



Article **Prognostic Value of B7H4 Expression in Patients with Solid Cancers: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis**

Miriam Dawidowicz^{1,*}, Agnieszka Kula¹, Sylwia Mielcarska², Elżbieta Świętochowska² and Dariusz Waniczek^{1,*}

- ¹ Department of Oncological Surgery, Faculty of Medical Sciences in Zabrze, Medical University of Silesia, 41-808 Katowice, Poland; d201070@365.sum.edu.pl
- ² Department of Medical and Molecular Biology, Faculty of Medical Sciences in Zabrze, Medical University of Silesia, 41-800 Zabrze, Poland; d201109@365.sum.edu.pl (S.M.); eswietochowska@365.sum.edu.pl (E.Ś.)
- * Correspondence: d201069@365.sum.edu.pl (M.D.); dwaniczek@365.sum.edu.pl (D.W.)

Abstract: V-set domain-containing T-cell activation inhibitor 1 (aliases VTCN1, B7H4) participates in tumour immune escape by delivering inhibitory signals to T cells. The purpose of this article was to assess the B7H4 prognostic value in solid cancers. Three databases were searched for relevant articles. The main endpoints were overall survival (OS), disease-specific survival (DSS), progression-free survival (PFS), recurrence-free survival (RFS), and disease-free survival (DFS). Appropriate hazard ratios (HRs) were pooled. The R studio software (version 4.0.3) was used for data analysis. Thirty-one studies met the inclusion criteria. High expression of B7H4 was associated with worse OS (HR = 1.52, 95% CI: 1.37–1.68) but not with DSS (HR = 1.14, 95% CI: 0.49–2.63), RFS (HR = 1.77, 95% CI: 0.75–4.18), DFS (HR = 1.29, 95% CI: 0.8–2.09), or PFS (HR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.91–3.2) in patients with solid cancers. High expression of B7H4 is associated with a poorer prognosis in patients with solid cancers. B7H4 is a promising prognostic biomarker and immunotherapeutic target for various solid cancers because of its activity in cancer immunity and tumourigenesis.

Keywords: B7H4; cancer prognosis; immune checkpoint; solid cancers

1. Introduction

1.1. B7H4 Expression and Function

B7H4 is a member of the B7 immune checkpoint family. The immune checkpoints are regulators of the immune system and are crucial for self-tolerance [1]. B7H4 is a coinhibitory ligand that exerts its function by suppressing the T cell effector function, while its molecule interaction on T cells remains unknown. B7H4 is broadly overexpressed in human cancers, including lung, liver, kidney, ovary, stomach, skin, pancreas, colorectal, and breast cancers, and is exploited by tumour in order to evade immune surveillance [2–6].

1.2. B7H4 in Solid Cancers

B7H4 is predominantly expressed on antigen-presenting cells (APCs) and tumour cells. Its heightened activity in cancer is associated with the increased infiltration of immunosuppressive cells and elevated production of regulatory T cells, leading to a reduced proliferation and effector function of CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T cells [7]. Contrary to PD-L1, which is expressed in about 30% or even fewer patients and is associated with immunologically "hot" tumours, the expression of B7H4 marks a "cold" environment. The researchers observed, in some cases, a resistance to immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy, which mainly targets PD-1/PD-L1 and CTLA4 pathways [8–10]. This effect might be possibly explained by the activation of alternative immune checkpoints, e.g., B7H4. Aberrant B7x expression is associated with tumour necrosis, stage, grade, epithelial–mesenchymal transition (EMT), and survival outcomes such as progression free survival (PFS) and overall survival



Citation: Dawidowicz, M.; Kula, A.; Mielcarska, S.; Świętochowska, E.; Waniczek, D. Prognostic Value of B7H4 Expression in Patients with Solid Cancers: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2024, 25, 5045. https://doi.org/ 10.3390/ijms25095045

Academic Editor: Laura Francesca Pisani

Received: 8 April 2024 Revised: 27 April 2024 Accepted: 2 May 2024 Published: 6 May 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/). (OS), making it a potential blood biomarker in many cancers [11-14]. B7H4 has a soluble form called sB7H4 that can be detected in blood serum of cancer patients [15–17]. B7H4 expression is significantly limited in healthy tissues [18]. Elevated levels of sB7H4 were detected in the sera of gastric, hepatocellular, and renal cancer patients. In those studies, patients with higher levels of sB7H4 had a significantly shorter OS and higher probability of recurrence [15–17]. However, there is a very limited number of studies that evaluate the association of sB7H4 with cancer prognosis to conduct the meta-analysis. Instead, we performed the most comprehensive and up-to-date meta-analysis of B7H4 expression assessed by the immunohistochemistry method (IHC) and prognostic outcomes among solid cancers. Furthermore, we assessed all available surrogate endpoints, such as DFS, PFS, and RFS. Nowadays, B7H4 is extensively studied as a therapeutic target due to its role in immune system suppression in tumourigenesis [19–21]. Its expression is also distinct from the PD-1/PD-L1 pathways; thus, it provides the chance for effective therapies for the vast majority of cancer patients with B7H4-positive tumours [22,23]. Besides its therapeutic role, B7H4 might be a potentially good screening protein as it is secreted into the blood stream by cancer cells and paracancerous tissue, and it is mostly absent in healthy cells. On the other hand, it is not useful as a cancer-specific biomarker due to its overexpression in a variety of cancers. Study results also suggest that it might play a prognostic, predictive, and potentially monitoring role in cancers. This knowledge may be applied in the future in clinical decision making.

1.3. The Aim of the Study

As B7H4 is a relatively new immune checkpoint, its prognostic value in cancer prognosis has yet to be estimated. Currently available meta-analyses that tackle the topic of B7H4's prognostic role were mostly conducted over 5 years ago. Moreover, as the number of studies was limited at that time, they are based on results from mixed methods of estimating B7H4 expression (ELISA, IHC) and sources of B7H4 expression (tissue, homogenates, blood sera) [24]. Additionally, some included different methods of prognosis estimation, such as the odds ratio (OR), rate ratio (RR), and hazard ratio (HR), to conduct the meta-analysis [25]. Furthermore, most studies were focused on the overall survival (OS) parameter, and two studies also evaluated disease-free survival (DFS) [25,26]. The diseasespecific survival (DSS), progression-free survival (PFS), and recurrence-free survival (RFS) parameters have not yet been evaluated in meta-analyses. Therefore, we conducted a meta-analysis with one method of estimation of B7H4 expression (IHC) and prognosis (HR) to evaluate the prognostic value of B7H4 in parameters such as OS, DSS, DFS, PFS, and RFS among solid cancers.

2. Results

2.1. Search Results and Study Characteristics

A flow diagram showing our literature search and screening strategy is presented in Figure 1. A total of 850 articles were initially identified through database research. After removing 387 studies by applying automatic tools, the remaining 463 records were screened by reading the titles and abstracts. Further, 313 studies were excluded. One hundred and forty-nine studies were evaluated for eligibility, and, finally, 31 articles were included in the meta-analysis. The basic characteristics of the included studies are shown in Table 1. The studies were published between 2007 and 2023. They consisted of the following cancer types: OS—osteosarcoma [27], Pca—prostate cancer [28,29], CvC—cervical cancer [30,31], CCA—cholangiocarcinoma [13,32], PDAC—pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma [33–36], UCC—urothelial cell carcinoma [36], HNSCC—head and neck squamous cell carcinoma [37,38], OC—ovarian cancer [39], ESCC—esophageal squamous cell carcinoma [28,40], BC—breast cancer [41,42], GC—gastric cancer [43,44], ECC—endometrial cancer [45], NSCLC—non-squamous cell lung carcinoma [46,47], RCC—renal cell carcinoma [48], and CRC—colorectal cancer [39,49–52]. The sample sizes ranged from 37 to 996, with a total of 6357 patients. B7H4 expression was measured by IHC in all cohorts. HRs and the corresponding 95% CIs of the assessed parameters were obtained by the multivariate analysis in 20 cohorts and univariate analysis or Kaplan–Meier curves in 11 cohorts. The NOS scores of all these studies were between 6 and 8 points, except for one article, which scored 5 points (Supplementary Material Table S4).



Figure 1. Study selection flowchart.

Table 1. Basic characteristics.

