\leq 5\%$ and very high as $\geq 30\%$ [145]. Notably, our study congruently suggested that high Ki-67 is significantly associated with better treatment response only at 14 and 20% cut-off values.

Our meta-analysis findings also suggested other biomarkers such as nm23-H1 and CK5/6 as predictors in TA-treated Asian breast cancer patients and Tau in NAC-treated patients. These other biomarkers can be further evaluated and utilised as potential targets in treating breast cancer due to their involvement in the cell signalling pathway and cell division [12, 60]. Tau protein behaves as a microtubule-association protein, which can be found in normal breast epithelial and cancer cells [61]. The expression of Tau protein was found higher in metastatic breast cancer and is often associated with better prognosis and better response to taxanes [61, 146]. Interestingly, our findings suggest the opposite effect where Tau- breast cancer was favoured to have a better response when treated with taxane-containing chemotherapy. However, this could be due to the clinical variance in the study pooled in our analysis. In particular, breast cancer patients in Li et al. [61] were treated with combination TA regimens, while patients in Wang et al. [83] were treated with TP regimens. Furthermore, both studies excluded metastatic breast cancer patients from their study. Meanwhile, CK5/6-often used to define basal-like TNBC--is an intermediate filament protein that provides structure to the cell and is also associated with poor prognosis [90]. CK5/6 and EGFR expression were accepted as biomarkers for classification of Basallike breast cancer within the TNBC subtype [90].

There were several genes included for analysis in this study. Our meta-analysis results suggested the PIK3CA gene as a predictor for pCR in TA-treated breast cancer patients with PIK3CA mt (17.1%) and PIK3CAwt (24.7%) [106]. Similarly, patients harbouring mutated PIK3CA gene in the Caucasian population who received either trastuzumab, lapatinib, or the combination in addition to a taxane-based chemotherapy are associated with a lower pCR rate [147]. PIK3CA mutations are commonly found in the luminal subtypes, involving signalling pathways to attain a multi-lineage potential, leading to resistance to endocrine therapy [148]. The current treatment recently approved by the US FDA for breast cancer with PIK3CA mutation includes an oral medication Alpelisib acting as PI3K Alpha-Selective Inhibitor. This works as an inhibitor on the common mutation site and induces $p110\alpha$ degradation. This type of PIK3 inhibitor showed more tolerable effects in patients. However, substantial toxicities are still present [149, 150].

Although our study did not reveal a significant association between pCR and the *TP53* gene, *TP53* is one of the frequently mutated genes in breast cancer and has an involvement in gene transcription that curates cell cycle processes, apoptosis, and DNA repair [151]. *TP53* mutations are correlated with HER2+, HR-, and high Ki-67 and contribute to the aggressive characteristics of cancer, leading to treatment resistance [152]. Therefore, it is often associated with a poor prognosis. The molecular profile involving gene expression has been associated with breast cancer recurrence. While the molecular profiling of advanced breast cancer is crucial, it can also be very costly. There is a complex interplay between the genes and the signal pathways which subsequently affect the pCR outcome that needs to be further understood.

In this study, we have explored the role of molecular subtypes, biomarkers, and genetic variations on treatment outcome. It was evident that the treatment given to patients based on their breast cancer characterisation in the neoadjuvant settings has yielded variable pCR outcome. The combination of classifying the patient's molecular subtypes and identifying the status of their biomarkers can effectively predict the treatment outcome. Apart from use of the routine biomarkers (ER, PR, and HER2), further classification and diagnosis can be done utilising several of the non-conventional biomarkers (Tau, CK5/6, EGFR, Topo-II) and genes (TP53 and PIK3CA) especially in the Asian population in hopes to achieve better individualised treatment through PPM. Thus, there is a need for high-quality validated biomarkers that can predict treatment responses.

Limitations

Despite the efforts during the development and completion of this study, some limitations need to be addressed. First, our study is inclusive of different analytical study designs such as observational (case-control and cohort study) and experimental (randomised controlled trials and non-randomised controlled trials) which might be prone to bias and heterogeneity when they are pooled for analysis. Second, the number of individual studies pooled for each of the analyses was mostly small, both in the overall and subgroup analyses. Third, for a considerable number of studies, there was a need to (1) indirectly categorised their molecular subtypes based on IHC which may not be entirely correct since we are only utilising the data available in the article, and (2) indirectly calculate the 95% CI value in RevMan which may deviate from the original value. Lastly, our tests for publication bias should be considered carefully as the number and size of studies included were limited. Notwithstanding the first limitation of this study, the inclusion of several different analytical study designs allowed us to increase the number of individual studies gathered for the identification of genetic determinants of treatment outcome in breast cancer patients submitted to neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Moreover, we have accounted for heterogeneity using best practices that are consistent with those employed by The Cochrane Collaboration [153]. Nonetheless, future studies should be focused on each of the breast cancer characterisations to validate our findings. In particular, future studies focusing on investigating the effect of specific variant of a gene-utilising the homozygous and heterozygous nature of the variant-against their wildtype on treatment outcome in Asian breast cancer patients will justify the importance and benefits of PPM.

Conclusions

To the best of our knowledge, this SLR is the only comprehensive review currently available that analyses the effect of molecular subtype classification, biomarkers, and genetic variations on the pCR outcome of breast cancer patients in the neoadjuvant setting focusing on the Asian population. The SLR search spanned 20 years and identified over 6000 records which was further reduced to 3725 records after the exclusion of non-Asian breast cancer patients, suggesting that although this area is still understudied, there is a growing interest to pursue the research area. Notably, this SLR adhered to best practices and followed PRISMA reporting guidelines. Our findings justified that molecular subtype (HER2E and TNBC), biomarkers (ER, PR, HER2, HR, Ki-67, nm23-H1, CK5/6, and Tau), and gene (PIK3CA) could be further explored for their possible role in first-line treatment response in Asian breast cancer clinical studies. Understanding the effect of these determinants might be a crucial step to tailor treatment to each patient, which can avoid overtreatment of the tumour with non-aggressive nature and undertreatment of the tumour with aggressive nature. Thus, with further validation, this information can be utilised to treat breast cancer more efficiently in the Asian population.

Abbreviations

CI	Confidence interval
EGFR	Epidermal growth factor receptor
ER	Oestrogen receptor
HER2	Human epidermal growth factor receptor-2
HER2E	Human epidermal growth factor receptor-2 enriched
HR	Hazards ratio
IHC	Immunohistochemistry
NAC	Neoadjuvant chemotherapy
OR	Odds ratio
pCR	Pathological complete response
PR	Progesterone receptor
TA	Taxane-anthracycline
TNBC	Triple-negative breast cancer
TP	Tayane-platinum

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-024-02520-5.

