



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

ESMO-ESTRO consensus statements on the safety of combining radiotherapy with immune checkpoint inhibitors, VEGF(R) inhibitors, or multitargeted tyrosine kinase inhibitors

Aken, E.S.M. van; Devnani, B.; Prelaj, A.; Castelo-Branco, L.; Marijnen, C.A.M.; Martins-Branco, D.; ... ; Gandhi, A.K.

Citation

Aken, E. S. M. van, Devnani, B., Prelaj, A., Castelo-Branco, L., Marijnen, C. A. M., Martins-Branco, D., ... Gandhi, A. K. (2025). ESMO-ESTRO consensus statements on the safety of combining radiotherapy with immune checkpoint inhibitors, VEGF(R) inhibitors, or multitargeted tyrosine kinase inhibitors. *Annals Of Oncology*, 37(1), 17-32.
doi:10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4310402>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

SPECIAL ARTICLE

ESMO—ESTRO consensus statements on the safety of combining radiotherapy with immune checkpoint inhibitors, VEGF(R) inhibitors, or multitargeted tyrosine kinase inhibitors

E. S. M. van Aken^{1,2,*†}, B. Devnani^{3‡}, A. Prelaj^{4‡}, L. Castelo-Branco^{5‡}, C. A. M. Marijnen^{1,2}, D. Martins-Branco⁶, M. A. Gambacorta^{7,8}, A. Lamarca⁹, K. Harrington¹⁰, G. Minniti^{11,12}, M. Hecht¹³, D. Papamichael¹⁴, M. Krause^{15,16,17,18,19,20}, R. Cathomas²¹, K. Lindberg^{22,23}, S. M. O’Cathail^{24,25}, U. Nestle^{26,27}, J. Barriuso^{28,29}, S. Nowicki³⁰, C. Rödel^{31,32}, P. Boot¹, C. Belka³³, U. Ricardi³⁴, F. Lordick³⁵, D. De Ruyscher^{36,37,§}, G. Pentheroudakis^{6,§}, M. C. de Jong^{1,¶} & A. K. Gandhi³⁸