	Author	Year	Patient Source	Sample Size	Method	Cancer Type	B7H4 + Expres- sion	Cut-off	Cell Types	Outcome	HR	Multivare (M)/Univare (U)	NOS
1	[49]	2021	China	98	IHC	CRC	0.69	>0%	tumour cells	OS/DFS	reported	U/M	8
2	[44]	2011	Japan	120	IHC	GC	0.94	staining 0, +/++, +++	tumour cells	OS	reported	U/M	7
3	[50]	2021	China	110	IHC	CRC	0.51	H score > 85	tumour cells	OS	reported	U	6
4	[40]	2011	China	112	IHC	ESCC	0.95	H score > 160	tumour cells	OS	reported	U/M	7
5	[13]	2017	China	140	IHC	CCA	0.45	Final score > 3	all types of cells	OS	reported	U/M	7
6	[38]	2016	China	164	IHC	HNSCC	1.00	H score > 88	all types of cells	OS	reported	U	5

	Author	Year	Patient Source	Sample Size	Method	Cancer Type	B7H4 + Expres- sion	Cut-off	Cell Types	Outcome	HR	Multivare (M)/Univare (U)	NOS
7	[27]	2015	China	104	IHC	OS	0.7	Final score > 3	all types of cells	OS	reported	U/M	7
8	[30]	2020	China	50	IHC	CvC	0.32	>5%	tumour cells	OS/DFS	reported	U	7
9	[41]	2016	China	293	IHC	OC	0.91	Final score > 2,	tumour cells	OS/DFS	reported	U	7
10	[36]	2014	China	62	IHC	UCC	0.76	Final score > 4	all types of cells	OS	reported	U/M	6
11	[42]	2018	China	59	IHC	BC	0.91	Final score > 3	tumour cells	OS	reported	U/M	7
12	[28]	2020	China	152	IHC	PCa	0.67	IHC score > 1,	all types of cells	OS	reported	U/M	6
13	[39]	2014	China	185	IHC	CRC	0.63	Final score > 3	tumour cells	OS/DFS	reported	U	7
14	[53]	2018	Korea	158	IHC	ESCC	0.54	IHC score > 1,	all types of cells	OS/DFS	reported	U/M	8
15	[46]	2018	USA	123	IHC	NSCLC	NA	>1, 38 mediana, % of tumor cells	tumour cells	OS	reported	U	6
16	[46]	2018	USA	61	IHC	NSCLC	NA	>1, 59 mediana, % of tumor cells	tumour cells	OS	reported	U	6
17	[33]	2016	China	40	IHC	PDAC	0.75	>10%	tumour cells	OS	reported	М	7
18	[47]	2019	Italy	44	IHC	NSCLC	0.39	>0%	tumour cells	OS/PFS	reported	U/M	8
19	[47]	2019	Italy	37	IHC	NSCLC	0.4	>10%	tumour cells	OS/PFS	reported	U/M	8
20	[34]	2016	Greece	41	IHC	PDAC	0.39	>0%	tumour cells	OS	reported	U/M	7
21	[32]	2016	China	110	IHC	CCA	0.49	Final score > 3	tumour cells	OS/RFS	reported	М	8
22	[51]	2022	China	996	IHC	CRC	0.61	Final score > 3	tumour cells	OS	reported	М	7
23	[52]	2019	China	118	IHC	CRC	0.56	Final score > 3	all types of cells	OS	reported	М	7
24	[29]	2007	USA	814	IHC	PCa	0.8	>5% + strong intensity	tumour cells	RFS/DSS	reported	U	7
25	[31]	2022	China	605	IHC	CvC	0.45	≥5%	tumour cells	RFS/DSS	reported	U	7
26	[45]	2023	China	833	IHC	ECC	0.71	>0%	tumour cells	RFS/DSS	reported	U/M	8
27	[48]	2020	Japan	83	IHC	RCC	0.40	median NA	tumour cells or im- mune cells	OS/PFS	reported	U/M	8
28	[48]	2020	Japan	69	IHC	RCC	0.48	median NA	tumour cells or im- mune cells	OS/PFS	reported	U/M	8

Table 1. Cont.

	Author	Year	Patient Source	Sample Size	Method	Cancer Type	B7H4 + Expres- sion	Cut-off	Cell Types	Outcome	HR	Multivare (M)/Univare (U)	NOS
29	[43]	2015	China	100	IHC	GC	0.71	Final score > 2		OS	reported	U/M	7
30	[35]	2023	Germany	68	IHC	PDAC	0.22	>1%	tumour cells	OS	pooled	U	6
31	[37]	2022	Germany	408	IHC	HNSCC	0.97	\leq 70% + intensity 1	tumour cells	OS	pooled	U	6

Table 1. Cont.

Immunohistochemistry (IHC), overall survival (OS), progression-free survival (PFS), disease-free survival (DFS), disease-specific survival (DSS), recurrence-free survival (RFS), adenocarcinoma (ADC), squamous cell carcinoma (SCC), nivolumab cohort (N), chemotherapy cohort (CTH), OS—osteosarcoma, Pca—prostate cancer, CvC—cervical cancer, CCA—cholangiocarcinoma, PDAC—pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma, UCC—urothelial cell carcinoma, HNSCC—head and neck squamous cell carcinoma, OC—ovarian cancer, ESCC—esophageal squamous cell carcinoma, BC—breast cancer, GC—gastric cancer, ECC—endometrial cancer, NSCLC—non-squamous cell lung carcinoma, RCC—renal cell carcinoma, and CRC—colorectal cancer.

2.2. Results of Overall Survival Meta-Analysis

In total, 29 cohorts were qualified to assess the relation between B7H4 and OS, including both univariate and multivariate analyses. In the studies that reported both univariate and multivariate HRs, we used multivariate to diminish the risk of bias. The I (2) value was less than 50%, and the p value was less than 0.01, so the common effect model was used in the OS comparison. The results of the overall survival in solid tumours showed that high expression of B7H4 was associated with shorter OS (common effect model HR = 1.52, 95% CI: 1.37–1.68) (Figure 2A). We performed subgroup analysis to explore the potential factors that may cause heterogeneity. We classified the included cohorts and conducted subgroup analysis based on the cancer type, sample size, final score assessed in IHC analysis, and analysis method (Figure 2C,D, Supplementary Materials Figure S3). Subgroup analysis of gastrointestinal tumours revealed that B7H4 overexpression was correlated with poor OS, with an HR of 1.59, 95% CI: 1.27–1.98 (Figure 2C). The subgroup analysis by cancer type further confirmed the association of high B7H4 expression with shorter OS in patients with CCA (HR = 1.84, 95% CI: 1.37–2.48), ESCC (HR = 1.64, 95% CI: 1.15–2.32), CRC (HR = 1.59, 95% CI: 1.33–1.90), and GC (HR = 1.51, 95% CI: 1.12–2.04) but not in patients with PDAC (HR = 2.29, 95% CI: 0.93–5.61), RCC (HR = 1.77, 95% CI: 0.8–3.9), and NSCLC (HR = 1.11, 95% CI: 0.50–2.49) (Figure 2D). In addition, the subgroup analysis according to cancer type showed that there was significant heterogeneity within the PDAC and NSCLC subgroups (Figure 2D). When the subgroup analysis was performed according to the analysis method and final IHC score, the results changed. OS estimated by the univariate method did not support the B7H4 impact on survival unlike the multivariate method (HR = 1.26, 95% CI: 0.96–1.67 vs. HR = 1.61, 95% CI: 1.48–1.91) (Supplementary Materials Figure S3A). Similarly, the method of estimation of B7H4 expression impacted the results. The studies that assessed B7H4 IHC score with a cut-off > 3 had low heterogeneity and supported its association with worse OS (HR = 1.64, 95% CI: 1.41–1.90) (Supplementary Materials Figure S3C). Sample size did not change HRs significantly (Supplementary Materials Figure S3B).