Additional file 1. PRISMA 2020 Checklist.

Additional file 2. Search term strategy. Supplementary Table 2.1. The keywords and search terms formulated from the SLR PICO question. Supplementary Table 2.2. Search strategy and results from MEDLINE (PubMed) database. Supplementary Table 2.3. Search strategy and results from Science Direct database. Supplementary Table 2.4. Search strategy and results from Science Direct database. Supplementary Table 2.5. Search strategy and results from Cochrane Library database.

Additional file 3. Data Extraction. Supplementary Table 3.1. Extraction of data from the included studies in the systematic literature review and meta-analysis. **Supplementary Table 3.2.** Extraction of pCR data from the included studies in the systematic literature review and meta-analysis.

Additional file 4. Data Synthesis. Supplementary Table 4.1. Data synthesised for overview of all included studies. Supplementary Table 4.2.1. Data synthesised for the association of breast cancer treatment response according to breast cancer characterisation. Supplementary Table 4.2.2. Analysis of breast cancer treatment response according to chemotherapeutic agents in different breast cancer characteristics. Supplementary Table 4.3. Pooled reported association of pCR in included studies. Supplementary Table 4.4. Evaluation of synthesised tpCR data. Supplementary Table 4.5. Evaluation of synthesised tpCR data. Supplementary Table 4.6. Evaluation of synthesised pooled reported association of pCR data.

Additional file 5. Modified Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale.

Additional file 6. Quality of the included studies. Supplementary Table 6.1. Newcastle-Ottawa Scale of each included cohort study. Supplementary Figure 6.1. Risk of bias by domain and question in 87 cohort studies using Newcastle-Ottawa Scale. Numbers on the green bar represent the number of studies with low risk of bias over the number of studies assessed. Supplementary Table 6.2. Newcastle-Ottawa Scale of each included case-control study. Supplementary Figure 6.2. Risk of bias by domain and question in 14 case-cohort studies using Newcastle-Ottawa Scale. Numbers on the green bar represent the number of studies with low risk of bias over the number of studies assessed.

Additional file 7. Meta-analysis results. Supplementary Figure 7.1. Pooled pCR outcome of NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients. Forest plots describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the association of pCR outcome in: NAC TA-treated breast cancer patients between (A) TNBC and HER2E; (B) Luminal B and Luminal A; NAC TP-treated breast cancer patients between (C) HER2E and TNBC; NAC TA-treated breast cancer patients with (D) EGFR. I^2 and p-value for X² of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis. Supplementary Figure 7.2. Pooled reported association of pCR in NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients presented in different variables. Forest plots describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the pooled reported association of pCR in NACtreated breast cancer patients presented according to (A) Molecular classification; (B) Genetic variations; and (C) Biomarkers. I² and p-value for X² of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis. Supplementary Figure 7.3. Pooled reported association of pCR in NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients with ER. Forest plot describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the association between the biomarker ER and pCR in NAC-treated breast cancer patients. I^2 and p-value for X^2 of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis. Supplementary Figure 7.4. Pooled reported association of pCR in NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients with PR. Forest plot describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the association between the biomarker PR and pCR in NAC-treated breast cancer patients. I² and *p*-value for X² of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis. Supplementary Figure 7.5. Pooled reported association of pCR in NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients with HR. Forest plot describing the random effect ORs and 95% Cls from studies assessing the association between the hormone receptors (HR) - comprising ER and PR - and pCR in NAC-treated breast cancer patients. I² and p-value for X^2 of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis. Supplementary Figure 7.6. Pooled reported association of pCR in NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients with HER2. Forest plot describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the association between the biomarker HER2 and pCR in NAC-treated breast cancer patients. I² and *p*-value for X² of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis. Supplementary Figure 7.7. Pooled reported association of pCR in NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients with Ki-67. Forest plot describing the random effect ORs and 95% CIs from studies assessing the association between Ki-67 and pCR in NAC-treated breast cancer patients. I² and *p*-value for

X² of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis. **Supplementary Figure 7.8.** Pooled reported association of pCR in NAC-treated Asian breast cancer patients presented in different biomarkers. Forest plot describing the random effect HRs and 95% Cls from studies assessing the association between pCR in NAC-treated breast cancer patients and the biomarkers ER, HR, and Ki-67. I² and *p*-value for X² of heterogeneity are reported for each group analysis.

Additional file 8. Publication Bias. Supplementary Figure 8.1. Funnel plot of pooled pCR outcome of Asian breast cancer patients treated with TA chemotherapy. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of HER2E and Luminal, combined in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated with TA regimen in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.2. Funnel plot of pooled pCR outcome of Asian breast cancer patients treated with TA chemotherapy. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of TNBC and Luminal, combined in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated with TA regimen in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.3. Funnel plot of pooled pCR outcome of Asian breast cancer patients treated with TA chemotherapy. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of TNBC and HER2E in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated with TA regimen in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.4. Funnel plot of pooled pCR outcome of Asian breast cancer patients treated with TP chemotherapy. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of HER2E and Luminal, combined in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated with TP regimen in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.5. Funnel plot of pooled pCR outcome of Asian breast cancer patients treated with TA chemotherapy. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of ER in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated with TA regimen in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.6. Funnel plot of pooled pCR outcome of Asian breast cancer patients treated with TA chemotherapy. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of HER2 in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated with TA regimen in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.7. Funnel plot of pooled pCR outcome of Asian breast cancer patients treated with TA chemotherapy. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of Ki-67 in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated with TA regimen in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.8. Funnel plot of pooled pCR association of Asian breast cancer patients in the neoadjuvant setting. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of ER+ and ER- (adjusted OR association) in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.9. Funnel plot of pooled pCR association of Asian breast cancer patients in the neoadjuvant setting. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of PR- and PR+ (adjusted OR association) in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.10. Funnel plot of pooled pCR association of Asian breast cancer patients in the neoadjuvant setting. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of HER2- and HER2+ (crude OR association) in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.11. Funnel plot of pooled pCR association of Asian breast cancer patients in the neoadjuvant setting. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of HER2+ and HER2- (adjusted OR association) in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.12. Funnel plot of pooled pCR association of Asian breast cancer patients in the neoadjuvant setting. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of high and low Ki-67 (crude OR association) in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated in the neoadjuvant setting. Supplementary Figure 8.13. Funnel plot of pooled pCR association of Asian breast cancer patients in the neoadjuvant setting. Funnel plot assessing the publication bias in evaluating the effect of high and low Ki-67 (adjusted OR association) in breast cancer pCR outcome of patients treated in the neoadjuvant setting.

Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our deep gratitude to Dr. Nik Ani Afiqah Haji Mohammad Tuah and Dr. Ravi Sekhar Patnaik for the helpful discussion, and Madam Sriyani Perera for proofreading our manuscript and the valuable insight.

Authors' contributions

MA conceptualised the original topic content. SM conceptualised and designed the research protocol. NS and SM searched the studies. NS, SM, and AM extracted all necessary data and checked the data extraction process. NS and SM led the meta-analysis. NS prepared the original draft manuscript. SM and AM led the revision and edited the manuscript. SP proofread the original manuscript. LH, SP, and MA revised and edited the final version of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable; the analysis is based on published aggregate data and does not require ethical approval or informed consent. Thus, the ethics approval was waived by the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC).

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author details

¹ Pengiran Anak Puteri Rashidah Sa'adatul Bolkiah (PAPRSB) Institute of Health Sciences, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Jalan Tungku Link, Gadong BE1410, Negara Brunei Darussalam. ²Halalan Thayyiban Research Centre, Universiti Islam Sultan Sharif Ali, Jalan Tutong, Sinaut TB1741, Negara Brunei Darussalam. ³ Faculty of Medicine, University of Peradeniya, Peradeniya, Sri Lanka.

Received: 17 November 2023 Accepted: 23 March 2024 Published online: 04 April 2024

References

- Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. Am Cancer Soc Journals. 2021;71(3):209–49.
- Harris EER. Precision Medicine for Breast Cancer: The Paths to Truly Individualized Diagnosis and Treatment. Toillon R-A, editor. Int J Breast Cancer. 2018;2018(Special Issue):1–8. https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/ 4809183.
- Duffy MJ, Harbeck N, Nap M, Molina R, Nicolini A, Senkus E, et al. Clinical use of biomarkers in breast cancer: Updated guidelines from the European Group on Tumor Markers (EGTM). Eur J Cancer. 2017;75:284–98.
- Eliyatkın N, Yalçın E, Zengel B, Aktaş S, Vardar E. Molecular Classification of Breast Carcinoma: From Traditional, Old-Fashioned Way to A New Age, and A New Way. J Breast Heal. 2015;11(2):59–66.
- Goldhirsch A, Winer EP, Coates AS, Gelber RD, Piccart-Gebhart M, Thürlimann B, et al. Personalizing the treatment of women with early breast cancer: Highlights of the stgallen international expert consensus on the primary therapy of early breast Cancer 2013. Ann Oncol. 2013;24(9).
- Perou CM, Sørlie T, Eisen MB, van de Rijn M, Jeffrey SS, Rees CA, et al. Molecular portraits of human breast tumours. Nature. 2000;406(6797):747–52.
- Sørlie T, Perou CM, Tibshirani R, Aas T, Geisler S, Johnsen H, et al. Gene expression patterns of breast carcinomas distinguish tumor subclasses with clinical implications. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2001;98(19):10869– 74. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11553815.
- 8. Sorlie T, Tibshirani R, Parker J, Hastie T, Marron JS, Nobel A, et al. Repeated observation of breast tumor subtypes in independent gene

expression data sets. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2003;100(14):8418–23. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12829800.

- 9. Henry NL, Hayes DF. Cancer biomarkers. Mol Oncol. 2012;6(2):140–6. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22356776.
- Meehan J, Gray M, Martínez-Pérez C, Kay C, Pang LY, Fraser JA, et al. Precision Medicine and the Role of Biomarkers of Radiotherapy Response in Breast Cancer. Front Oncol. 2020;10:628. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32391281.
- Mueller C, Haymond A, Davis JB, Williams A, Espina V. Protein biomarkers for subtyping breast cancer and implications for future research. Expert Rev Proteomics. 2018;15(2):131–52. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29271260.
- Li XR, Liu M, Zhang YJ, Wang JD, Zheng YQ, Li J, et al. CK5/6, EGFR, Ki-67, cyclin D1, and nm23-H1 protein expressions as predictors of pathological complete response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in triple-negative breast cancer patients. Med Oncol. 2011;28(SUPPL 1).
- Talseth-Palmer BA, Scott RJ. Genetic variation and its role in malignancy. Int J Biomed Sci. 2011;7(3):158–71. Available from: https:// pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23675233.
- Liefaard MC, Lips EH, Wesseling J, Hylton NM, Lou B, Mansi T, et al. The Way of the Future: Personalizing Treatment Plans Through Technology. Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ B. 2021;41:12–23. https://doi.org/10. 1200/EDBK_320593.
- Pinto N, Dolan ME. Clinically relevant genetic variations in drug metabolizing enzymes. Curr Drug Metab. 2011;12(5):487–97. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21453273.
- Garraway LA, Verweij J, Ballman KV. Precision Oncology: An Overview. J Clin Oncol. 2013;31(15):1803–5. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2013. 49.4799.
- 17. Abrahams E, Ginsburg GS, Silver M. The personalized medicine coalition: Goals and strategies. Am J Pharmacogenomics. 2005;5
- Goetz LH, Schork NJ. Personalized medicine: motivation, challenges, and progress. Fertil Steril. 2018;109(6):952–63. Available from: https:// pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29935653.
- Liu H, Lv L, Gao H, Cheng M. Pathologic Complete Response and Its Impact on Breast Cancer Recurrence and Patient's Survival after Neoadjuvant Therapy: A Comprehensive Meta-Analysis. Huang T, editor. Comput Math Methods Med. 2021;2021:7545091. https://doi.org/10. 1155/2021/7545091.
- André F, Bachelot T, Commo F, Campone M, Arnedos M, Dieras V, et al. Comparative genomic hybridisation array and DNA sequencing to direct treatment of metastatic breast cancer: A multicentre, prospective trial (SAFIR01/UNICANCER). Lancet Oncol. 2014;15(3):267–74.
- Howlader N, Cronin KA, Kurian AW, Andridge R. Differences in breast cancer survival by molecular subtypes in the United States. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2018;27(6).
- Gianni L, Eiermann W, Semiglazov V, Lluch A, Tjulandin S, Zambetti M, et al. Neoadjuvant and adjuvant trastuzumab in patients with HER2-positive locally advanced breast cancer (NOAH): follow-up of a randomised controlled superiority trial with a parallel HER2-negative cohort. Lancet Oncol. 2014;15(6):640–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S1470-2045(14)70080-4.
- McCarthy N, Boyle F, Zdenkowski N, Bull J, Leong E, Simpson A, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with sequential anthracycline–docetaxel with gemcitabine for large operable or locally advanced breast cancer: ANZ 0502 (NeoGem). Breast. 2014;23(2):142–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2013.12.001.
- Pan J-W, Zabidi MMA, Ng P-S, Meng M-Y, Hasan SN, Sandey B, et al. The molecular landscape of Asian breast cancers reveals clinically relevant population-specific differences. Nat Commun. 2020;11(1):6433. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-20173-5.
- Leong SPL, Shen Z-Z, Liu T-J, Agarwal G, Tajima T, Paik N-S, et al. Is Breast Cancer the Same Disease in Asian and Western Countries? World J Surg. 2010;34(10):2308–24. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00268-010-0683-1.
- Yap Y-S, Lu Y-S, Tamura K, Lee JE, Ko EY, Park YH, et al. Insights Into Breast Cancer in the East vs the West: A Review. JAMA Oncol. 2019;5(10):1489–96. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2019.0620.
- 27. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for

reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372:n71. Available from: http://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n71.abstract.

- Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. Systematic Reviews. 2006;
- Wells GA, Wells G, Shea B, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for Assessing the Quality of Nonrandomised Studies in Meta-Analyses. In 2014.
- 30. Review Manager (RevMan). The Cochrane Collaboration; 2020.
- Greenland S. Generalized Mantel-Haenszel Estimators for K 2 x J Tables. Biometrics. 1989;45(1):183–91. Available from: http://www.jstor.org/ stable/2532044.
- DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-Analysis in Clinical Trials. Control Clin Trials. 1986;7:177–88.
- Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses Testing for heterogeneity; 2003.
- Bi Z, Chen P, Liu YB, Zhao T, Sun X, Song XR, et al. Efficacy and safety analysis of paclitaxel, docetaxel and liposomal paclitaxel after neoadjuvant therapy in breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2020;184(2):397–405.
- Bi Z, Liu J, Chen P, Liu Y, Zhao T, Wang C, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy and timing of sentinel lymph node biopsy in different molecular subtypes of breast cancer with clinically negative axilla. Breast Cancer. 2019;26(3):373–7.
- 36. Chen R, Ye Y, Yang C, Peng Y, Zong B, Qu F, et al. Assessment of the predictive role of pretreatment Ki-67 and Ki-67 changes in breast cancer patients receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy according to the molecular classification: a retrospective study of 1010 patients. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2018;170(1):35–43.
- Chen S, Huang L, Chen C-M, Shao Z-M. Progesterone receptor loss identifies luminal-type local advanced breast cancer with poor survival in patients who fail to achieve a pathological complete response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Oncotarget. 2015;6(20):18174–82.
- Chen S, Huang L, Liu Y, Chen CM, Wu J, Shao ZM. The predictive and prognostic significance of pre- and post-treatment topoisomerase lla in anthracycline-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy for local advanced breast cancer. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2013;39(6):619–26.
- Chen W, He J, Song S, Wang M, Wu H, Wang X. Efficacy of TCH/TEC neoadjuvant chemotherapy for the treatment of HER-2-Overexpressing breast cancer. Oncol Lett. 2015;9(4):1922–6.
- 40. Chen X, Ye G, Zhang C, Li X, Shen K. Non-anthracycline-containing docetaxel and cyclophosphamide regimen is associated with sustained worse outcome compared with docetaxel, anthracycline and cyclophosphamide in neoadjuvant treatment of triple negative and HER2positive breast cancer patients. Chin J Cancer Res. 2016;28(6):561–9.
- Chen XS, Nie XQ, Chen CM, Wu JY, Wu J, Lu JS, et al. Weekly paclitaxel plus carboplatin is an effective nonanthracycline-containing regimen as neoadjuvant chemotherapy for breast cancer. Ann Oncol. 2010;21(5):961–7.
- Chen XS, Wu JY, Huang O, Chen CM, Wu J, Lu JS, et al. Molecular subtype can predict the response and outcome of Chinese locally advanced breast cancer patients treated with preoperative therapy. Oncol Rep. 2010;23(5).
- Chen YZ, Xue JY, Chen CM, Yang BL, Xu QH, Wu F, et al. PPAR signaling pathway may be an important predictor of breast cancer response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Cancer ChemotherPharmacol. 2012;70(5):637–44.
- Chow LWC, Morita S, Chow CYC, Ng WK, Toi M. Neoadjuvant palbociclib on ER+ breast cancer (N007): Clinical response and EndoPredict's value. EndocrRelat Cancer. 2018;25(2):123–30.
- 45. Da YK, Wu SY, Liu GY, Wu J, Di GH, Hu Z, et al. Concurrent neoadjuvant chemotherapy and estrogen deprivation in patients with estrogen receptor–positive, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2–negative breast cancer (CBCSG-036): A randomized, controlled, multicenter trial. Cancer. 2019;125(13):2185–93.
- Di KD, Fu RZ, Li L, Wang W, Wang SB. Association between the methylation status of PCDH17 and the efficacy of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in triple-negative breast cancer. Oncol Lett. 2020;20(2):1649–56.
- 47. Ding J, Yang Y, Jiang L, Wu W, Shao Z. Predictive factors of pathologic complete response in HER2-positive and axillary lymph node positive breast cancer after neoadjuvant paclitaxel, carboplatin plus with

trastuzumab Gao Y, Hu YJ, Yang HJ, et al. Low expression of stathmin in tumor predicts high response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy with docetaxel-containing regimens in locally advanced breast cancer. Genet Test Mol Biomarkers. 2012;16(7):689–94.