¹Department of Radiation Oncology, Netherlands Cancer Institute—Antoni van Leeuwenhoek, Amsterdam; ²Department of Radiation Oncology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands; ³Radiation Oncology Department, AIIMS—All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Jodhpur, India; ⁴Oncologia Medica Toracica Department, Fondazione IRCCS—Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori, Milan, Italy; ⁵Oncology Institute of Southern Switzerland (IOSI), EOC, Bellinzona; ⁶Scientific and Medical Division, ESMO—European Society for Medical Oncology, Lugano, Switzerland; ⁷Department of Imaging Diagnostics and Radiation Oncology, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario “Agostino Gemelli” IRCCS, Rome; ⁸Specialization School in Radiation Oncology, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome, Italy; ⁹Department of Medical Oncology—OncoHealth Institute—Health Research Institute-Fundación Jiménez Díaz University Hospital (IIS-FJD), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Madrid, Spain; ¹⁰Division of Radiotherapy and Imaging, The Institute of Cancer Research/Royal Marsden NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, London, UK; ¹¹Department of Radiological Sciences, Oncology and Anatomical Pathology, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome; ¹²IRCCS Neuromed, Pozzilli, Isernia, Italy; ¹³Department of Radiotherapy and Radiation Oncology, Saarland University Medical Center, Homburg, Germany; ¹⁴Department of Medical Oncology, Bank of Cyprus Oncology Centre, Nicosia, Cyprus; ¹⁵German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Heidelberg; ¹⁶German Cancer Consortium (DKTK), Partner Site Dresden, Dresden; ¹⁷OncoRay—National Center for Radiation Research in Oncology, Faculty of Medicine and University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Technische Universität Dresden, Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden—Rossendorf, Dresden; ¹⁸Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden—Rossendorf, Dresden; ¹⁹Department of Radiotherapy and Radiation Oncology, Faculty of Medicine and University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden; ²⁰National Center for Tumor Diseases (NCT), Partner Site Dresden, Germany; ²¹German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Heidelberg, Germany, Faculty of Medicine and University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany, and Helmholtz Association/ Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden — Rossendorf, Dresden, Germany; ²²Division of Oncology/ Hematology, Cantonal Hospital Graubünden, Chur, Switzerland; ²³Department of Oncology and Pathology, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm; ²⁴Centre of Pulmonary Oncology, Theme Cancer, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden; ²⁵School of Cancer Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK; ²⁶CUH/UCC Cancer Centre, Cork University Hospital, Cork, Ireland; ²⁷Department of Radiation Oncology, Kliniken Maria Hilf, Moenchengladbach; ²⁸Department of Radiation Oncology, University Hospital Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany; ²⁹GI and NET Oncology Unit, Department of Medical Oncology, Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre, Instituto de Investigación Hospital 12 de Octubre (Imas12), Madrid, Spain; ³⁰Division of Cancer Sciences, School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester; ³¹Beatson West of Scotland Cancer Centre, Glasgow, UK; ³²Goethe-University Frankfurt, University Hospital, Department of Radiotherapy, Frankfurt; ³³German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Heidelberg, German Cancer Consortium (DKTK), Partner Site Frankfurt am Main, Frankfurt; ³⁴Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Munich LMU, Munich, Germany; ³⁵University of Turin, Department of Oncology, Turin, Italy; ³⁶Department of Medicine II, University of Leipzig Medical Center, Cancer Center Central Germany (CCCG), Leipzig, Germany; ³⁷Department of Radiation Oncology, Maastricht Clinic, Maastricht; ³⁸Erasmus MC Cancer Institute, University Medical Center Rotterdam, Department of Radiotherapy, Rotterdam, The Netherlands; ³⁹Department of Radiation Oncology, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Institute of Medical Sciences, Lucknow, India



Available online 26 September 2025

Background: The combination of radiotherapy (RT) with targeted agents or immunotherapy may result in improved outcomes, but it can also increase toxicity. However, there is a paucity of high-quality toxicity data, leading to an absence of evidence-based guidelines.

Design: To address this, European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) and European Society for Radiotherapy and Oncology (ESTRO) initiated a series of systematic reviews followed by a Delphi consensus process to develop multidisciplinary, evidence-based consensus statements regarding the safety of combining RT with such agents. The current publication describes the combination of RT with immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs), vascular endothelial growth factor (receptor) [VEGF(R)] inhibitors, or multitargeted tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs). By systematically covering different drug classes and irradiated areas, 76 clinical scenarios were evaluated during two Delphi rounds

*Correspondence to: E. S. M. van Aken, Department of Radiation Oncology, Netherlands Cancer Institute—Antoni van Leeuwenhoek, Plesmanlaan 121, 1066 CX Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Tel: +31-0-20-512-1739
E-mail: interaction@nki.nl (E. S. M. van Aken).

†Shared first author.

‡Shared second author.

§Shared penultimate author.

*Shared last author.

Manuscript social media information

The publication can be shared on all available social media platforms.

0923-7534/© 2025 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of European Society for Medical Oncology. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

with 20 international experts. Safety statements were developed for each scenario, based on the systematic literature reviews.

Results: A total of 5921 records were screened during the systematic literature review process for ICIs, VEGF(R) inhibitors, and multitargeted TKIs, and 159 reports were selected for inclusion in the final literature reviews and the database. During the two Delphi rounds, agreement was reached regarding the safety statements for 74 clinical scenarios.

Conclusions: Generally, the expected toxicity of combining RT with ICIs is low, particularly for programmed death (-ligand) 1 inhibitors. For most combinations with VEGF(R) inhibitors and multitargeted TKIs, exercising caution is recommended. The evidence-based safety statements developed during this comprehensive project provide practical guidance on combining RT with targeted cancer therapies and immunotherapy.