2.3. Results of DSS, PFS, RFS, and DFS Meta-Analysis

The I (2) value was more than 50%, and the *p* value was less than 0.05, so the randomeffects model was used in the comparison of DSS, DFS, PFS, and RFS (Figures 3–6). The pooled results of the meta-analysis showed that a high expression of B7H4 was not associated with shorter DSS (HR = 1.14, 95% CI: 0.49–2.63), RFS (HR = 1.77, 95% CI: 0.75–4.18) (Figures 3A and 6A, respectively), DFS (HR = 1.29, 95% CI: 0.8–2.09), or PFS (HR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.91–3.2) (Figures 4A and 5A, respectively) in the patients with solid cancers than a low expression of B7H4. In the sensitivity analysis, the PFS and RFS results would change if the Genova C 2019 NSCLC CTH cohort [47] and Zong L. 2022 [31] were omitted, respectively (Figures 5B and 6B).

A. Study	logHR SE(logHR)	Hazard Ratio	HR 95%-CI (Weight common)	Weight (random)	D. Study	logHR SE	(logHR)	Hazard Ratio	HR	95%-CI	Weight (common) (Weight random)
Feng Y 2021 CRC Angami T 2011 GC Chen LJ 2011 ESCC Xie N 2017 CCA Dong Q 2015 GS Fam M 2014 UCC Xul H 2016 PDAC Wang L 2018 BC Tsiaousidou A 2016 PDAC Tsiaousidou BSC	2.3281 1.0416 0.3988 0.1901 0.4415 0.2713 0.6311 0.1948 1.1464 0.4390 0.3112 0.2081 1.8971 0.8376 1.8974 0.3052 1.0225 0.4802 0.5318 0.2360		- 10.26 [1.33; 79.01] 1.49 [1.03; 2.16] 1.55 [0.91; 2.65] 1.88 [1.28; 2.75] 3.15 [1.33; 7.44] 1.36 [0.91; 2.05] 6.67 [1.29; 34.43] - 5.65 [0.44; 72.95] 2.78 [1.08; 7.12] 1.70 [1.07; 2.70]	0.2% 7.1% 3.5% 6.8% 1.3% 5.9% 0.4% 0.2% 1.1% 4.6%	0.5% 6.2% 4.3% 6.1% 2.2% 5.7% 0.7% 0.3% 1.9% 5.1%	cancer_type = CRC Feng Y 2021 Yan X 2022 Cao H 2019 Ding S 2021 Liang M 2014 Common effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity. J ² = 14%, τ ²	2.3281 0.3968 0.7476 0.3443 0.5475 = < 0.0001,	1.0416 0.1186 0.3307 0.2621 0.2019 p = 0.33	*	10.26 1.49 2.11 1.41 1.73 1.59 1.59	[1.33; 79.01] [1.18; 1.88] [1.10; 4.04] [0.84; 2.36] [1.16; 2.57] [1.33; 1.90] [1.33; 1.90]	0.2% 18.3% 2.4% 3.7% 6.3% 31.0%	0.5% 8.3% 3.4% 4.5% 5.9% 22.6%
Zhao X 2016 CCA Yan X 2022 CRC Li H 2020 Pca Cao H 2019 CRC Geng Y 2015 GC Ding S 2021 CRC Wu L 2016 GSCC	0.5800 0.2425 0.3968 0.1186 1.5282 0.6059 0.7476 0.3307 0.4447 0.2527 0.3443 0.2621 0.5789 0.2771		1.79 [1.11; 2.87] 1.49 [1.18; 1.88] 4.61 [1.41; 15.12] 2.11 [1.10; 4.04] 1.56 [0.95; 2.56] 1.41 [0.84; 2.36] 1.78 [1.04; 3.07]	4.4% 18.3% 0.7% 2.4% 4.0% 3.7% 3.4%	4.9% 8.3% 1.3% 3.4% 4.7% 4.5% 4.2%	cancer_type = GC Arigami T 2011 Geng Y 2015 Common effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 0\%$, τ^2	0.3988 0.4447 = 0, <i>p</i> = 0.88	0.1901 0.2527	**	1.49 1.56 1.51 1.51	[1.03; 2.16] [0.95; 2.56] [1.12; 2.04] [1.12; 2.04]	7.1% 4.0% 11.2%	6.2% 4.7% 10.9%
Zong L 2022 CvC Liang L 2016 OC Parra ER 2018 NSCLC ADC Parra ER 2018 NSCLC ADC Parra ER 2018 NSCLC SCC Loch F N 2023 PDAC Borgmann M 2022 HNSCC	-0.9676 1.0609 -0.2357 0.2634 0.5475 0.2019 -0.8940 0.3141 0.6249 0.3098 0.1621 0.3793 0.2562 0.1623		0.38 [0.05; 3.04] 0.79 [0.47; 1.32] 1.73 [1.16; 2.57] 0.41 [0.22; 0.76] 1.87 [1.02; 3.43] 1.18 [0.56; 2.47] 1.29 [0.94; 1.78]	0.2% 3.7% 6.3% 2.6% 2.7% 1.8%	2% 0.5% 7% 4.5% 3% 5.9% 6% 3.6% 7% 3.7% 5% 2.8% 8% 7.0% 8% 7.0% 8% 1.5% 7% 1.4% 9% 2.9% 3% 2.2%	cancer_type = ESCC Chen LJ 2011 Piao L 2018 Common effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, τ^2	0.4415 0.5318 = 0, <i>p</i> = 0.80	0.2713 0.2360	++00	1.55 1.70 1.64 1.64	[0.91; 2.65] [1.07; 2.70] [1.15; 2.32] [1.15; 2.32]	3.5% 4.6% 8.1%	4.3% 5.1% 9.4%
Jikuya R 2020 RCC Jikuya R 2020 cCRCC Genova C 2019 NSCLC-nivolumab cohort Genova C 2019 NSCLC-CTH cohort Common effect model Random effects model	0.6387 0.5567 0.4929 0.5860 0.8671 0.3681 -0.1625 0.4412		1.89 [0.64, 5.64] 1.64 [0.52, 5.16] 2.38 [1.16, 4.90] 0.85 [0.36, 2.02] 1.52 [1.37, 1.68] 1.55 [1.34, 1.79]	0.8% 0.7% 1.9% 1.3% 100.0%		cancer_type = CCA Xie N 2017 Zhao X 2016 Common effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, τ^2 :	0.6311 0.5800 = 0, <i>p</i> = 0.87	0.1948 0.2425	+++00	1.88 1.79 1.84 1.84	[1.28; 2.75] [1.11; 2.87] [1.37; 2.48] [1.37; 2.48]	6.8% 4.4% 11.2%	6.1% 4.9% 11.0%
$ a_1 - a_2 - a_1 - a_2 - a_2 - a_1 - a_2 - a_2 - a_1 - a_2 - a_2 - a_2 - a_1 - a_2 - a_2 - a_2 - a_1 - a_2 - a_$		0.1 0.51 2 10	1.00 [1.04, 1.10]		100.070	cancer_type = OS Dong Q 2015	1.1464	0.4390		3.15	[1.33; 7.44]	1.3%	2.2%
R						cancer_type = UCC Fan M 2014	0.3112	0.2081	+	1.36	[0.91; 2.05]	5.9%	5.7%
Omitting Feng Y 2021 CRC Omitting Arigami T 2011 GC Omitting Chen LJ 2011 ESCC Omitting Xie N 2017 CCA Omitting Dong Q 2015 OS	Hazar	d Ratio HR 9	5%-Cl 12 3; 1.76] 44% 3; 1.82] 48% 3; 1.81] 48% 2; 1.75] 45%			cancer_type = PDAC Xu H 2016 Tsiaousidou A 2016 Loch F N 2023 Common effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $\vec{r} = 55\%$, \vec{x}	1.8971 1.0225 0.1621 = 0.3419, p	0.8376 0.4802 0.3793 = 0.11		6.67 2.78 1.18 1.92 2.29	[1.29; 34.43] [1.08; 7.12] [0.56; 2.47] [1.11; 3.32] [0.93; 5.61]	0.4% 1.1% 1.8% 3.3%	0.7% 1.9% 2.8% 5.4%
Omitting Fan M 2014 UCC Omitting Xu H 2016 PDAC Omitting Wang L 2018 BC Omitting Triagerideu A 2016 PDAC			4; 1.83] 48% 3; 1.76] 44% 4; 1.78] 47%			cancer_type = BC Wang L 2018	1.7316	1.3052	_ _	5.65	[0.44; 72.95]	0.2%	0.3%
Omitting Tsiadusidou A 2016 EAC Omitting Tsiadusidou A 2018 ESCC Omitting Zhao X 2016 CCA Omitting Xao X 2016 CCA			2, 1.70] 40% 2, 1.80] 48% 2, 1.79] 47%			cancer_type = Pca Li H 2020	1.5282	0.6059		4.61	[1.41; 15.12]	0.7%	1.3%
Omitting Li H 2020 Pca Omitting Cao H 2019 CRC Omitting Geng Y 2015 GC			2; 1.75] 44% 2; 1.77] 47% 3; 1.81] 48%			cancer_type = OSCC Wu L 2016	0.5789	0.2771	-	1.78	[1.04; 3.07]	3.4%	4.2%
Omitting Ding S 2021 CRC Omitting Wu L 2016 OSCC Omitting Zong L 2022 CVC			4; 1.82] 48% 2; 1.79] 47%			cancer_type = CvC Zong L 2022	-0.9676	1.0609		0.38	[0.05; 3.04]	0.2%	0.5%
Omitting Liang L 2016 OC Omitting Liang M 2014 CRC Omitting Parra ER 2018 NSCLC ADC			2, 1.78] 40% 2, 1.80] 47% 2, 1.74] 19%			cancer_type = OC Liang L 2016	-0.2357	0.2634		0.79	[0.47; 1.32]	3.7%	4.5%
Omitting Parra ER 2018 NSCLC SCC Omitting Loch F N 2023 PDAC Omitting Borgmann M 2022 HNSCC Omitting Jikuya R 2020 RCC Omitting Jikuya R 2020 ccRCC Omitting Genova C 2019 NSCLC-nivolumi Omitting Genova C 2019 NSCLC-CTH col	ab cohort nort		2, 1.79] 47% 5, 1.81] 47% 5, 1.84] 47% 8, 1.79] 48% 4, 1.79] 48% 2, 1.76] 46% 5, 1.81] 46%			cancer_type = NSCLC Parra ER 2018 Parra ER 2018 Genova C 2019 Genova C 2019 Common effects model Random effects model Heteropenětv. /² = 83%, -²	-0.8940 0.6249 0.8671 -0.1625	0.3141 0.3098 0.3681 0.4412 < 0.01	+++	0.41 1.87 2.38 0.85 1.10 1.11	[0.22; 0.76] [1.02; 3.43] [1.16; 4.90] [0.36; 2.02] [0.78; 1.54] [0.50; 2.49]	2.6% 2.7% 1.9% 1.3% 8.5%	3.6% 3.7% 2.9% 2.2% 12.3%
Random effects model	0.75	1.55 [1.34	; 1.79] 46%			cancer_type = HNSCC Borgmann M 2022	0.2562	0.1623	4	1.29	[0.94; 1.78]	9.8%	7.0%
C. Study logHR SE(Ic	ogHR) Hazard I	Ratio HR 9	Weight V 5%-Cl (common) (rar	Veight ndom)		cancer_type = RCC Jikuya R 2020 Jikuya R 2020 Common effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, τ^2	0.6387 0.4929 = 0, <i>p</i> = 0.86	0.5567 0.5860		1.89 1.64 1.77 1.77	[0.64; 5.64] [0.52; 5.16] [0.80; 3.90] [0.80; 3.90]	0.8% 0.7% 1.6%	1.5% 1.4% 2.8%
Feng Y 2021 CRC 2.3281 Angami T 2011 GC 0.3988 Xie N 2017 CCA 0.8311 Xu H 2016 PDAC 1.8971 Tsiaousidu A 2016 PDAC 1.8971 Piao L 2018 ESCC 0.5318 Zhao X 2016 PDAC 0.5318 Cach 2016 ECC 0.5318 Cach 2019 CC 0.7476 Geng Y 2015 GC 0.4447 Dim S 2012 CRC 0.4443	.0416 - .1901 - .1901 - .1938 - .1948 - .1948 - .2360 - .2425 - .1186 - .3307 - .2527 - .2621 -	10.26 [1.33; 1.49 [1.03] 1.48 [1.28] 2.78 [1.08] 1.70 [1.07] 1.70 [1.07] 1.70 [1.07] 1.71 [1.17] 1.49 [1.18] 2.11 [1.10] 1.40 [0.95] 1.41 [0.84]	79.01] 0.4% 2.16] 11.6% 2.75] 11.1% 34.43] 0.6% 7.12] 1.8% 2.70] 7.6% 2.87] 7.2% 4.88] 29.9% 4.04] 3.8% 2.56] 6.6%	0.4% 11.6% 11.1% 0.6% 1.8% 7.6% 7.2% 29.9% 3.8% 6.6% 6.1%		Common effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 40\%$, t^2 Test for subgroup differenc Test for subgroup differenc	= 0.0499, p es (common es (random o	< 0.01 effect): $\chi^2_{\frac{1}{2}4} = 2$ effects): $\chi^2_{14} = 1$	0.1 0.51 2 10 22.98, df = 14 (p = 0.06) 99.97, df = 14 (p = 0.13)	1.52 1.55	[1.37; 1.68] [1.34; 1.79]	100.0%	100.0%
Liang M 2014 CRC 0.5475 0 Loch F N 2023 PDAC 0.1621 0	.2019 -	- 1.73 [1.16 - 1.18 [0.56]	2.57] 10.3% 2.47] 2.9%	10.3%									

