An Immune Gene Signature for Prediction of Overall Survival and Response to Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors Therapy in Patients with Lung Adenocarcinoma

Hongquan Chen

Fujian Medical University

Renxi Lin

Fujian Medical University

Weibin Lin

Fujian Medical University

Qing Chen

Fujian Medical University

Dongjie Ye

Fujian Medical University

Jing Li

Fujian Medical University

Jinan Feng

Fujian Medical University

Wenxiu Cheng

Fujian Medical University

Mingfang Zhang

Fujian Medical University

Yuanlin Qi (✉ ylqi@fjmu.edu.cn)

Fujian Medical University

Research Article

Keywords: lung adenocarcinoma, immune gene signature, prognosis, immune microenvironment, tumor immunotherapy

Posted Date: January 31st, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1264781/v1>

Abstract

Lung adenocarcinoma is one of the most common malignant tumors worldwide. The purpose of this study was to construct a stable immune gene signature for prediction of prognosis (IGSPP) and response to immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) therapy in LUAD patients. Five genes were screened by weighted gene coexpression network analysis, Cox regression and LASSO regression analyses and were used to construct the IGSPP. The survival rate of the IGSPP low-risk group was higher than that of the IGSPP high-risk group. Multivariate Cox regression analysis showed that IGSPP could be used as an independent prognostic factor for the overall survival of LUAD patients. IGSPP genes were enriched in cell cycle pathways. IGSPP gene mutation rates were higher in the high-risk group. CD4 memory-activated T cells, M0 and M1 macrophages had higher infiltration abundance in the high-risk group, which was associated with poor overall survival. In contrast, the abundance of resting CD4 memory T cells, monocytes, resting dendritic cells and resting mast cells associated with a better prognosis was higher in the low-risk group. TIDE scores and the expressions of different immune checkpoints showed that patients in the high-risk IGSPP group benefited more from ICIs treatment. In short, an IGSPP of LUAD was constructed and characterized. It could be used to predict the prognosis and benefits of ICIs treatment in LUAD patients.

Introduction

Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer death worldwide. According to global tumor statistics in 2018, the fatality rate of lung cancer accounts for 18.4% of the total cancer deaths¹. Lung cancer can be divided into small cell lung cancer (SCLC) and non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC). NSCLC accounts for approximately 85% of all lung cancers². It can be divided into lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and lung squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC) based on its pathological characteristics. LUAD is the most common type of non-small-cell lung cancer³. It is difficult to diagnose LUAD in the early stage, and thus it is usually diagnosed in the late stage. The five-year survival rate of patients with lung adenocarcinoma is very low⁴. Therefore, there is an urgent need for a new index to predict the survival rate and guide the clinical management of patients with lung adenocarcinoma.

In recent years, immunotherapy has become a hot spot in the treatment of lung adenocarcinoma⁵. Cancer immunotherapy overcomes tumor immune escape and reactivates the antitumor immune response by regulating the immune system⁶. Early methods of cancer immunotherapy targeted cytokines that affect the function of immune cells⁷, while the new generation of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) therapy targets immune checkpoint molecules, including cytotoxic T lymphocyte antigen-4 (CTLA-4), programmed cell death protein 1 (PD-1) and PD-1 ligand (PD-L1)⁸. ICIs therapy improves the survival rate of patients with NSCLC. However, compared with LUSC patients, LUAD patients have a lower response to ICIs therapy, and only some patients can benefit from immunotherapy⁹. The effect of ICIs treatment can be modulated by many factors, including the tumor microenvironment (TME). Analysis of the TME is helpful to improve the effect of cancer immunotherapy and the prognosis¹⁰. Therefore, it is urgent to construct an immune gene marker to predict the efficacy and prognosis of LUAD immunotherapy.

Several prognostic biomarkers of LUAD have been established^{11–14}. In this study, we developed a new immune gene marker that can predict the response to conventional therapy and immunotherapy. By using weighted gene coexpression network analysis (WGCNA), immune hub genes related to LUAD patient prognosis and an immune gene signature for prediction of prognosis (IGSPP) were constructed. The relationships between IGSPP, the pathological features and the overall survival of LUAD patients were then studied. The molecular and immune characteristics of IGSPP were analyzed. The prognostic ability of IGSPP in patients with immunotherapy was detected and compared with other prediction models. We hope that this IGSPP can be used as a new prognostic biomarker for patients with LUAD.

Methods

Data collection

RNA-seq data and related clinical information of 535 LUAD samples and 59 para-cancer samples were downloaded from the TCGA database (<https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/>). Samples with an unknown total survival time were excluded. The RNA-seq data and clinical information of 1134 LUAD patient samples (dataset GSE68465, GSE30219, GSE72094) were downloaded from the GEO database (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/>). All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations. Immune-related gene (IRG) lists were downloaded from the ImmPort (<https://www.immport.org/home>) and InnateBD (<https://www.innatedb.ca/>) databases.

Screening of immune hub genes

Gene expression data of 535 TCGA LUAD samples were extracted by Strawberry Perl (version 5.32.1.1). Differentially expressed genes (DEGs, $|\log_2FC| > 1$, $q\text{-value} < 0.05$) between tumors and para-cancer tissues were screened by using the R package "limma". A list of differentially expressed Immune-related gene (DEIRGs) was then obtained by intersecting the DEG and IRG lists.

WGCNA can be used to find clusters of highly related genes. We used WGCNA to find immune gene sets related to the LUAD patient prognosis and then constructed a similarity matrix based on our DEIRG expression data. The scale independence and average connectivity of the networks were tested with different power values (1~10). The appropriate power value was determined when the independent scale was greater than 0.85 and the connectivity was high. Then, the similarity matrix was transformed into a topological matrix with the topological overlap measure (TOM) describing the correlation between genes. The genes were clustered by using 1-TOM as the distance. The dynamic pruning tree was built, and the merging threshold function was set to 0.25 for module identification. Finally, the module with the highest correlation with the clinical features was selected as the key module. This module was used to identify immune-related hub genes¹⁵.