- 48. Fei F, Chen C, Xue J, Di GH, Lu JS, Liu GY, et al. Efficacy and safety of docetaxel combined with oxaliplatin as a neoadjuvant chemotherapy regimen for Chinese triple-negative local advanced breast cancer patients : A prospective, open, and unicentric phase II clinical trial. Am J Clin Oncol Cancer Clin Trials. 2013;36(6):545–51.
- 49. Gu X, Zhang Y, Chen L, Guo J, Zhang WH. Efficacy of neo-adjuvant chemotherapy with TEC regimen on breast cancer. Cancer ChemotherPharmacol. 2015;75(2):301–8.
- Hong J, Wu J, Huang O, He J, Zhu L, Chen W, et al. Early response and pathological complete remission in Breast Cancer with different molecular subtypes: A retrospective single center analysis. J Cancer. 2020;11(23):6916–24.
- 51. Huang L, Chen S, Yang W, Xu B, Huang T, Yang H, et al. Efficacy and safety analysis of trastuzumab and paclitaxel based regimen plus carboplatin or epirubicin as neoadjuvant therapy for clinical stage II-III, HER2-positive breast cancer patients: a phase 2, open-label, multicenter, randomized trial. Oncotarget. 2015;6 Available from: www. impactjournals.com/oncotarget/.
- Huang L, Chen S, Yao L, Liu G, Wu J, Shao Z. Phase II trial of weekly nab-paclitaxel and carboplatin treatment with or without trastuzumab as nonanthracycline neoadjuvant chemotherapy for locally advanced breast cancer. Int J Nanomedicine. 2015;10:1969–75.
- 53. Huang O, Chen CM, Wu JY, Chen SJ, Chen XS, Liu GY, et al. Retrospective analysis of 119 Chinese noninflammatory locally advanced breast cancer cases treated with intravenous combination of vinorelbine and epirubicin as a neoadjuvant chemotherapy: A median follow-up of 63.4 months. BMC Cancer. 2009;9:375.
- 54. Kong D, Wang M-H, Yang J, Li L. Association of T-cadherin levels with the response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in locally advanced breast cancer. Oncotarget. 2017;8:13747–53. Available from: www. impactjournals.com/oncotarget/.
- Kong Y, Dong Q, Ji H, Sang M, Ding Y, Zhao M, et al. The effect of the Leptin and leptin receptor expression on the efficacy of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer. Med Sci Monit. 2019;25:3005–13.
- Lei C, Yang C, Xia B, Ji F, Zhang Y, Gao H, et al. Analysis of Tau protein expression in predicting pathological complete response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in different molecular subtypes of breast cancer. J Breast Cancer. 2020;23(1):47–58.
- 57. Li K, Liao N, Chen B, Zhang G, Wang Y, Guo L, et al. Genetic mutation profile of Chinese HER2-positive breast cancers and genetic predictors of responses to Neoadjuvant anti-HER2 therapy. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2020;183(2):321–32.
- Li M, Zhang J, Ouyang T, Li J, Wang T, Fan Z, et al. Incidence of BRCA1 somatic mutations and response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in Chinese women with triple-negative breast cancer. Gene. 2016;584(1):26–30.
- Li S, Wei W, Jiang Y, Li Q, Huang Q, Yang H, et al. Comparison of the efficacy and survival analysis of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for Her-2-positive breast cancer. Drug Des Devel Ther. 2018;12:3085–93.
- Li XR, Liu M, Zhang YJ, Wang JD, Zheng YQ, Li J, et al. ER, PgR, HER-2, Ki-67, topoisomerase IIα, and nm23-H1 proteins expression as predictors of pathological complete response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy for locally advanced breast cancer. Med Oncol. 2011;28(SUPPL. 1).
- Li Z, Xiong Q, Tu J, Gong Y, Qiu W, Zhang H, et al. Tau proteins expressions in advanced breast cancer and its significance in taxanecontaining neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Med Oncol. 2013;30(3):591. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12032-013-0591-y.
- 62. Liu F, Li Y, Ren M, Zhang X, Guo X, Lang R, et al. Peritumoral FOXP3+ regulatory T cell is sensitive to chemotherapy while intratumoral FOXP3+ regulatory T cell is prognostic predictor of breast cancer patients. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2012;135(2):459–67.
- 63. Liu J, Wang S, Wang C, Kong X, Sun P. Prognostic value of using glucosylceramide synthase and cytochrome P450 family 1 subfamily A1 expression levels for patients with triple-negative breast cancer following neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Exp Ther Med. 2021;21(3).
- 64. Liu S, Duan X, Xu L, Ye J, Cheng Y, Liu Q, et al. Nuclear Gli1 expression is associated with pathological complete response and event-free

survival in HER2-positive breast cancer treated with trastuzumabbased neoadjuvant therapy. Tumour Biol. 2016;37(4):4873–81.

- Liu Y, Xu Z, Zhang Z, Wen G, Sun J, Han F. Efficacy and safety of TE/TEC/ intensive paclitaxel neoadjuvant chemotherapy for the treatment of breast cancer. Oncol Lett. 2019;17(1):907–12.
- Liu YX, Zhang KJ, Tang LL. Clinical significance of androgen receptor expression in triple negative breast cancer-an immunohistochemistry study. Oncol Lett. 2018;15(6):10008–16.
- Luo J, Zhou Z, Yang Z, Chen X, Cheng J, Shao Z, et al. The Value of 18F-FDG PET/CT imaging combined with pretherapeutic ki67 for early prediction of pathologic response after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in locally advanced breast cancer. Med (United States). 2016;95(8).
- Lv M, Guo H, Wang C, Tian P, Ma Y, Chen X, et al. Neoadjuvant docetaxel with or without carboplatin plus dual HER2 blockade for HER2-positive breast cancer: a retrospective multicenter Chinese study. Gland Surg. 2020;9(6):2079–90.
- Lv M, Li B, Li Y, Mao X, Yao F, Jin F. Predictive Role of Molecular Subtypes in Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer Patients in Northeast China. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2011;12:2411–7.
- Lv Y, Li Y, Mu W, Fu H. Factors Affecting Pathological Complete Response After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Operable Primary Breast Cancer. J Coll Physicians Surg Pak. 2020;30(4):389–93.
- Mou P, Wang HJ, An L, Yin Q, Chang J. RS7435335 located in the UGT2B7 gene may be a possible genetic marker for the clinical response and prognosis of breast cancer patients receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy. J Cell Biochem. 2019;120(5):7167–73.
- Nie C, Lv H, Bie L, Hou H, Chen X. Hypoxia-inducible factor 1-alpha expression correlates with response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in women with breast cancer. Med (United States). 2018;97(51).
- Shan BJ, Shen XB, Jin W, Dong MH, Han XH, Lin L, et al. Standarddoseepirubicin increases the pathological complete response rate in neoadjuvant chemotherapy for breast cancer: A multicenter retrospective study. Gland Surg. 2020;9(4):1026–35.
- 74. Shao Z, Pang D, Yang H, Li W, Wang S, Cui S, et al. Efficacy, Safety, and Tolerability of Pertuzumab, Trastuzumab, and Docetaxel for Patients with Early or Locally Advanced ERBB2-Positive Breast Cancer in Asia: The PEONY Phase 3 Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Oncol. 2020;6(3).
- Spring LM, Fell G, Arfe A, Sharma C, Greenup R, Reynolds KL, et al. Pathologic Complete Response after Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy and Impact on Breast Cancer Recurrence and Survival: A Comprehensive Meta-analysis. Clin Cancer Res. 2020;26(12):2838–48. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32046998.
- Su Y, Zheng Y, Zheng W, Gu K, Chen Z, Li G, et al. Distinct distribution and prognostic significance of molecular subtypes of breast cancer in Chinese women: a population-based cohort study. BMC Cancer. 2011;11(1):292. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2407-11-292.
- Tan Q-X, Qin Q-H, Yang W-P, Mo Q-G, Wei C-Y. Prognostic value of Ki67 expression in HR-negative breast cancer before and after neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Int J Clin Exp Pathol. 2014;7:6862–70. Available from: www.ijcep.com/.
- Tang Y, Zhu L, Li Y, Ji J, Li J, Yuan F, et al. Overexpression of epithelial growth factor receptor (EGFR) predicts better response to neo-adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with triple-negative breast cancer. J Transl Med. 2012;10(Suppl):1.
- Wan F, Dong L, Zhang F, Wang Y, Chen F, Ni S, et al. Clinical study of the relationship between γ-synuclein and the response of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer. J Int Med Res. 2013;41(3):743–53.
- Wang J, Di S, Xu B, Yuan P, Ma F, Luo Y, et al. Value of breast cancer molecular subtypes and ki67 expression for the prediction of efficacy and prognosis of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in a Chinese population. Med (United States). 2016;95(18):e3518.
- Wang J, Xu B, Yuan P, Li Q, Zhang P, Cai R, et al. HER2 as a predictive factor for successful neoadjuvant anthracycline chemotherapy of locally advanced and early breast cancer. Int J Biol Markers. 2014;29(3):e187–92.
- Wang J, Xu B, Yuan P, Zhang P, Li Q, Ma F, et al. TOP2A amplification in breast cancer is a predictive marker of anthracycline-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy efficacy. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2012;135(2):531–7.
- Wang K, Deng QT, Liao N, Zhang GC, Liu YH, Xu FP, et al. Tau expression correlated with breast cancer sensitivity to taxanes-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Tumour Biol. 2013;34(1):33–8.