100.0% . . 100.0%

1.64 [1.45; 1.87] 1.64 [1.45; 1.87]

0.1 0.51 2

10

Common effect model Random effects mode

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 < 0.0001$, p = 0.57

Figure 2. Forest plots of studies evaluating HRs of high B7H4 expression and overall survival in solid tumours and the subgroup analysis. (**A**) Forest plot of overall survival among all solid tumours. (**B**) One–leave meta–analysis for investigating the effects of particular studies on the association between B7H4 expression and overall survival in solid tumours. (**C**) Forest plot of overall survival in gastrointestinal cancers. (**D**) Forest plot of overall survival in cancer type subgroups.





Figure 3. (**A**) Forest plot of studies evaluating HRs of high B7H4 expression and disease–specific survival (DSS) in solid tumours. (**B**) One–leave meta–analysis for investigating the effects of particular studies on the association between B7H4 expression and DSS in solid tumours.

A. Study	logHR	SE(logHR)		Hazard Ratio		HR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
Feng Y 2021 CRC Piao L 2018 ESCC Zong L 2022 CvC Liang L 2016 OC Liang M 2014 CRC	1.6632 0.1204 -1.0498 -0.1744 0.6038	0.7484 0.2206 1.0910 - 0.2280 0.2189		+ + + + +		5.28 1.13 0.35 0.84 1.83	[1.22; 22.87] [0.73; 1.74] [0.04; 2.97] [0.54; 1.31] [1.19; 2.81]	2.8% 32.5% 1.3% 30.4% 33.0%	8.4% 29.2% 4.5% 28.7% 29.3%
Common effect model Random effects model			0.1	0.5 1 2	 10	1.24 1.29	[0.97; 1.59] [0.80; 2.09]	100.0%	100.0%

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 65\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.1583$, p = 0.02

B. Study

Л

Study	Hazard Ratio	HR 95%-CI	12
Omitting Feng Y 2021 CRC Omitting Piao L 2018 ESCC Omitting Zong L 2022 CvC Omitting Liang L 2016 OC Omitting Liang M 2014 CRC		1.15 [0.74; 1.78] 6 1.40 [0.63; 3.10] 7 1.38 [0.83; 2.30] 7 1.53 [0.90; 2.58] 5 1.07 [0.70; 1.63] 5	0% 3% 0% 8% 5%
Random effects model		1.29 [0.80; 2.09] 6	5%

Figure 4. (**A**) Forest plot of studies evaluating HRs of high B7H4 expression and disease – free survival (DFS) in solid tumours. (**B**) One-–leave meta–analysis for investigating the effects of particular studies on the association between B7H4 expression and DFS in solid tumours.