Construction of IGSPP

We used the TCGA dataset as a training cohort and three GEO dataset (GSE68465, GSE30219, GSE72094) as validation cohorts (Table 1). The TCGA cohort was used to identify prognostic immune genes and to establish a prognostic-immune risk model. Three GEO cohorts were used to validate the predictive ability of the risk model. We used the R package "survival" to analyze hub genes in the TCGA cohort by using univariate Cox regression and then screened candidate genes significantly related to overall survival (OS). We used Kaplan–Meier (KM) plots to visualize the survival curves. Candidate genes were then integrated into least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) regression. To prevent overfitting of the model, the R package "glmnet" was used to find the best gene model. Multivariate Cox regression analysis was then carried out, and the R package "survival" was used to identify genes significantly affecting OS. These genes were used to construct IGSP. The risk scores of each sample in the TCGA and GEO cohorts were calculated according to the Cox regression coefficients and gene expression¹⁶.

According to the median risk score, the samples were divided into high-risk groups (TCGA cohort, n=252; GSE68465 cohort, n=209; GSE30219 cohort, n=200; GSE72094 cohort, n=190) and low-risk groups (TCGA cohort, n=252; GSE68465 cohort, n=233; GSE30219 cohort, n=93; GSE72094 cohort, n=208). KM survival curves were used to compare the OS between subgroups. Time-dependent ROC curves were drawn by using the R package "timeROC" according to the risk scores. The area under the curve (AUC) was calculated to verify the accuracy and prediction ability of the model. Univariate and multivariate Cox regression analyses were performed to verify the independent prognostic value of IGSP and explore the potential clinicopathological factors related to the prognosis. A nomogram was constructed by the R package "rms", and the predictive variables in multivariate analysis were used. Calibration curves were used to evaluate the consistency between the predictions and the actual survival results.

Enrichment analysis

Gene ontology (GO) and Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) were analyzed by using the R package "clusterProfiler" (filtering condition: q-value <0.05) to study the possible molecular mechanism of DEIRGs. The GO terms included biological process (BP), molecular function (MF) and cellular component (CC)¹⁷. The enrichment results were visualized with the R package "ggplot2".

Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) was used to analyze the enrichment differences of the functionally annotated gene sets according to the expression data. To explore the molecular mechanism of the difference in prognosis between the IGSP subgroups, we used the R packages "limma" and "clusterProfiler" to analyze the GSEA enrichment in the hallmark gene sets (h.all.v7.4.symbols.gmt) and the KEGG subsets of the canonical pathway gene sets (c2.cp.kegg.v7.4.symbols.gmt).

Tumor mutation burden assay

Mutation data of LUAD patients were downloaded from the TCGA portal (<https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/>). Tumor mutation burden (TMB) was calculated by Strawberry Perl. Mutations of all 30 DEIRGs related to OS were visualized by the R package "maftools". Gene mutation data of the IGSP subgroups were also

extracted by Perl. Ten genes with the highest mutation frequency in the IGSP subgroups were then visualized as waterfall charts by the R package "maftools". The correlations between TMB and the IGSP risk score were analyzed. KM survival curves were used to show the effects of TMB on the survival rate on the IGSP subgroups.

Tumor immune microenvironment analysis

We used the CIBERSORT algorithm to estimate the immune cell infiltration¹⁸. According to the expression matrix of the TCGA cohort, the infiltration of 22 kinds of immune cells in 535 samples of LUAD patients was estimated. The relative ratios of the 22 types of immune cells between IGSP subgroups were compared.

To further determine the immune and molecular characteristics between IGSP subgroups, single sample GSEA (ssGSEA) was performed on certain gene signatures, and the scores between two IGSP subgroups were compared by using the R package "GSVA"¹⁹.

Analysis of the prognostic value of IGSP after ICIs therapy

Tumor immune dysfunction and exclusion (TIDE) score files of LUAD patients were downloaded from the TIDE website (<http://tide.dfci.harvard.edu>). The R package "limma" was used to analyze the differences among the IGSP subgroups. We calculated the tumor inflammation signature (TIS) score of the LUAD sample of the TCGA cohort. Time ROC curves were drawn according to the IGSP risk score, TIDE and TIS score by using the R package "timeROC" to verify the accuracy of the prediction by our IGSP model.

Cell Lines and Reagents

Human lung cancer cell lines (A549, H1299, PC9, H292, H1975) and human bronchial epithelial cell lines (Beas-2B) were purchased from the National Collection of Authenticated Cell Cultures (<https://www.cellbank.org.cn>, Shanghai, China). Cells were cultured in RPMI-1640 or F-12K medium (HyClone, Beijing, China) containing 10% fetal bovine serum (Ausbio, Australia) at 37°C and 5% CO₂, according to manufacturer's instructions.

RNA extraction and real-time quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR)

Total RNA were extracted from cultured cells by TRIzol (Invitrogen, Shanghai, China). Reverse transcription reactions were then performed by using a first-strand cDNA synthesis kit (Novoprotein, Shanghai, China). Real-time PCR system was configured according to an ABI SYBR Green Master Mix (Applied Biosystems, USA), and the mRNA expressions of IGSP genes were detected by using a real-time fluorescent quantitative PCR instrument (QuantStudio 3, Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). $2^{-\Delta\Delta C_t}$ method was used to calculate the relative expression levels of the IGSP candidate genes²⁰. GAPDH was used as an internal reference. Primers used in RT-qPCR were listed in Supplementary Table 1.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were carried out with R 4.1.0 (<https://www.R-project.org>) and GraphPad Prism 8.0 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA, USA). The differences in continuous variables between the two groups were tested by independent t-tests or nonparametric Wilcoxon tests. Categorical data were tested by chi-square tests. Univariate and multivariate Cox regression analyses were used to evaluate the effects of immune and clinicopathological factors on the prognosis of patients with LUAD. The Kaplan–Meier method and log-rank test were used for survival analysis. A two-sided p value < 0.05 was considered significant.

Results

Screening and characteristics of immune-related hub genes

RNA sequencing data of 535 lung adenocarcinoma tissues and 59 normal tissues from the TCGA database were analyzed, and a total of 8191 differentially expressed genes (DEGs) (Table S2) were obtained. Among them, 6317 genes were upregulated and 1874 genes were downregulated (Fig. 1A). By overlapping DEGs and immune-related genes (IRGs) from ImmPort and InnateDB, 681 differentially expressed immune-related genes (DEIRGs) were obtained (Table S3). There were 258 downregulated and 423 upregulated genes among them (Fig. 1B).