- Wang LC, Wang LS, Li AX, Shi ZZ, Li YQ, Huang W, et al. Combinational Treatment of Doxorubicin With Neoadjuvant Docetaxel for Different Subtypes of Patients With Breast Cancer. Technol Cancer Res Treat. 2020;19
- Wang X, Cai L, Ye F, Li M, Ma L, Geng C, et al. Elevated expression of MTDH predicts better prognosis of locally advanced HER-2 positive breast cancer patients receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy plus trastuzumab. Med (United States). 2019;98(36).
- Wang Y, Dong T, Xuan Q, Zhao H, Qin L, Zhang Q. Lymphocyte-activation gene-3 expression and prognostic value in neoadjuvant-treated triple-negative breast cancer. J Breast Cancer. 2018;21(2):124–33.
- Wang Y, Liu H, Mao F, Jin F, Ma B, Jiang J, et al. Identifying the role of PTPN12 expression in predicting the efficacy of capecitabine to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer treatment; 2016. p. 3400–9.
- Wang Y, Xu Y, Chen J, Ouyang T, Li J, Wang T, et al. TP53 mutations are associated with higher rates of pathologic complete response to anthracycline/cyclophosphamide-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy in operable primary breast cancer. Int J Cancer. 2016;138(2):489–96.
- Wang YJ, Huang XY, Mo M, Li JW, Jia XQ, Shao ZM, et al. Serum tumor marker levels might have little significance in evaluating neoadjuvant treatment response in locally advanced breast cancer. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2015;16(11):4603–8.
- 90. Wang Z, Liu L, Li Y, Song Z, Jing Y, Fan Z, et al. Analysis of CK5/6 and EGFR and Its Effect on Prognosis of Triple Negative Breast Cancer. Front. Oncol. 2021:10.
- 91. Wu J, Li S, Jia W, Su F. Response and prognosis of taxanes and anthracyclines neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with triple-negative breast cancer. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol. 2011;137(10):1505–10.
- 92. Wu X, Tang P, Li S, Wang S, Liang Y, Zhong L, et al. A randomized and open-label phase II trial reports the efficacy of neoadjuvant lobaplatin in breast cancer. Nat Commun. 2018;9(1).
- Wu Z, Zhang L, Peng J, Xu S, Zhou L, Lin Y, et al. Predictive and prognostic value of PDL1 protein expression in breast cancer patients in neoadjuvant setting. Cancer Biol Ther. 2019;20(6):941–7.
- Wu Z, Zhang L, Xu S, Lin Y, Yin W, Lu J, et al. Predictive and prognostic value of ZEB1 protein expression in breast cancer patients with neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Cancer Cell Int. 2019;19(1).
- 95. Xie F, Chen R, Zhang L, Yin Z, Zhu Q, You S, et al. Efficacy of two-weekly nanoparticle albumin-bound paclitaxel as neoadjuvant chemotherapy for breast cancer. Nanomedicine. 2019;14(12):1595–603.
- Xu Y, Ouyang T, Li J, Wang T, Fan Z, Fan T, et al. Predictive value of BRCA1/2 mRNA expression for response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in BRCA-negative breast cancers. Cancer Sci. 2018;109(1):166–73.
- 97. Xu Y, Wang Y, Yuan C, Sheng X, Sha R, Dai H, et al. Predictive and prognostic value of EPIC1 in patients with breast cancer receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Ther Adv Med Oncol. 2020;12
- Xuhong J, Qi X, Tang P, Fan L, Chen L, Zhang F, et al. Neoadjuvant Pyrotinib plus Trastuzumab and Chemotherapy for Stage I–III HER2-Positive Breast Cancer: A Phase II Clinical Trial. Oncologist. 2020;25(12):e1909–20.
- 99. Yan H, Xiao H, Zhu J, Zhang J, Liu Z. Association between the HER2 protein expression level and the efficacy of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in HER2-positive breast cancer. Cancer Manag Res. 2020;12:12715–22.
- Yang L, Ye F, Bao L, Zhou X, Wang Z, Hu P, et al. Somatic alterations of TP53, ERBB2, PIK3CA and CCND1 are associated with chemosensitivity for breast cancers. Cancer Sci. 2019;110(4):1389–400.
- Yang M, Qu H, Liu A, Liu J, Sun P, Li H. Efficacy and safety of nanoparticle albumin-bound paclitaxel as neoadjuvant chemotherapy in HER2negative breast cancer. J Cancer Res Ther. 2019;15(7):1561–6.
- 102. Yao L, Liu Y, Li Z, Ouyang T, Li J, Wang T, et al. HER2 and response to anthracycline-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer. Ann Oncol. 2011;22(6):1326–31.
- 103. Yao L, Zhang J, Liu Y, Ouyang T, Li J, Wang T, et al. Association between HER2 status and response to neoadjuvant anthracycline followed by paclitaxel plus carboplatin chemotherapy without trastuzumab in breast cancer. Chin J Cancer Res. 2015;27(6):553–61.
- 104. Yin Y, Zhang P, Xu BH, Zhang BL, Li Q, Yuan P, et al. Unfavorable pathological complete response rate of neoadjuvant chemotherapy epirubicin plus taxanes for locally advanced triple-negative breast cancer. J Huazhong Univ Sci Technol - Med Sci. 2013;33(2):262–5.
- Yu K, Liu G, Zhou X, Zhou Y, Wu J, Chen C, et al. Association of HER-2 Copy Number and HER-2/CEP-17 Ratio with Neoadjuvant