A. Study	logHR	SE(logHR)	Haza	rd Ratio	HR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
Jikuya R-RCC 2020 RCC Jikuya R-ccRCC 2020 ccRCC Genova C 2019 NSCLC-nivolumab cohort Genova C 2019 NSCLC-CTH cohort	0.9314 0.8007 0.8242 -0.4463	0.4040 0.4177 0.3447 0.4088			2.54 2.23 2.28 0.64	[1.15; 5.60] [0.98; 5.05] [1.16; 4.48] [0.29; 1.43]	23.3% 21.8% 32.1% 22.8%	24.5% 23.8% 27.4% 24.3%
Common effect model Random effects model		г			1.74 ► 1.71	[1.19; 2.55] [0.91; 3.20]	100.0%	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 62\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.2531$, $p = 0.05$		0.2	2 0.5	1 2	5			
B. Study		Haza	rd Ratio	HR	95%-CI	12		
Omitting Jikuya R-RCC 2020 RCC Omitting Jikuya R-ccRCC 2020 ccRCC Omitting Genova C 2019 NSCLC-nivolumal Omitting Genova C 2019 NSCLC-CTH coho	b cohort ort	=		1.50 1.57 1.53 2.34	[0.67; 3.38] [0.67; 3.67] [0.65; 3.63] [1.51; 3.62]	70% 73% 71% 0%		
Random effects model		[+	- 1.71	[0.91; 3.20]	62%		
		0.5	1 2					

Figure 5. (A) Forest plot of studies evaluating HRs of high B7H4 expression and progression-free survival (PFS) in solid tumours. (B) One-leave meta-analysis for investigating the effects of particular studies on the association between B7H4 expression and PFS in solid tumours.

								Weight	Weight
Study	logHR	SE(logHR)	I	Hazard Rat	tio	HR	95%-CI	(common)	(random)
Zhao X 2016 CCA	0.4688	0.2984		+ 👼		1.60	[0.89; 2.87]	26.9%	26.0%
Zong L 2023 ECC	1.7492	0.5148				5.75	[2.10; 15.77]	9.0%	21.0%
Zang X 2007 Pca	0.7975	0.2842			•	2.22	[1.27: 3.88]	29.6%	26.3%
Zong L 2022 CvC	-0.4780	0.2636				0.62	[0.37; 1.04]	34.4%	26.7%
0							M 05. 4 001	400.00/	
Common effect model				\leq		1.43	[1.05; 1.93]	100.0%	
Random effects model			Г			1.77	[0.75; 4.18]		100.0%
			01	0512	10				
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 85\%$, τ^2	= 0.6515	, p < 0.01	0.1	0.0 1 2	10				
В.									
Study		Hazard R	atio	HR	95%-CI	12			
Omitting Zhao X 2016 CC	A				[0.54: 6.55]	90%			
Omitting Zong L 2023 EC	C		<u> </u>	1.29	[0 60 2 76]	83%			
Omitting Zang X 2007 Pc	a		-	- 1.68	[0.49:5.73]	88%			
Omitting Zong L 2022 Cv	<u> </u>			- 2.43	[1 31: 4 53]	57%			
United a construction of the construction of t	<u> </u>			2.40	[1.01, 4.00]	51 /0			

Random effects model



Figure 6. (A) Forest plot of studies evaluating HRs of high B7H4 expression and recurrence-free survival (RFS) in solid tumours. (B) One-leave meta-analysis for investigating the effects of particular studies on the association between B7H4 expression and RFS in solid tumours.

The *p* values of Begg's test and Egger's test for OS were above 0.05, which indicated no significant publication bias. Zong L. 2023, Piao L. 2018, Jikuya R. 2019 ccRCC cohort, and Zhao X. 2016 contributed the most to the overall heterogeneity in DSS, DFS, PFS, and RFS, respectively.

3. Methods

3.1. Data Sources and Search Strategy for Meta-Analysis

This systematic review and meta-analysis were performed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines [54]. Embase (https://www.embase.com/ accessed on 1 July 2023), PubMed (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ accessed on 10 July 2023), and the Cochrane Library (https://www.cochrane-library.com/ accessed on 1 August 2023) were searched for articles. The retrieval time was from the inception to 17 September 2023. This review was registered on the PROSPERO platform (CRD42023414613). The search strategy is described in detail in Supplementary Materials Tables S1–S3.

3.2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria included patients diagnosed with solid cancer before enrolment, randomised controlled trials (RCTs) or observational studies, sufficient data about B7H4 expression evaluated by the immunohistochemical method (IHC), a clinical outcome with a provided hazard ratio (HR), or, in cases where the HR was not provided, the Kaplan–Meier curve with a number at risk table was accepted. The outcomes included overall survival (OS), disease-specific survival (DSS), disease-free survival (DFS), recurrence-free survival (RFS), and progression-free survival (PFS) (OS, DSS, DFS, PFS, RFS definitions: Supplementary Material Table S5). The exclusion criteria included a lack of sufficient data, non-solid and nervous system cancer, case reports, sequencing data studies, animal experiments, studies based on TCGA and other online available repository to avoid the duplication of data, meta-analyses, network meta-analyses, reviews, conference presentations, or study protocols.

3.3. Study Selection and Data Extraction

Two review authors (Miriam Dawidowicz and Agnieszka Kula) independently reviewed the titles and study abstracts with potential eligibility. The full texts of eligible studies were downloaded for further assessment. Three authors (Miriam Dawidowicz, Agnieszka Kula, Sylwia Mielcarska) independently extracted the following data: basic information, such as the first author, publication year, sample size, country, and study design; characteristics of patients, type, and stage of cancer; more detailed information regarding the clinical outcomes; information of cancer treatment, details about B7H4 expression location and cut-off value determining high expression, HR estimation method (univariate or multivariate analysis), and HR. Any disagreement was resolved by group discussion and consensus. We excluded results reported in only one study. If the study did not report an HR, but a survival curve with a number at risk table was published, the HR values were reconstructed using WebPlotDigitizer v4.7 and an algorithm was developed by Guyot P in R Studio [55]

3.4. Statistical Analysis for Meta-Analysis

To conduct all analyses, we used R software (version 4.0.3). For estimating the HR, multivariate analysis models were used; if not provided in the articles, univariate models were used. To estimate the heterogeneity, the chi-square Cochran's Q-test and Higgins I2 statistics were performed. I2 values were interpreted as follows: 25-50%—low heterogeneity, 50-75%—moderate heterogeneity, above 75%—high heterogeneity according to J. P. Higgins and Thompson [56]. A fixed-effects model was used to pool the value of the HR and 95% confidence interval if I2 < 50% and *p* value > 0.05, indicating the lack of substantial heterogeneity. The random-effects model was applied when the significant heterogeneity was determined. In order to test the effect of the exclusion of one study each time, sensitivity analyses were performed. The publication bias assessments were conducted by a funnel plot and Begg's and Egger's tests.

3.5. Quality Assessment

Two reviewers (Miriam Dawidowicz, Sylwia Mielcarska) assessed the quality of eligible studies independently by using the Newcastle–Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS) [57]. The NOS assessed the quality of studies from the aspects of selection, comparability, and exposure, with a total score ranging from 0 to 9 points. More than 6 points was defined as high quality.

4. Discussion

B7H4 has been evaluated in a variety of solid tumours for its prognostic significance. In this meta-analysis, we aimed to summarise and compare the results of the published studies and extract valuable information that can be used in clinical decision making for human solid tumours. A total of 31 studies and 6357 patients were included. The results demonstrated that high B7H4 expression predicted poor OS in patients with cancers. The sensitivity analysis and publication bias proved that the results were reliable. However, heterogeneity existed among these studies. Considering the apparent heterogeneity, a subgroup analysis was performed.

The subgroup analysis indicated that a sample size, analysis method, and IHC score cut-off value did significantly reduce the heterogeneity among studies. Additionally, the subgroup analysis by cancer type revealed that B7H4 overexpression was correlated with poor OS in tumours, including CRC, GC, ESCC, and CCA, but not in PDAC, NSCLC, and RCC. Moreover, the subgroup analysis by cancer type also significantly reduced the heterogeneity within each subgroup. However, NSCLC and PDAC subgroup analyses by cancer type did not reduce heterogeneity. This might be explained by either high diversity of this cancer type, a small number of the included studies, or different methods of estimating the cut-off value for B7H4 expression.