GO analysis showed that the DEIRGs were enriched in humoral immune response, complement activation, B cell-mediated immunity, immunoglobulin-mediated immune response, and adaptive immune response based on somatic recombination of immune receptors built from immunoglobulin superfamily domains (Fig. 1C, Table S4). KEGG analysis showed that the DEIRGs were enriched in cytokine-cytokine receptor interaction, viral protein interaction with cytokines and cytokine receptors, neuroactive ligand-receptor interaction, chemokine signal pathway, JAK-STAT signal pathway, IL-17 signal pathway, rheumatoid arthritis and complement and coagulation cascade (Fig. 1D, Table S5).

To identify the module most related to prognosis, we performed WGCNA on the obtained DEIRGs. The optimal soft-thresholding power was 4 based on the scale-free network (Fig. 2A, 2B). Four modules were determined according to the average linkage hierarchical clustering and the optimal soft-thresholding power. The DEIRGs obtained above were allocated to four modules. According to the Pearson correlation coefficient between the module and the sample characteristics of each module, the turquoise module was found to be closely related to the prognosis of LUAD tumors (Fig. 2C, 2D). Therefore, we identified the turquoise module as the key module. A total of 263 genes in the turquoise module were selected for GO and KEGG analysis. Based on the p value, the top 10 enriched GO terms of BP, MF and CC (Fig. 2E) and the top 30 KEGG pathways are shown (Fig. 2F). For more information, please see Tables S6 and S7 .

The expression of turquoise module genes was extracted from the TCGA, GSE68465, GSE30219, GSE72094 datasets. A total of 210 intersecting genes were obtained. With a p value < 0.01 as the filtering condition, 30 DEIRGs related to OS were screened by univariate Cox analysis in the TCGA cohort (Fig. 3). We also analyzed the mutations of these 30 DEIRGs. Most of these genes had missense mutations, but

the mutation rate was no more than 5% (Fig. 4A). To determine the independent prognostic genes, LASSO regression and multivariate Cox regression analyses were performed with the 30 DEIRGs obtained above (Fig. 4B, 4C). As shown in Figure 4D, five genes (ANGPTL4, LIFR, SHC3, PLK1 and C6) were obtained and used to construct a prognostic index. IGSP was constructed by multiplying the expression level of these genes by the Cox regression coefficient. The formula was $IGSP = \text{expression level of ANGPTL4} * 0.14 + \text{expression level of LIFR} * (-0.22) + \text{expression level of SHC3} * (-0.16) + \text{expression level of PLK1} * 0.19 + \text{expression level of C6} * (-0.23)$.

mRNA expressions of five IGSP genes in cultured lung carcinoma cells

RT-qPCR was used to compare the expression levels of five genes used to construct IGSP between five lung carcinoma cells and bronchial epithelial cell Beas-2B. Compared with the normal bronchial epithelial cell Beas-2B, the expression levels of ANGPTL4 is up-regulated in A549 and H1975 cells (Fig. 5A), PLK1 is up-regulated in A549, H292 and H1975 cells (Fig. 5B), SHC3 is down-regulated in A549 and H1299 cells (Fig. 5C), LIFR is down-regulated in all five cells (Fig. 5D), C6 is down-regulated in A549, H1299, PC9, and H292 cells (Fig. 5E). In general, the expression patterns of IGSP genes in cultured lung carcinoma cells and LUAD tissues were consistent with TCGA data.

IGSP can predict the survival of LUAD patients

LUAD patients in the TCGA training cohort were divided into a low-risk group and a high-risk group according to the median risk score calculated by the IGSP formula. As shown in Figure 6A, the survival of the high-risk group of TCGA was significantly lower than that of the low-risk group ($p < 0.001$). IGSP time-dependent ROC curves showed that the areas under the curves (AUCs) of IGSP were 0.677, 0.691 and 0.661 for 1-, 3- and 5-year overall survival (OS), respectively (Fig. 6B). This result showed that the IGSP we constructed had potential for monitoring survival. We ranked the risk score of each patient in the TCGA training cohort and used a dot map to show the survival status of the patient. As shown in Figure 6C, the higher the risk score, the shorter the survival time. A heatmap describing the expression pattern of the DEIRGs in both subgroups was constructed. We further verified the predictive ability of IGSP in the GSE68465 (Fig. 6D-F), GSE30219 (Fig.S1A-C) and GSE72094 (Fig.S1D-F) validation cohorts. The results of the validation cohort were highly consistent with those of the training cohorts. Therefore, the IGSP had high accuracy in predicting OS in LUAD patients.

We evaluated the impact of clinicopathological factors and prognostic model risk scores on the OS of LUAD patients by performing univariate Cox regression analysis on the TCGA training cohort (Fig. 7A). Tumor stage and patient risk score were adverse factors of OS. We also performed multivariate Cox regression analysis (Fig. 7B). This confirmed that IGSP could be used as an independent prognostic factor in LUAD patients after adjusting for other clinicopathological factors. To improve the prediction of survival of LUAD patients, we constructed a nomogram model of the TCGA cohort to quantitatively evaluate the OS of individual patients according to the variables related to OS (age, sex, tumor invasion, lymph node metastasis, distant metastasis and risk score) (Fig. 7C). Each patient received a total score

from each prognostic parameter. The higher the total score, the lower the survival. The calibration curve of the prognostic nomogram showed good consistency between the prediction of the TCGA cohort and the actual 1-, 3- and 5-year survival rates (Fig. 7D). This result was further verified in the GSE68465 (Fig. S2A-D), GSE30219 (Fig.S3A-D) and GSE72094 (Fig.S4A-D) validation cohorts.

We used the chi-square test to analyze the correlation between IGSP risk scores and a variety of clinicopathological factors in the TCGA cohort. Correlations between tumor pathological stage, tumor invasion, lymph node metastasis, sex and age and the risk score of the patients were observed (Fig. S5A). We also analyzed the effect of IGSP risk scores on the prognosis of patients with different clinical characteristics. We found that the OS of patients with high risk was lower than that of patients with low risk in different stages (Fig. S5B).

Molecular characteristics of the different groups of IGSP

We carried out GSEA on different IGSP subgroups to determine the enriched gene sets. The gene sets of the IGSP high-risk subgroup were significantly enriched in cell cycle pathways, such as "Cell cycle", "DNA replication", "G2 M checkpoint" and "E2F targets" (Fig. 8A, 8B). This suggested that the cell cycle progression of LUAD patients in the high-risk IGSP group was accelerated, which may lead to excessive proliferation of tumor cells. The gene sets in the low-risk group were significantly enriched in substance metabolism pathways (Fig. 8C). The detailed results of GSEA are listed in Tables S8 and S9.