Taxane-Containing Chemotherapy Sensitivity in Locally Advanced Breast Cancer. Oncologist. 2012;17(6):792–800.

- 106. Yuan H, Chen J, Liu Y, Ouyang T, Li J, Wang T, et al. Association of PIK3CA Mutation Status before and after Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy with Response to Chemotherapy in Women with Breast Cancer. Clin Cancer Res. 2015;21(19):4365–72.
- 107. Zhang GC, Qian XK, Guo ZB, Ren CY, Yao M, Li XR, et al. Pre-treatment hormonal receptor status and Ki67 index predict pathologic complete response to neoadjuvant trastuzumab/taxanes but not diseasefree survival in HER2-positive breast cancer patients. Med Oncol. 2012;29(5):3222–31.
- 108. Zhang P, Yin Y, Mo H, Zhang B, Wang X, Li Q, et al. Better pathologic complete response and relapse-free survival after carboplatin plus paclitaxel compared with epirubicin plus paclitaxel as neoadjuvant chemotherapy for locally advanced triple-negative breast cancer: a randomized phase 2 trial. Vol. 7. 2016. Available from: www.impactjour nals.com/oncotarget.
- 109. Zhang S, Zhang C, Liu J, Qin L, Cui S, Zhang J. A Phase II trial of Zoladex combined with CEF chemotherapy as neoadjuvant therapy in premenopausal women with hormone-responsive, operable breast cancer. Med Oncol. 2012;29(2):479–85.
- 110. Zhang W, Tian H, Yang SH. The Efficacy of Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy for HER-2-Positive Locally Advanced Breast Cancer and Survival Analysis. Anal Cell Pathol. 2017;2017
- 111. Zhang Z, Zhang W, Jin Y, Wang H, Gu F, Zhou J, et al. Evaluating the response of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for treatment of breast cancer: Are tumor biomarkers and dynamic contrast enhanced MR images useful predictive tools? J Thorac Dis. 2014;6(6):785–94.
- 112. Zhao YC, Wang Y, Ni XJ, Li Y, Wang XM, Zhu YY, et al. Clinical significance of Smac and survivin expression in breast cancer patients treated with anthracycline-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Mol Med Rep. 2014;9(2):614–20.
- 113. Zheng Y, Li S, Boohaker RJ, Liu X, Zhu Y, Zhai L, et al. A microRNA expression signature in taxane-anthracycline-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy response. J Cancer. 2015;6(7):671–7.
- 114. Zhou L, Xu S, Yin W, Lin Y, Du Y, Jiang Y, et al. Weekly paclitaxel and cisplatin as neoadjuvant chemotherapy with locally advanced breast cancer: a prospective, single arm, phase II study. Oncotarget. 2017;8:79305–14. Available from: www.impactjournals.com/oncot arget/.
- 115. Zhu T, Liu CL, Zhang YF, Liu YH, Xu FP, Zu J, et al. A phase II trial of dose-dense (biweekly) paclitaxel plus carboplatin as neoadjuvant chemotherapy for operable breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2016;156(1):117–24.
- 116. Chiu JW, Leung R, Tang V, Cheuk WY, Lo J, Kwok GW, et al. Changing pattern of recurrences in patients with early HER2-positive breast cancer receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy in the era of dual anti-HER2 therapy. Postgrad Med J. 2019;
- Man VCM, Cheung PSY. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy increases rates of breast-conserving surgery in early operable breast cancer. Hong Kong Med J. 2017;23(3):251–7.
- 118. Park JH, Kang MJ, Ahn JH, Kim JE, Jung KH, Gong G, et al. Phase II trial of neoadjuvant letrozole and lapatinib in Asian postmenopausal women with estrogen receptor (ER) and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2)-positive breast cancer [Neo-ALL-IN]: Highlighting the TILs, ER expressional change after ne. Cancer ChemotherPharmacol. 2016;78(4):685–95.
- 119. Hasegawa Y, Tanino H, Horiguchi J, Miura D, Ishikawa T, Hayashi M, et al. Randomized controlled trial of zoledronic acid plus chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone as neoadjuvant treatment of HER2-negative primary breast cancer (JONIE Study). PLoS One. 2015;10(12).
- 120. Ishikawa T, Narui K, Tanabe M, Kida K, Oba MS, Yamada A, et al. BRCAness is beneficial for indicating triple negative breast cancer patients resistant to taxane. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2016;42(7):999–1001.
- 121. Sugitani I, Ueda S, Sakurai T, Shigekawa T, Hirokawa E, Shimada H, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with trastuzumab, docetaxel, and carboplatin administered every 3 weeks for Japanese women with HER2-positive primary breast cancer: efficacy and safety. Int J Clin Oncol. 2017;22(5):880–6.
- 122. Teraoka S, Sato E, Narui K, Yamada A, Fujita T, Yamada K, et al. Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy With Anthracycline-Based Regimen

for BRCAnessTumors in Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. J Surg Res. 2020;250:143–7.