Thus, this may suggest that cancer type was the main source of heterogeneity and that B7H4 expression may exert distinct effects in different cancer types. Studies with an IHC score cut-off value < 3 and univariate method of HR estimation did not support the relationship between high expression of B7H4 and OS. On the other hand, cut-off value was one of the heterogeneity sources. The studies where the expression of B7H4 was estimated by the most similar method had, as expected, low heterogeneity. Another factor that contributes to heterogeneity is the origin of the studied population. We did not analyse this factor in the subgroup analysis, but Qi Z-J and colleagues assessed that B7H4 was associated with worse OS in the Chinese population but not in the Japanese population [24]. The high expression of B7H4 was not significantly correlated with poor DSS, PFS, RFS, or DFS. However, the results might be inaccurate due to a relatively small number of studies that provided DSS, PFS, RFS, or DFS. Furthermore, the methods of estimating a high expression of B7H4 were highly varied in the included studies, and there were not enough studies to conduct an analysis for DSS, PFS, RFS, or DFS parameters in the subgroups to elucidate the impact of this factor.

B7H4 is not usually expressed in most normal immune cells and tissues; however, its overexpression in cancers often correlates with poor clinical outcomes and lower patient survival [9,10]. These findings were also confirmed in the previous meta-analysis. Nonetheless, there are some discrepancies between our results and the meta-analysis mentioned above. For instance, the HR in the meta-analysis conducted by Qi ZJ et al. and Song X et al. indicated poor OS in patients with PDAC, whereas our results did not support this effect of high B7H4 expression [24,26]. Secondly, patients with high B7-H4 had a significantly shorter DFS in the cohorts studied by Song X et al., whereas our analysis did not support it as well. These differences might be partially caused by including the team studies that evaluated the B7H4 expression by various methods, such as IHC and ELISA.

B7H4 is involved in tumour immunosuppressive mechanisms and is a checkpoint for inhibition [58]. Besides the prognostic value of B7H4, after PD-L1/PD-1 and CTLA-4, it is expected to be another ICB (immune checkpoint blockage) target [59]. High expression of B7H4 is associated with a poorer differentiation of tumour cells and epithelial–mesenchymal

transition (EMT) of tumour cells [51,60]. Poorly differentiated tumour cells are associated with a higher presence of cancer stem cells (CSCs) in the tumour area, and this tumour phenotype is more prone to developing resistance to therapy [61]. B7H4 is expressed on CSCs, and its expression is associated with their maintenance [53,62]. Further, CSCs contribute to cancer resistance to ICI therapy [61].

Moreover, high expression of B7H4 is related to low infiltration levels of cytotoxic T lymphocytes [58,62]. The inhibition of B7H4 glycosylation has been reported to restore antitumour immunity in immune cold breast cancers [26]. These findings support the view that inhibiting the B7H4 function leads to restoring the proper T-cell function in patients with cancer. In addition, the B7H4 targeting strategy has the potential to possibly reduce the metastatic burden and tumour recurrence after therapy [61,63]. All these reasons indicate B7H4 to be an important and potent therapeutic target.

Given the limitations of this study, further well-designed studies that include evaluation of more tumour types with a larger sample size, a specifically determined cut-off value for high B7H4 expression by the IHC method, and detailed data about previously applied treatments are needed. A unified measuring method and cut-off value need to be established for prognostic analysis. The most comparable results were observed between studies that assessed B7H4 expression using an IHC score that was the percentage of positive cells and staining intensity, with a cut-off value for high expression above an IHC score of 3. In some studies, the HR and 95% CI were calculated by extracting data from Kaplan–Meier curves rather than directly from the original literature, which inevitably led to small statistical deviations. Another important matter is that researchers should provide sufficient data in their articles to enable including their results in further meta-analyses.

5. Conclusions

In summary, our meta-analysis provides comprehensive evidence that high B7H4 expression is associated with poor OS in solid tumours and might be used as a potential prognostic marker. However, high B7H4 expression was not related to OS in patients with PDAC, NSCLC, and RCC. The subgroup analysis that we performed helped to reduce the heterogeneity of results. The identified factors, such as cancer type, HR, and cut-off value estimation methods, significantly contributed to mitigating heterogeneity. These findings indicate the importance of evaluating different elements affecting the prognostic value of B7H4. Further studies performed to elucidate the mechanisms underlying the observed correlations and to confirm our results in larger, well-designed studies are required. Standardising methods for assessing B7H4 expression and establishing a uniform cut-off value for prognostic analysis are important steps towards improving the reliability and comparability of future studies. Therefore, more mechanistic studies are needed for further analysis.

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at: https://www.mdpi.com/article/10.3390/ijms25095045/s1.