Gene mutation analysis showed that the mutation rate of the IGSP high-risk group was significantly higher than that of the IGSP low-risk group. Missense mutations were the most frequent mutation type, followed by multipoint mutations. We visualized the top ten genes with the highest mutation rate. The mutation rates of TP53, TTN, MUC16, RYR2, CSMD3, LRP1B, ZFHX4, USH2A, KRAS, and XIRP2 were all more than 15% in both IGSP subgroups (Fig. 8D, 8E). We also explored the correlation between the tumor mutation burden (TMB) and IGSP risk score. The IGSP risk score was positively correlated with TMB (Fig. 8F). The effect of TMB on the prognosis of LUAD patients is shown as a KM survival curve. The results showed that there was no significant correlation between TMB and OS ($p=0.966$) (Fig. 8G).

Immune characteristics of different groups of IGSP

CIBERSORT is a tool for assessing immune cell infiltration. We used it to assess the relative proportion of 22 immune cells in all LUAD cases. CD4 memory activated T cells, activated NK cells, M0 macrophages, M1 macrophages and activated mast cells were more abundant in the high-risk subgroup of IGSP, while CD4 memory resting T cells, monocytes, resting dendritic cells and resting mast cells were more abundant in the low-risk subgroup of IGSP (Fig. 9A). The content of immune cells in the high-risk group of IGSP is shown in Figure 9B.

We also discussed the prognostic value of 22 kinds of immune cells. Among them, the infiltration abundance of naive B cells, plasma cells, resting CD4 memory T cells, activated CD4 memory T cells, regulatory T cells (Tregs), monocytes, M0 macrophages, M1 macrophages, resting dendritic cells, activated dendritic cells, resting mast cells and neutrophils was significantly correlated with OS. The

higher the infiltration abundance of naive B cells, resting dendritic cells, resting mast cells, monocytes, plasma cells, resting memory CD4 T cells and regulatory T cells (Tregs), the better the prognosis, while the higher the infiltration abundance of activated dendritic cells, M0 macrophages, M1 macrophages, neutrophils and memory CD4 T cells, the worse the prognosis (Fig. S6). It seems that IGSP is related to the infiltration levels of most immune cells and that IGSP reflects the state of the tumor immune microenvironment.

We used ssGESA to analyze the differences in immune functions among the IGSP subgroups. As shown in Figure 10A, inflammation-promoting, MHC class I, NK cells and Th2 cells had higher scores in the IGSP high-risk group, while aDCs, B cells, DCs, HLA, iDCs, mast cells, neutrophils, T helper cells, TILs and type II IFN response had higher scores in the IGSP low-risk group. We also explored the effects of immune functions on prognosis. In a total of 20 immune functions related to prognosis, 18 of them had a positive correlation with the prognosis of LUAD patients, while the other two had a negative correlation with the prognosis (Fig. 10B).

Six immune subtypes of cancer, including C1 (wound healing), C2 (IFN- γ dominant), C3 (inflammatory), C4 (lymphocyte depleted), C5 (immunologically quiet) and C6 (TGF- γ dominant), were identified to define immune response patterns impacting the prognosis²¹. We analyzed the distribution of various IS in different IGSP subgroups by the chi-square test. We found that the distributions of immune subtypes in the high- and low-risk groups were significant ($p = 0.001$) (Fig. S7).

Benefits of ICIs treatment in IGSP subgroups

We used tumor immune dysfunction and exclusion (TIDE) to evaluate the potential clinical efficacy of ICIs therapy in IGSP subgroups²². The results showed that the TIDE score of the IGSP high-risk subgroup was lower than that of the low-risk subgroup. This means that patients within the IGSP high-risk group would benefit more from ICIs treatment than those in the IGSP low-risk group (Fig. 11A). In addition, we analyzed the relationship between the IGSP subgroups and microsatellite instability (MSI), T cell exclusion and T cell dysfunction scores. We found that microsatellite instability (MSI) and T cell exclusion scores were higher in the high-risk IGSP group (Fig. 11B, 11C), while T cell dysfunction scores were higher in the low-risk IGSP group (Fig. 11D).

The tumor inflammation signature (TIS) measures pre-existing but suppressed adaptive immune responses in tumors with an 18-gene signature, including genes associated with antigen presentation, chemokine expression, cytotoxic activity, and adaptive immune resistance²³. We extracted TIS gene expression from TCGA LUAD patients and drew 1-, 3- and 5-year ROC curves based on TIS and TIDE scores. We compared these curves with our IGSP time ROC curves. As shown in Figure 11E-G, the predictive ability of IGSP was significantly better than those of TIDE and TIS in the TCGA cohort.

Expressions of Different Immune Checkpoints in IGSP subgroups

We compared the expressions of a group of co-stimulatory and/or co-inhibitory receptors of T cells as well as their ligands between IGSP subgroups. As shown in Fig. 12, the mRNA expressions of co-inhibitory receptors/ligands, such as PD-1, LAG3, CD155, CD112, and BTLA, and co-stimulatory receptors/ligands, such as GITR, OX40, OX40L, 4-1BB, and 4-1BBL were higher in the high-risk subgroup. These results further suggested that patients in the high-risk subgroup should be more likely to benefit from ICIs therapy, not only in PD-1/PD-L1 treatment, but also in agents targeting emerging immune checkpoints, such as LAG3, GITR and OX40.

Discussion

The oncogenesis and development of lung cancer depend not only on the changes in cancer genomes and the molecular characteristics of cancer cells but also on their interaction with the tumor environment, especially with the immune system⁵. Clinical applications of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs), especially PD-1/PD-L1 antibodies, have improved the treatment of a variety of cancers, including NSCLCs^{24,25}. The development of ICIs is also considered to be a milestone in immune oncology. However, the proportion of LUAD patients benefiting from ICIs is 25% lower than that of LUSC patients²⁶. Novel biomarkers have been studied to predict the response of LUAD patients to ICIs therapy and further promote accurate immunotherapy²⁷.