- 123. Mohammed AA, Elsayed FM, Algazar M, Rashed HE, Anter AH. Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy In Triple Negative Breast Cancer: Correlation Between Androgen Receptor Expression And Pathological Response. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2020;21(2):563–8.
- 124. Mohammadianpanah M, Ashouri Y, Hoseini S, Amadloo N, Talei A, Tahmasebi S, et al. The efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant chemotherapy +/2 letrozole in postmenopausal women with locally advanced breast cancer: A randomized phase III clinical trial. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2012;132(3):853–61.
- 125. Duman BB, Afşar CU, Günaldi M, Sahin B, Kara IO, Erkisi M, et al. Retrospective analysis of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for breast cancer in Turkish patients. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2012;13(8):4119–23.
- 126. Salim DK, Mutlu H, Eryilmaz MK, Musri FY, Tural D, Gunduz S, et al. Molecular types and neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with breast cancer - while molecular shifting is more common in luminal a tumors, the pathologic complete response is most frequently observed in Her-2 like tumors. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2014;15(21):9379–83.
- 127. Elnemr GM, El-Rashidy AH, Osman AH, Issa LF, Abbas OA, Al-Zahrani AS, et al. Response of triple negative breast cancer to neoadjuvant chemotherapy: Correlation between Ki-67 expression and pathological response. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2016;17(2):807–13.
- 128. Elsamany S, Elemam O, Elmorsy S, Alzahrani A, Abbas MM. Predictive value of the pattern of β -catenin expression for pathological response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer patients. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2016;17(8):4091–5.
- 129. Elsamany S, Elmorsy S, Alzahrani A, Rasmy A, Abozeed WN, Mohammed AA, et al. Predictive value of IHC4 score for pathological response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in hormone receptor-positive breast cancer. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2015;16(17):7975–9.
- Lim LY, Miao H, Lim JSJ, Lee SC, Bhoo-Pathy N, Yip CH, et al. Outcome after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in Asian breast cancer patients. Cancer Med. 2017;6(1):173–85.
- 132. Tewari M, Pradhan S, Singh U, Singh TB, Shukla HS. Assessment of Predictive Markers of Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer. Asian Journal of Surgery. 2010;33
- 133. The jamovi project. jamovi. 2022. Available from: https://www.jamovi. org.
- NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology-Breast Cancer. Available from: https://www.nccn.org/guidelines/recently-published-guidelines.
- 135. Pandy JGP, Balolong-Garcia JC, Cruz-Ordinario MVB, Que FVF. Triple negative breast cancer and platinum-based systemic treatment: a meta-analysis and systematic review. BMC Cancer. 2019;19(1):1065. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31703646.
- 136. Yin L, Duan JJ, Bian XW, Yu SC. Triple-negative breast cancer molecular subtyping and treatment progress. Breast Cancer Res. 2020;22
- Bianchini G, Balko JM, Mayer IA, Sanders ME, Gianni L. Triple-negative breast cancer: challenges and opportunities of a heterogeneous disease. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2016;13(11):674–90. Available from: https:// pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27184417.
- 138. Fornier M, Fumoleau P. The Paradox of Triple Negative Breast Cancer: Novel Approaches to Treatment. Breast J. 2012;18(1):41–51. https://doi. org/10.1111/j.1524-4741.2011.01175.x.
- Godoy-Ortiz A, Sanchez-Muñoz A, Parrado MRC, Álvarez M, Ribelles N, Dominguez AR, et al. Deciphering her2 breast cancer disease: Biological and clinical implications. Front. Oncol. 2019;9(OCT).
- Wang J, Xu B. Targeted therapeutic options and future perspectives for her2-positive breast cancer. Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy. 2019;4
- 141. Yersal O, Barutca S. Biological subtypes of breast cancer: Prognostic and therapeutic implications. World Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2014;5
- Gao JJ, Swain SM. Luminal A Breast Cancer and Molecular Assays: A Review. Oncologist. 2018;23(5):556–65. Available from: https://pubmed. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29472313.
- 143. Li ZH, Hu PH, Tu JH, Yu NS. Luminal B breast cancer: Patterns of recurrence and clinical outcome. Oncotarget. 2016;7(40).

- 144. Łukasiewicz S, Czeczelewski M, Forma A, Baj J, Sitarz R, Stanisławek A. Breast Cancer-Epidemiology, Risk Factors, Classification, Prognostic Markers, and Current Treatment Strategies-An Updated Review. Cancers (Basel). 2021;13(17):4287. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih. gov/34503097.
- 145. Nielsen TO, Leung SCY, Rimm DL, Dodson A, Acs B, Badve S, et al. Assessment of Ki67 in Breast Cancer: Updated Recommendations From the International Ki67 in Breast Cancer Working Group. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2021;113(7):808–19. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih. gov/33369635.
- 146. Darlix A, Hirtz C, Thezenas S, Maceski A, Gabelle A, Lopez-Crapez E, et al. The prognostic value of the Tau protein serum level in metastatic breast cancer patients and its correlation with brain metastases. BMC Cancer. 2019;19(1):110. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-019-5287-z.
- 147. Loibl S, Majewski I, Guarneri V, Nekljudova V, Holmes E, Bria E, et al. PIK3CA mutations are associated with reduced pathological complete response rates in primary HER2-positive breast cancer: pooled analysis of 967 patients from five prospective trials investigating lapatinib and trastuzumab. Ann Oncol Off J Eur Soc Med Oncol. 2016;27(8):1519–25. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27177864.
- Feng Y, Spezia M, Huang S, Yuan C, Zeng Z, Zhang L, et al. Breast cancer development and progression: Risk factors, cancer stem cells, signaling pathways, genomics, and molecular pathogenesis. Genes Dis. 2018;5(2):77–106. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ 30258937.
- Chang D-Y, Ma W-L, Lu Y-S. Role of Alpelisib in the Treatment of PIK3CA-Mutated Breast Cancer: Patient Selection and Clinical Perspectives. Ther Clin Risk Manag. 2021;17:193–207. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi. nlm.nih.gov/33707948.
- Cho YA, Ko SY, Suh YJ, Kim S, Park JH, Park H-R, et al. PIK3CA Mutation as Potential Poor Prognostic Marker in Asian Female Breast Cancer Patients Who Received Adjuvant Chemotherapy. Curr Oncol. 2022;29(5):2895– 908. Available from: https://www.mdpi.com/1718-7729/29/5/236.
- Shahbandi A, Nguyen HD, Jackson JG. TP53 Mutations and Outcomes in Breast Cancer: Reading beyond the Headlines. Trends in cancer. 2020;6(2):98–110. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ 32061310.
- Andrikopoulou A, Terpos E, Chatzinikolaou S, Apostolidou K, Ntanasis-Stathopoulos I, Gavriatopoulou M, et al. TP53 mutations determined by targeted NGS in breast cancer: a case-control study. Oncotarget. 2021;12(21):2206–14. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ 34676052.
- 153. The Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Version 5. Higgins J, Green S, editors. 2011. Available from: www.handbook.cochrane.org.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.