Author Contributions: Conceptualisation, M.D. and A.K.; methodology, M.D., A.K. and S.M.; software, S.M.; validation, S.M.; formal analysis, M.D. and S.M.; investigation, M.D.; data curation, A.K.; writing—original draft, M.D.; writing—review and editing, A.K., S.M., E.Ś. and D.W.; visualisation, M.D. and S.M.; supervision, E.Ś. and D.W. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Materials, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author/s.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- 1. He, X.; Xu, C. Immune checkpoint signaling and cancer immunotherapy. Cell Res. 2020, 30, 660–669. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Schildberg, F.A.; Klein, S.R.; Freeman, G.J.; Sharpe, A.H. Coinhibitory Pathways in the B7-CD28 Ligand-Receptor Family. *Immunity* 2016, 44, 955–972. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Janakiram, M.; Shah, U.A.; Liu, W.; Zhao, A.; Schoenberg, M.P.; Zang, X. The third group of the B7-CD28 immune checkpoint family: HHLA2, TMIGD2, B7x, and B7-H3. *Immunol. Rev.* 2017, 276, 26–39. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 4. Carreno, B.M.; Collins, M. The B7 family of ligands and its receptors: New pathways for costimulation and inhibition of immune responses. *Annu. Rev. Immunol.* **2002**, *20*, 29–53. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 5. Collins, M.; Ling, V.; Carreno, B.M. The B7 family of immune-regulatory ligands. Genome Biol. 2005, 6, 223. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 6. Ni, L.; Dong, C. New B7 Family Checkpoints in Human Cancers. Mol. Cancer Ther. 2017, 16, 1203–1211. [CrossRef]
- Mortezaee, K.; Majidpoor, J. Alternative immune checkpoints in immunoregulatory profile of cancer stem cells. *Heliyon* 2023, 9, e23171. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 8. Chang, T.-P.; Polonskaya, Z.; Luna, X.; Martomo, S.; Zhang, Z.; Ng, S.; Patel, J.P.; Lu, D. 45P A novel bi-functional IL15 cytokine fusion antibody selected to kill B7-H4 positive tumor cells. *Ann. Oncol.* **2021**, *32*, S1391. [CrossRef]
- Jeon, H.; Vigdorovich, V.; Garrett-Thomson, S.C.; Janakiram, M.; Ramagopal, U.A.; Abadi, Y.M.; Lee, J.S.; Scandiuzzi, L.; Ohaegbulam, K.C.; Chinai, J.M.; et al. Structure and cancer immunotherapy of the B7 family member B7x. *Cell Rep.* 2014, 9, 1089–1098. [CrossRef]
- 10. Yuan, L.; Ye, J.; Fan, D. The B7-H4 gene induces immune escape partly via upregulating the PD-1/Stat3 pathway in non-small cell lung cancer. *Hum. Immunol.* **2020**, *81*, 254–261. [CrossRef]
- Yao, Y.; Ye, H.; Qi, Z.; Mo, L.; Yue, Q.; Baral, A.; Hoon, D.S.B.; Vera, J.C.; Heiss, J.D.; Chen, C.C.; et al. B7-H4(B7x)-Mediated Cross-talk between Glioma-Initiating Cells and Macrophages via the IL6/JAK/STAT3 Pathway Lead to Poor Prognosis in Glioma Patients. *Clin. Cancer Res.* 2016, 22, 2778–2790. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Krambeck, A.E.; Thompson, R.H.; Dong, H.; Lohse, C.M.; Park, E.S.; Kuntz, S.M.; Leibovich, B.C.; Blute, M.L.; Cheville, J.C.; Kwon, E.D. B7-H4 expression in renal cell carcinoma and tumor vasculature: Associations with cancer progression and survival. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2006, 103, 10391–10396. [CrossRef]
- 13. Xie, N.; Cai, J.-B.; Zhang, L.; Zhang, P.-F.; Shen, Y.-H.; Yang, X.; Lu, J.-C.; Gao, D.-M.; Kang, Q.; Liu, L.-X.; et al. Upregulation of B7-H4 promotes tumor progression of intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma. *Cell Death Dis.* **2017**, *8*, 3205. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Thompson, R.H.; Zang, X.; Lohse, C.M.; Leibovich, B.C.; Slovin, S.F.; Reuter, V.E.; Cheville, J.C.; Blute, M.L.; Russo, P.; Kwon, E.D.; et al. Serum-soluble B7x is elevated in renal cell carcinoma patients and is associated with advanced stage. *Cancer Res.* 2008, 68, 6054–6058. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 15. Shi, H.; Ji, M.; Wu, J.; Zhou, Q.; Li, X.; Li, Z.; Zheng, X.; Xu, B.; Zhao, W.; Wu, C.; et al. Serum B7-H4 expression is a significant prognostic indicator for patients with gastric cancer. *World J. Surg. Oncol.* **2014**, *12*, 188. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Zhang, C.; Li, Y.; Wang, Y. Diagnostic value of serum B7-H4 for hepatocellular carcinoma. J. Surg. Res. 2015, 197, 301–306. [CrossRef]
- 17. Azuma, T.; Sato, Y.; Ohno, T.; Azuma, M.; Kume, H. Serum soluble B7-H4 is a prognostic marker for patients with non-metastatic clear cell renal cell carcinoma. *PLoS ONE* **2018**, *13*, e0199719. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 18. Flies, D.B.; Chen, L. The new B7s: Playing a pivotal role in tumor immunity. J. Immunother. 2007, 30, 251–260. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 19. Gray, E.; Ulrich, M.; Epp, A.; Younan, P.; Sahetya, D.; Hensley, K.; Allred, S.; Huang, L.-Y.; Hahn, J.; Gahnberg, K.; et al. SGN-B7H4V, an investigational vedotin ADC directed to the immune checkpoint ligand B7-H4, shows promising activity in preclinical models. *J. Immunother. Cancer* 2023, *11*, e007572. [CrossRef]
- Gitto, S.B.; Whicker, M.; Davies, G.; Kumar, S.; Kinneer, K.; Xu, H.; Lewis, A.; Mamidi, S.; Medvedev, S.; Kim, H.; et al. A B7-H4-Targeting Antibody-Drug Conjugate Shows Antitumor Activity in PARPi and Platinum-Resistant Cancers with B7-H4 Expression. *Clin. Cancer Res.* 2024, 30, 1567–1581. [CrossRef]
- 21. Podojil, J.R.; Glaser, A.P.; Baker, D.; Courtois, E.T.; Fantini, D.; Yu, Y.; Eaton, V.; Sivajothi, S.; Chiang, M.; Das, A.; et al. Antibody targeting of B7-H4 enhances the immune response in urothelial carcinoma. *Oncoimmunology* **2020**, *9*, 1744897. [CrossRef]
- Song, X.; Zhou, Z.; Li, H.; Xue, Y.; Lu, X.; Bahar, I.; Kepp, O.; Hung, M.-C.; Kroemer, G.; Wan, Y. Pharmacologic Suppression of B7-H4 Glycosylation Restores Antitumor Immunity in Immune-Cold Breast Cancers. *Cancer Discov.* 2020, 10, 1872–1893. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Altan, M.; Pelekanou, V.; Schalper, K.A.; Toki, M.; Gaule, P.; Syrigos, K.; Herbst, R.S.; Rimm, D.L. B7-H3 Expression in NSCLC and Its Association with B7-H4, PD-L1 and Tumor-Infiltrating Lymphocytes. *Clin. Cancer Res.* 2017, 23, 5202–5209. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Qi, Z.-J.; Yu, D.; Chen, C.-H.; Jiang, H.; Li, R.; Kang, Y.-M. The prognostic value of B7H1 and B7H4 expression in pancreatic cancer: A meta-analysis. *Int. J. Biol. Markers* 2019, *34*, 373–380. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Meng, Z.; Wang, F.; Zhang, Y.; Li, S.; Wu, H. B7-H4 as an independent prognostic indicator of cancer patients: A meta-analysis. Oncotarget 2017, 8, 68825–68836. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 26. Song, X.; Shao, Y.; Gu, W.; Xu, C.; Mao, H.; Pei, H.; Jiang, J. Prognostic role of high B7-H4 expression in patients with solid tumors: A meta-analysis. *Oncotarget* **2016**, *7*, 76523–76533. [CrossRef]
- Dong, Q.; Ma, X. B7-H4 expression is associated with tumor progression and prognosis in patients with osteosarcoma. *Biomed Res. Int.* 2015, 2015, 156432. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