In this study, we integrated TCGA expression data and immune-related gene data and obtained 681 DEIRGs. Then, we used WGCNA and Cox regression analysis to screen DEIRGs related to the prognosis of LUAD patients. Finally, five genes were identified by LASSO and multivariate Cox regression analysis. These genes were used to construct the IGSP. The prognostic value of the IGSP was assessed in the TCGA training cohort and GEO validation cohort. The prognosis of patients within the IGSP low-risk subgroup was better than that of patients within the IGSP high-risk subgroup. IGSP has been shown to be an immune-related biomarker. Its predictive value is reliable and accurate.

Five genes, including ANGPTL4, LIFR, SHC3, PLK1 and C6, were used to construct the IGSP. Among them, ANGPTL4 and PLK1 are adverse prognostic genes in LUAD patients, while LIFR, SHC3 and C6 are favorable prognostic genes. ANGPTL4 has been identified as an oncogene in papillary thyroid carcinoma (PTC). Upregulation of ANGPTL4 promotes PTC cell proliferation and reduces PTC cell cycle arrest²⁸. Overexpression of PLK1 promotes the proliferation of renal cell carcinoma (RCC) cells and inhibits apoptosis²⁹. It also promotes the migration and invasion of NSCLC cells, thus reducing the survival rate of NSCLC patients³⁰. PLK1 has also been confirmed as a key regulatory protein of the cell cycle³¹. In contrast, overexpression of LIFR in hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) and breast cancer (BC) inhibited cancer cell migration and invasion in vivo and in vitro^{32,33}. SHC3 has been used to construct other prognostic biomarkers in NSCLC³⁴. NSCLC patients with higher expression of SHC3 have a better prognosis. This result is in agreement with our analysis. However, a higher expression level of SHC3 in HCC promotes the migration and invasion of HCC cells, leading to a worse prognosis of HCC patients³⁵. It seems that SHC3 has different functions in various tumors. C6 is the sixth component of complement.

Patients with C6 deficiency are susceptible to infection with *Neisseria meningitidis*³⁶. C6 deficiency is common among African Americans in the southeastern United States³⁷. However, there are few studies on the functions of complement C6 in lung cancer.

We verified the expression levels of five genes used to construct IGSP in cultured lung cancer cell lines. The expression levels of these five genes in lung cancer cell lines are consistent with the results of our analysis. Since the expression levels of genes in each lung cancer cell line are different, the expression levels of genes in these five lung cancer cell lines are not all the same.

Abnormal cell proliferation is one of the most important phenomena of cancer³⁸. Recent studies have shown that cell cycle-related genes are strongly associated with the prognosis of many malignant tumors. It is possible to evaluate tumor immunogenicity and response to ICIs therapy by analyzing cell cycle-related genes³⁹. In this study, two genes (ANGPTL4 and PLK1) of the IGSP that we constructed were involved in the regulation of the tumor cell cycle^{28,31}. GSEA of the IGSP subgroups showed that genes in the IGSP high-risk group were significantly enriched in cell cycle-related pathways. These results suggest that the predictability and accuracy of the IGSP in predicting the OS of LUAD patients are reasonable in the context of the molecular mechanism of cancer.

To further understand the immune characteristics of the different IGSP subgroups, we analyzed gene mutations in the IGSP subgroups. We found that missense mutations were the most common in LUAD patients' genomes, followed by multiple point mutations. TP53 is the gene with the highest mutation frequency, and its mutation frequency is higher in the IGSP high-risk subgroup than in the low-risk subgroup. It has been reported that mutant TP53 is an adverse prognostic factor of advanced NSCLC and head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC)^{19,40}. This result is consistent with our observation of a poor prognosis (OS) in the IGSP high-risk subgroup. However, some studies have reported that mutant TP53 promotes antitumor immunity. For example, the antitumor immune signatures of TP53-mutated cancer are significantly higher than those of TP53 wild-type cancer in LUAD and breast invasive carcinoma (BRCA)⁴¹. This suggests that patients in the IGSP high-risk subgroup should have better responses to immunotherapy. Other studies have shown that LUSC patients with high TP53 mutation rates had shorter overall survival times but were more responsive to ICIs treatment⁴². We also explored the correlation between IGSP and known immunotherapy biomarkers. The IGSP scores were positively correlated with TMB but not significantly correlated with the expression of PD-L1 and CTLA-4. NSCLCs usually have higher mutation burdens and can stimulate a stronger antitumor immune response. TMB can preferentially predict the clinical benefits of NSCLC immunotherapy regardless of the expression of PD-L1^{43,44}. This also suggests that the high-risk group of IGSP may benefit more from ICIs therapy.

The role of immune cell infiltration in tumors has increasingly attracted attention in recent years. It has been shown that immune cell infiltration plays key roles in tumor progression and the response to immunotherapy in LUAD and colorectal cancer (CRC)^{45,46}. In this study, we explored the potential relationship between IGSP and immune cell infiltration. We found that CD4+ T cells, NK cells, M0

macrophages, M1 macrophages and mast cells were enriched in the IGSP high-risk subgroup¹⁹. This result is consistent with other immune gene prognostic index studies in HNSCC, which also showed that CD4⁺ T cells and M1 macrophages were abundant in the high-risk group. Cancer immunotherapy promotes the activity of cytotoxic T lymphocytes (CTLs) in tumors and assists in the activation of tumor-specific CTLs in lymphoid organs, establishing efficient and lasting antitumor immunity. CD4⁺ T cells enhance the antitumor activity of CTLs⁴⁷. M1 proinflammatory macrophages can engulf tumor cells⁴⁸. Macrophage-directed cancer immunotherapy, which modulates M2/repair-type macrophages into M1/kill-type macrophages, has been shown to slow or stop cancer growth^{49,50}. These results suggest that patients within the IGSP high-risk subgroup might have better responses to immunotherapy.

The tumor immune dysfunction and exclusion (TIDE) algorithm simulates two main immune escape mechanisms of tumors to predict the ICIs response^{19,22}. The TIDE prediction score is positively correlated with the possibility of tumor immune escape. This indicates that patients with higher TIDE scores are less likely to benefit from ICIs therapy. In our study, the high-risk IGSP subgroup had lower TIDE scores and higher microsatellite instability (MSI) and T cell exclusion scores, while the low-risk IGSP subgroup had higher TIDE and T cell dysfunction scores. Therefore, patients with a low risk of IGSP may have immune escape due to T cell dysfunction and have a poor response to ICIs treatment, while patients with a high risk of IGSP could benefit more from ICIs treatment. Anti-PD-1/PD-L1 therapy for tumors with high MSI has shown lasting responses in prostate cancer and CRC^{51,52}. Therefore, patients in the IGSP high-risk group might have a better response to ICIs therapy because of MSI. Both TIDE and TIS could be used to predict the response of patients to immunotherapy^{22,23}, but their foci were T cell functions and status and did not fully reflect the complexity of the TME involved in immunotherapy¹⁹. In addition, both markers focused on the patient's response to immunotherapy rather than the patient's survival time¹⁹. The advantages of our study are that IGSP can distinguish the predicted survival time, molecular characteristics and the immune characteristics of patients.

The blockade of immune checkpoints can reduce the immune escape of tumor cells and activate immune reaction in tumor microenvironment⁵³. At present, clinical trials of immune checkpoint blockade treatments mainly focus on the interaction between CTLA-4 and its ligands CD80/CD86, and the binding of PD-1 and PD-L1^{54,55}. However, compared with LUSC patients, LUAD patients have lower benefits from CTLA4 and anti-PD-1 or anti-PD-L1 therapy. Expanding ICI-based treatment approaches beyond CTLA4 and PD-1/PD-L1 pathways is therefore a clear clinical need. Antibodies targeting the co-inhibitory receptors of T cells, such as LAG3, TIM3, TIGIT and BTLA, as well as agonists of the co-stimulatory receptors, such as GITR, OX40, 4-1BB and ICOS, are undergoing clinical trials⁵⁶⁻⁵⁸. In this study, we analyzed the mRNA expression levels of these co-inhibitory receptors and their ligands. It showed that the expressions of PD-1, LAG3, CD155, CD112, and BTLA, were increased in the high-risk subgroup of IGSP. Co-stimulatory T cell receptors play critical roles in T cell activation, differentiation, effector function and survival⁵⁸. Activating co-stimulatory T cell receptors is promising therapeutic strategy in clinical practice^{55,58}. We analyzed the mRNA expression levels of targeted costimulatory receptors GITR, OX40, 4-

1BB, ICOS and their ligands. It showed that the expressions of GITR, OX40, OX40L, 4-1BB, 4-1BBL were higher in the high-risk IGSPG subgroup. It suggests that our IGSPG high-risk group should be also more suitable for co- stimulatory receptors targeting therapy.

In summary, we constructed an IGSPG that can be used to predict the survival rate, molecular and immune characteristics of LUAD patients and the benefits of ICIs treatment. The predictive ability of this prognostic index in LUAD needs to be further validated to determine whether it can improve patient outcomes and treatment responses by tailoring treatment to each individual patient.

Declarations

Author Contributions

H.C., R.L. and W.L. collected and analyzed the data, wrote the manuscript. Q.C., D.Y., J.L., J.F. and W.C. participated in the process of data analysis and table making. M.Z. and Y.Q. review and modify the manuscript. All authors listed have approved the manuscript that is enclosed.

Data Availability

The datasets analysed during the current study are available in the TCGA (<https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov>) and GEO (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE68465/GSE30219/GSE72094>) repository.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

The research was supported by the grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81773055), the Natural Science Foundation of Fujian Province (2018J01829, 2019J01293), the key talents training program of Fujian Provincial Health Commission (2017-ZQN-59 and 2017-ZQN-60) and the Joint Funds for the innovation of science and technology of Fujian province (2017Y9113).

References

1. Bray F., et al. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin.* **68**,394–424(2018).
2. Blandin Knight S., et al. Progress and prospects of early detection in lung cancer. *Open Biol.* **7**, (2017).
3. Ma J., Ward E. M., Smith R., Jemal A. Annual number of lung cancer deaths potentially avertable by screening in the United States. *Cancer.* **119**,1381–1385(2013).
4. Nooreldeen R., Bach H. Current and Future Development in Lung Cancer Diagnosis. *Int J Mol Sci.* **22**, (2021).

5. Hirsch F. R., et al. Lung cancer: current therapies and new targeted treatments. *The Lancet*. **389**,299–311(2017).
6. Yang Y. Cancer immunotherapy: harnessing the immune system to battle cancer. *J Clin Invest*. **125**,3335–3337(2015).
7. Kennedy L. B., Salama A. K. S. A review of cancer immunotherapy toxicity. *CA Cancer J Clin*. **70**,86–104(2020).
8. Havel J. J., Chowell D., Chan T. A. The evolving landscape of biomarkers for checkpoint inhibitor immunotherapy. *Nat Rev Cancer*. **19**,133–150(2019).
9. Tian Y., Zhai X., Yan W., Zhu H., Yu J. Clinical outcomes of immune checkpoint blockades and the underlying immune escape mechanisms in squamous and adenocarcinoma NSCLC. *Cancer Med*. **10**,3–14(2021).
10. Keenan T. E., Burke K. P., Van Allen E. M. Genomic correlates of response to immune checkpoint blockade. *Nat Med*. **25**,389–402(2019).
11. Zeng H., et al. Stemness Related Genes Revealed by Network Analysis Associated With Tumor Immune Microenvironment and the Clinical Outcome in Lung Adenocarcinoma. *Front Genet*. **11**,549213(2020).
12. Zhang M., et al. An Immune-Related Signature Predicts Survival in Patients With Lung Adenocarcinoma. *Front Oncol*. **9**,1314(2019).
13. Song Q., et al. Identification of an immune signature predicting prognosis risk of patients in lung adenocarcinoma. *J Transl Med*. **17**,70(2019).
14. Yi M., et al. Immune signature-based risk stratification and prediction of immune checkpoint inhibitor's efficacy for lung adenocarcinoma. *Cancer Immunol Immunother*. **70**,1705–1719(2021).
15. Langfelder P., Horvath S. WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics*. **9**,559(2008).
16. Ye Z., et al. A 13-Gene Metabolic Prognostic Signature Is Associated With Clinical and Immune Features in Stomach Adenocarcinoma. *Front Oncol*. **11**,612952(2021).
17. Harris M. A., et al. The Gene Ontology (GO) database and informatics resource. *Nucleic Acids Res*. **32**,D258-261(2004).
18. Newman A. M., et al. Robust enumeration of cell subsets from tissue expression profiles. *Nat Methods*. **12**,453–457(2015).
19. Chen Y., Li Z.-Y., Zhou G.-Q., Sun Y. An Immune-Related Gene Prognostic Index for Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma. *Clinical cancer research: an official journal of the American Association for Cancer Research*. **27**,330–341(2021).
20. Livak K. J., Schmittgen T. D. Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time quantitative PCR and the 2(-Delta Delta C(T)) Method. *Methods*. **25**,402–408(2001).
21. Thorsson V., et al. The Immune Landscape of Cancer. *Immunity*. **48**,812-830 e814(2018).