- 28. Li, H.; Piao, L.; Liu, S.; Cui, Y.; Xuan, Y. B7-H4 is a potential prognostic biomarker of prostate cancer. *Exp. Mol. Pathol.* 2020, 114, 104406. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Zang, X.; Thompson, R.H.; Al-Ahmadie, H.A.; Serio, A.M.; Reuter, V.E.; Eastham, J.A.; Scardino, P.T.; Sharma, P.; Allison, J.P. B7-H3 and B7x are highly expressed in human prostate cancer and associated with disease spread and poor outcome. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2007, *104*, 19458–19463. [CrossRef]
- Zong, L.; Zhang, Q.; Zhou, Y.; Kong, Y.; Yu, S.; Chen, J.; Zhang, Y.; Xiang, Y. Expression and Significance of Immune Checkpoints in Clear Cell Carcinoma of the Uterine Cervix. J. Immunol. Res. 2020, 2020, 1283632. [CrossRef]
- Zong, L.; Gu, Y.; Zhou, Y.; Kong, Y.; Mo, S.; Yu, S.; Xiang, Y.; Chen, J. Expression of B7 family checkpoint proteins in cervical cancer. *Mod. Pathol.* 2022, 35, 786–793. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Zhao, X.; Guo, F.; Li, Z.; Jiang, P.; Deng, X.; Tian, F.; Li, X.; Wang, S. Aberrant expression of B7-H4 correlates with poor prognosis and suppresses tumor-infiltration of CD8+ T lymphocytes in human cholangiocarcinoma. *Oncol. Rep.* 2016, 36, 419–427. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Xu, H.; Chen, X.; Tao, M.; Chen, K.; Chen, C.; Xu, G.; Li, W.; Yuan, S.; Mao, Y. B7-H3 and B7-H4 are independent predictors of a poor prognosis in patients with pancreatic cancer. *Oncol. Lett.* 2016, *11*, 1841–1846. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Tsiaousidou, A.; Tsaroucha, A.K.; Lambropoulou, M.; Pitiakoudis, M.; Polychronidis, A.; Chatzitheoklitos, E.; Romanidis, K.; Simopoulos, C. Increased B7H4 tissue expression correlates with high CA19.9 serum levels and a worse prognosis of pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Clin. Exp. Med.* 2016, 16, 351–356. [CrossRef]
- Loch, F.N.; Kamphues, C.; Beyer, K.; Schineis, C.; Rayya, W.; Lauscher, J.C.; Horst, D.; Dragomir, M.P.; Schallenberg, S. The Immune Checkpoint Landscape in Tumor Cells of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2023, 24, 2160. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 36. Fan, M.; Zhuang, Q.; Chen, Y.; Ding, T.; Yao, H.; Chen, L.; He, X.; Xu, X. B7-H4 expression is correlated with tumor progression and clinical outcome in urothelial cell carcinoma. *Int. J. Clin. Exp. Pathol.* **2014**, *7*, 6768–6775. [PubMed]
- Borgmann, M.; Oetting, A.; Meyer, F.; Möckelmann, N.; Droste, C.; von Bargen, C.M.; Möller-Koop, C.; Witt, M.; Borgmann, K.; Rothkamm, K.; et al. The prognostic impact of B7-H3 and B7-H4 in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *J. Cancer Res. Clin.* Oncol. 2023, 149, 3383–3393. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Wu, L.; Deng, W.-W.; Yu, G.-T.; Mao, L.; Bu, L.-L.; Ma, S.-R.; Liu, B.; Zhang, W.-F.; Sun, Z.-J. B7-H4 expression indicates poor prognosis of oral squamous cell carcinoma. *Cancer Immunol. Immunother.* 2016, 65, 1035–1045. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Liang, M.; Li, J.; Wang, D.; Li, S.; Sun, Y.; Sun, T.; Zhang, J.; Chen, X.; Li, Q.; Sun, S. T-cell infiltration and expressions of T lymphocyte co-inhibitory B7-H1 and B7-H4 molecules among colorectal cancer patients in northeast China's Heilongjiang province. *Tumour Biol.* 2014, 35, 55–60. [CrossRef]
- Chen, L.-j.; Sun, J.; Wu, H.-y.; Zhou, S.-m.; Tan, Y.; Tan, M.; Shan, B.-e.; Lu, B.-f.; Zhang, X.-g. B7-H4 expression associates with cancer progression and predicts patient's survival in human esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. *Cancer Immunol. Immunother.* 2011, 60, 1047–1055. [CrossRef]
- Liang, L.; Jiang, Y.; Chen, J.-S.; Niu, N.; Piao, J.; Ning, J.; Zu, Y.; Zhang, J.; Liu, J. B7-H4 expression in ovarian serous carcinoma: A study of 306 cases. *Hum. Pathol.* 2016, 57, 1–6. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 42. Wang, L.; Yang, C.; Liu, X.-B.; Wang, L.; Kang, F.-B. B7-H4 overexpression contributes to poor prognosis and drug-resistance in triple-negative breast cancer. *Cancer Cell Int.* **2018**, *18*, 100. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 43. Geng, Y.; Wang, H.; Lu, C.; Li, Q.; Xu, B.; Jiang, J.; Wu, C. Expression of costimulatory molecules B7-H1, B7-H4 and Foxp3+ Tregs in gastric cancer and its clinical significance. *Int. J. Clin. Oncol.* **2015**, *20*, 273–281. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 44. Arigami, T.; Uenosono, Y.; Ishigami, S.; Hagihara, T.; Haraguchi, N.; Natsugoe, S. Clinical significance of the B7-H4 coregulatory molecule as a novel prognostic marker in gastric cancer. *World J. Surg.* **2011**, *35*, 2051–2057. [CrossRef]
- 45. Zong, L.; Yu, S.; Mo, S.; Sun, Z.; Lu, Z.; Chen, J.; Xiang, Y. B7-H4 Further Stratifies Patients With Endometrial Cancer Exhibiting a Nonspecific Molecular Profile. *Arch. Pathol. Lab. Med.* **2023**, *147*, 1288–1297. [CrossRef]
- Parra, E.R.; Villalobos, P.; Zhang, J.; Behrens, C.; Mino, B.; Swisher, S.; Sepesi, B.; Weissferdt, A.; Kalhor, N.; Heymach, J.V.; et al. Immunohistochemical and Image Analysis-Based Study Shows That Several Immune Checkpoints are Co-expressed in Non-Small Cell Lung Carcinoma Tumors. J. Thorac. Oncol. 2018, 13, 779–791. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Genova, C.; Boccardo, S.; Mora, M.; Rijavec, E.; Biello, F.; Rossi, G.; Tagliamento, M.; Dal Bello, M.G.; Coco, S.; Alama, A.; et al. Correlation between B7-H4 and Survival of Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer Patients Treated with Nivolumab. *J. Clin. Med.* 2019, *8*, 1566. [CrossRef]
- Jikuya, R.; Kishida, T.; Sakaguchi, M.; Yokose, T.; Yasui, M.; Hashizume, A.; Tatenuma, T.; Mizuno, N.; Muraoka, K.; Umemoto, S.; et al. Galectin-9 expression as a poor prognostic factor in patients with renal cell carcinoma. *Cancer Immunol. Immunother.* 2020, 69, 2041–2051. [CrossRef]
- 49. Feng, Y.; Yang, Z.; Zhang, C.; Che, N.; Liu, X.; Xuan, Y. B7-H4 induces epithelial-mesenchymal transition and promotes colorectal cancer stemness. *Pathol. Res. Pract.* **2021**, *218*, 153323. [CrossRef]
- 50. Ding, S.; Lv, X.; Liu, Z.; Zhan, S.; Xu, Y.; Zhang, X.; Liu, C.; Cao, L. Overexpression of B7-H4 is associated with infiltrating immune cells and poor prognosis in metastatic colorectal cancer. *Int. Immunopharmacol.* **2021**, *90*, 107144. [CrossRef]
- 51. Yan, X.; Hong, B.; Feng, J.; Jin, Y.; Chen, M.; Li, F.; Qian, Y. B7-H4 is a potential diagnostic and prognostic biomarker in colorectal cancer and correlates with the epithelial-mesenchymal transition. *BMC Cancer* **2022**, *22*, 1053. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

- 52. Cao, H.; Wang, Q.; Gao, Z.; Xu, X.; Lu, Q.; Wu, Y. Clinical value of detecting IQGAP3, B7-H4 and cyclooxygenase-2 in the diagnosis and prognostic evaluation of colorectal cancer. *Cancer Cell Int.* **2019**, *19*, 163. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 53. Piao, L.; Yang, Z.; Jin, J.; Ni, W.; Qi, W.; Xuan, Y. B7H4 is associated with stemness and cancer progression in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. *Hum. Pathol.* 2018, *80*, 152–162. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Page, M.J.; McKenzie, J.E.; Bossuyt, P.M.; Boutron, I.; Hoffmann, T.C.; Mulrow, C.D.; Shamseer, L.; Tetzlaff, J.M.; Akl, E.A.; Brennan, S.E.; et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Syst. Rev.* 2021, 10, 89. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 55. Guyot, P.; Ades, A.E.; Ouwens, M.J.N.M.; Welton, N.J. Enhanced secondary analysis of survival data: Reconstructing the data from published Kaplan-Meier survival curves. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* **2012**, *12*, *9*. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Higgins, J.P.T.; Thompson, S.G.; Spiegelhalter, D.J. A re-evaluation of random-effects meta-analysis. J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. A Stat. Soc. 2009, 172, 137–159. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 57. Stang, A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. *Eur. J. Epidemiol.* 2010, 25, 603–605. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 58. Jing, Z.-L.; Liu, G.-L.; Zhou, N.; Xu, D.-Y.; Feng, N.; Lei, Y.; Ma, L.-L.; Tang, M.-S.; Tong, G.-H.; Tang, N.; et al. Interferon-γ in the tumor microenvironment promotes the expression of B7H4 in colorectal cancer cells, thereby inhibiting cytotoxic T cells. *Sci. Rep.* 2024, 14, 6053. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Pulanco, M.C.; Madsen, A.T.; Tanwar, A.; Corrigan, D.T.; Zang, X. Recent advancements in the B7/CD28 immune checkpoint families: New biology and clinical therapeutic strategies. *Cell. Mol. Immunol.* 2023, 20, 694–713. [CrossRef]
- Mizuno, T.; Kamai, T.; Tsuzuki, T.; Nishihara, D.; Kijima, T.; Arai, K.; Yoshida, K.-I. Elevated expression of B7 homolog 4 is associated with disease progression in upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma. *Cancer Immunol. Immunother.* 2022, 71, 565–578. [CrossRef]
- 61. Mortezaee, K. Enriched cancer stem cells, dense stroma, and cold immunity: Interrelated events in pancreatic cancer. *J. Biochem. Mol. Toxicol.* **2021**, *35*, e22708. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 62. Panaccione, A.; Guo, Y.; Yarbrough, W.G.; Ivanov, S.V. Expression Profiling of Clinical Specimens Supports the Existence of Neural Progenitor-Like Stem Cells in Basal Breast Cancers. *Clin. Breast Cancer* **2017**, *17*, 298–306.e7. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 63. Galazka, K.; Opławski, M.; Windorbska, W.; Skret-Magierlo, J.; Koper, K.; Basta, P.; Mach, P.; Dutch-Wicherek, M.; Mazur, A.; Wicherek, L. The immunohistochemical analysis of antigens such as RCAS1 and B7H4 in the cervical cancer nest and within the fibroblasts and macrophages infiltrating the cancer microenvironment. *Am. J. Reprod. Immunol.* **2012**, *68*, 85–93. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.