22. Jiang P, et al. Signatures of T cell dysfunction and exclusion predict cancer immunotherapy response. *Nat Med.* **24**,1550–1558(2018).
23. Danaher P, et al. Pan-cancer adaptive immune resistance as defined by the Tumor Inflammation Signature (TIS): results from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA). *J Immunother Cancer.* **6**,63(2018).
24. Forde P. M., Kelly R. J., Brahmer J. R. New strategies in lung cancer: translating immunotherapy into clinical practice. *Clin Cancer Res.* **20**,1067–1073(2014).
25. Garon E. B., et al. Pembrolizumab for the treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer. *N Engl J Med.* **372**,2018–2028(2015).
26. Darvin P, Toor S. M., Sasidharan Nair V., Elkord E. Immune checkpoint inhibitors: recent progress and potential biomarkers. *Exp Mol Med.* **50**,1–11(2018).
27. Nishino M., Ramaiya N. H., Hatabu H., Hodi F. S. Monitoring immune-checkpoint blockade: response evaluation and biomarker development. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol.* **14**,655–668(2017).
28. Yang L., et al. ANGPTL4 Promotes the Proliferation of Papillary Thyroid Cancer via AKT Pathway. *Onco Targets Ther.* **13**,2299–2309(2020).
29. Gao Z., et al. PLK1 promotes proliferation and suppresses apoptosis of renal cell carcinoma cells by phosphorylating MCM3. *Cancer Gene Ther.* **27**,412–423(2020).
30. Shin S.-B., Jang H.-R., Xu R., Won J.-Y., Yim H. Active PLK1-driven metastasis is amplified by TGF- β signaling that forms a positive feedback loop in non-small cell lung cancer. *Oncogene.* **39**,767–785(2020).
31. Gutteridge R. E., Ndiaye M. A., Liu X., Ahmad N. Plk1 Inhibitors in Cancer Therapy: From Laboratory to Clinics. *Mol Cancer Ther.* **15**,1427–1435(2016).
32. Luo Q., et al. LIFR functions as a metastasis suppressor in hepatocellular carcinoma by negatively regulating phosphoinositide 3-kinase/AKT pathway. *Carcinogenesis.* **36**,1201–1212(2015).
33. Wang M., et al. Long non-coding RNA-CTD-210809.1 represses breast cancer metastasis by influencing leukemia inhibitory factor receptor. *Cancer Sci.* **109**,1764–1774(2018).
34. Li R., et al. Identification and validation of the prognostic value of immune-related genes in non-small cell lung cancer. *Am J Transl Res.* **12**,5844–5865(2020).
35. Liu Y., et al. Demethylation-Induced Overexpression of Shc3 Drives c-Raf-Independent Activation of MEK/ERK in HCC. *Cancer Res.* **78**,2219–2232(2018).
36. Potter P. C., et al. Prophylaxis against *Neisseria meningitidis* infections and antibody responses in patients with deficiency of the sixth component of complement. *J Infect Dis.* **161**,932–937(1990).
37. Zhu Z., et al. High prevalence of complement component C6 deficiency among African-Americans in the south-eastern USA. *Clin Exp Immunol.* **119**,305–310(2000).
38. Hanahan D., Weinberg R. A. The hallmarks of cancer. *Cell.* **100**,57–70(2000).
39. Yin X., et al. Development of a novel gene signature to predict prognosis and response to PD-1 blockade in clear cell renal cell carcinoma. *Oncoimmunology.* **10**,1933332(2021).

40. Jiao X.-D., Qin B.-D., You P., Cai J., Zang Y.-S. The prognostic value of TP53 and its correlation with EGFR mutation in advanced non-small cell lung cancer, an analysis based on cBioPortal data base. *Lung Cancer*. **123**,70–75(2018).
41. Li L., Li M., Wang X. Cancer type-dependent correlations between TP53 mutations and antitumor immunity. *DNA Repair (Amst)*. **88**,102785(2020).
42. Xu F., et al. A -associated gene signature for prediction of prognosis and therapeutic responses in lung squamous cell carcinoma. *Oncoimmunology*. **9**,1731943(2020).
43. Pan Y. H., et al. Predictive Value of the TP53/PIK3CA/ATM Mutation Classifier for Patients With Bladder Cancer Responding to Immune Checkpoint Inhibitor Therapy. *Front Immunol*. **12**,643282(2021).
44. Bai X., et al. Development and validation of a genomic mutation signature to predict response to PD-1 inhibitors in non-squamous NSCLC: a multicohort study. *J Immunother Cancer*. **8**,(2020).
45. Zuo S., Wei M., Wang S., Dong J., Wei J. Pan-Cancer Analysis of Immune Cell Infiltration Identifies a Prognostic Immune-Cell Characteristic Score (ICCS) in Lung Adenocarcinoma. *Frontiers in immunology*. **11**,1218(2020).
46. Saito T., et al. Two FOXP3(+)CD4(+) T cell subpopulations distinctly control the prognosis of colorectal cancers. *Nature medicine*. **22**,679–684(2016).
47. Borst J., Ahrends T., Babala N., Melief C. J. M., Kastenmuller W. CD4(+) T cell help in cancer immunology and immunotherapy. *Nat Rev Immunol*. **18**,635–647(2018).
48. Xia Y., et al. Engineering Macrophages for Cancer Immunotherapy and Drug Delivery. *Adv Mater*. **32**,e2002054(2020).
49. Mills C. D., Lenz L. L., Harris R. A. A Breakthrough: Macrophage-Directed Cancer Immunotherapy. *Cancer Res*. **76**,513–516(2016).
50. Klichinsky M., et al. Human chimeric antigen receptor macrophages for cancer immunotherapy. *Nat Biotechnol*. **38**,947–953(2020).
51. Abida W., et al. Analysis of the Prevalence of Microsatellite Instability in Prostate Cancer and Response to Immune Checkpoint Blockade. *JAMA Oncol*. **5**,471–478(2019).
52. Kok M., Chalabi M., Haanen J. How I treat MSI cancers with advanced disease. *ESMO Open*. **4**,e000511(2019).
53. Topalian S. L., Taube J. M., Anders R. A., Pardoll D. M. Mechanism-driven biomarkers to guide immune checkpoint blockade in cancer therapy. *Nat Rev Cancer*. **16**,275–287(2016).
54. Anderson A. C., Joller N., Kuchroo V. K. Lag-3, Tim-3, and TIGIT: Co-inhibitory Receptors with Specialized Functions in Immune Regulation. *Immunity*. **44**,989–1004(2016).
55. Edner N. M., Carlesso G., Rush J. S., Walker L. S. K. Targeting co-stimulatory molecules in autoimmune disease. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. **19**,860–883(2020).
56. Fang J., et al. Prognostic value of immune checkpoint molecules in breast cancer. *Biosci Rep*. **40**, (2020).

57. Chen L., Flies D. B. Molecular mechanisms of T cell co-stimulation and co-inhibition. Nat Rev Immunol. **13**,227–242(2013).

58. Kraehenbuehl L., Weng C. H., Eghbali S., Wolchok J. D., Merghoub T. Enhancing immunotherapy in cancer by targeting emerging immunomodulatory pathways. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. **19**,37–50(2022).

Tables

Table1. Clinical characteristics of patients with LUAD in each data set

		Training cohort	Testing cohort		
	Characteristics	TCGA	GSE68465	GSE30219	GSE72094
n		522	443	293	398
State	Alive	334	207	93	285
	Dead	188	236	200	113
Age	<=65	241	231	179	118
	>65	262	212	113	280
	unknow	19	0	1	0
Gender	Female	280	220	43	222
	Male	242	223	250	176
Stage	Stage I	279	0	0	254
	Stage II	124	0	0	67
	Stage III	85	0	0	57
	Stage IV	26	0	0	15
	unknow	8	443	293	5
T	T1	172	150	166	0
	T2	281	251	69	0
	T3	47	28	31	0
	T4	19	12	21	0
	unknow	3	2	6	398
N (%)	N0	335	299	198	0
	N1	98	88	53	0
	N2	75	53	30	0
	N3	2	0	10	0
	unknow	12	3	2	398
M (%)	M0	353	0	282	0
	M1	25	0	8	0
	unknow	144	443	3	398

Figures

Figure 1

Differentially expressed immune-related genes in LUAD

A. Differentially expressed genes (DEGs) (logFC filter=1, FDR Filter=0.05) between 535 LUAD samples (red) and 59 para-cancerous samples (blue). B. Differentially expressed immune-related genes (DEIRGs) between 539 LUAD samples (red) and 59 para-cancerous samples (blue). C. Gene Ontology (GO) enrichment analysis of DEIRGs ($p < 0.05$). D. Kyoto Encyclopedia of Gene and Genome (KEGG) pathway analysis of DEIRGs ($p < 0.05$).

Figure 2

Identification of immune-related hub genes

A. The horizontal threshold is 0.85. B. The best soft threshold for WGCNA is 4. C. DEIRG clustering tree based on dissimilarity measure (1-TOM). D. The gene modules related to LUAD obtained by WGCNA. E. Functional enrichment analysis of 263 genes in the turquoise module. F. KEGG pathway enrichment analysis of 263 genes in the turquoise module.

Figure 3

Kaplan–Meier survival curves of 30 immune-related hub genes obtained by univariate Cox regression analysis.

Figure 4

Construction of IGSP for LUAD patients

A. Mutation analysis of 30 immune-related hub genes. B. The confidence interval of each λ . C. Establishment of the LASSO regression model. D. Multivariate Cox regression analysis was used to identify 5 immune-related hub genes used to construct the IGSP.

Figure 5

The expression levels of five genes in the construction of IGSP

A-E. The expression levels of five genes in cell lines.

Figure 6

The relationship between the IGSP scores and the prognosis of patients

A and D. KM survival curves of IGSP high- and low-risk groups TCGA training cohort (A) and GEO validation cohort (D). B and E. Time ROC curves of the TCGA cohort (B) and GEO cohort (E). C and F. (from top to bottom) Patient risk score distribution, scatter diagram of patient survival status, and expression patterns of risk genes.

Figure 7

Prognostic value of IGSP in the TCGA cohort

A. Univariate Cox regression analysis. B. Multivariate Cox regression analysis. C. OS nomograms of 1-, 3- and 5-year. D. Consistency between predicted and observed 1-, 3- and 5-year survival rates.

Figure 8

Molecular characteristics of IGSP subgroups

A and B. GSEA enrichment analysis in the IGSP high-risk group ($p < 0.05$). C. GSEA enrichment analysis in the IGSP low-risk group ($p < 0.05$). D. Gene mutations of patients within the IGSP high-risk group. E. Gene mutations of patients within the IGSP low-risk group. F. Correlation between the TMB and IGSP score. G. Correlation between the TMB and OS in patients with LUAD.

Figure 9

Immune cell infiltration in the IGSP subgroups

A. Infiltration abundance of 22 immune cells in the IGSP subgroups. Blue represents the low-risk group of IGSP, and red represents the high-risk group. The horizontal line represents the median, and the

bottom and top of the box are the 25th and 75th percentiles (quartile intervals), respectively. The Wilcoxon test was used to evaluate the differences between the two subgroups (* $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$, **** $P < 0.0001$). B. Contents of immune cells in the high- and low-risk IGSP groups.

Figure 10

Immune characteristics of the IGSP subgroups

A. Immune-related functions were enriched and analyzed by ssGSEA and then compared among different IGSP subgroups. The scattered points represent the ssGSEA scores of the two subgroups, the horizontal line represents the median, and the bottom and top of the box represent the 25th and 75th percentiles (quartile intervals), respectively. The Wilcoxon test was used to evaluate the difference between two subgroups (* $p < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$). B. Correlation between immune-related function score and overall survival time.

Figure 11

The prognostic value of IGSP for ICI treatment

A-D. Scores of TIDE, MSI, T cell exclusion and T cell dysfunction in different IGSP groups. The Wilcoxon test was used to evaluate the difference (* $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$). E-G. The 1-, 3- and 5-year ROC curves based on the IGSP, TIS and TIDE scores of the TCGA cohort.

Figure 12

The expression of some key immune checkpoint molecules.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [SupplementaryFigures.zip](#)
- [SupplementaryTables.zip](#)