Key words: radiotherapy, tyrosine kinase inhibitors, immune checkpoint inhibitors, toxicity, systematic review, consensus statements

INTRODUCTION

Systemic therapy is a crucial pillar in the treatment of cancer, along with surgery and radiotherapy (RT). Recently, the number of systemic treatment options has increased considerably, due to the introduction of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) and a wide array of targeted agents. This has led to improved treatment outcomes across nearly all cancer types and various disease settings.¹

Approximately 50% of cancer patients will receive RT at some point during their treatment.²⁻⁴ Consequently, patients already receiving targeted agents or ICIs are frequently referred for RT, mostly for oligometastases, oligoprogression, or local palliative treatment.⁵⁻⁸ Although concurrently combining these agents with RT may improve tumor control, increased toxicity is a potential threat.⁸ Unfortunately, there is a very limited amount of high-quality evidence about toxicity when combining RT with the latest systemic agents. For several targeted drug–RT combinations, unexpected clinically relevant toxicity has been reported, including mucositis, ulceration, pulmonary toxicity, and dermatitis, raising safety concerns for some combinations.⁹⁻¹⁵

This lack of evidence causes clinical dilemmas for oncologists. On the one hand, disproportionate adverse effects of combined-modality treatment should be avoided. On the other hand, drug interruption or dosage reduction may affect disease control, leading to tumor progression or flare,¹⁶⁻¹⁸ while RT avoidance or dose reduction can result in reduced tumor or symptom control. Therefore, unnecessary treatment deintensification or interruption should be avoided. We face a significant knowledge gap and a lack of consensus regarding this issue. Moreover, there are no evidence-based, multidisciplinary protocols or guidelines for most targeted/immunotherapy drug–RT combinations.^{8,19,20} Depending on the specific drug–RT combination, site of irradiation, and the treatment decision, this lack of knowledge can lead to suboptimal treatment or unexpected increased toxicity for these patients.

Therefore, the European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) and the European Society for Radiotherapy and Oncology (ESTRO) jointly initiated an elaborate and comprehensive series of drug class-specific and irradiated area-specific systematic literature reviews and Delphi consensus

statements regarding the safety of combining RT with targeted agents or ICIs. For each drug class, irradiated area-specific systematic literature reviews and Delphi consensus statements were developed. A complementing paper provides a framework of the most important (radio)biological and pharmacological factors, along with general clinical considerations.²¹ The goal of the current publication within this series is to provide clinicians with systematic reviews and consensus statements regarding the safety of combining RT with ICIs, vascular endothelial growth factor (receptor) [VEGF (R)] inhibitors, or multitargeted tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs).

METHODS

Project governance

This project was carried out in close collaboration with ESMO and ESTRO. Permission was granted by both the ESMO board and the ESTRO guidelines committee. The project was overseen by a coordinating committee, consisting of representatives and experts from both ESMO and ESTRO, who convened monthly. Daily project coordination was managed by researchers from the Netherlands Cancer Institute. The project received financial support from the KWF Dutch Cancer Society [grant number: 12702]. Production costs have been covered by ESMO and ESTRO from central funds.

Systematic literature reviews

The coordinating committee evaluated the clinical relevance and emerging evidence of novel anticancer treatments to cluster the research into 10 different drug classes, namely ICIs and different classes of targeted agents. Antibody–drug conjugates were not included in the current project.

For each drug class, a systematic literature search was carried out in the Medline, Embase, and SCOPUS databases on 21 December 2020. The search strategy and key words are provided in [Supplementary Tables S1-S3](#), available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>. Studies were only included if RT and the targeted agents were combined concurrently, which was defined as a maximum time gap between drug administration and RT of 5 drug half-lives

before RT,^{21–26} or 2 weeks after RT. A description of treatment-related toxicity was required as well. Further inclusion and exclusion criteria can be found in [Supplementary Table S4](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008), available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>. Initially, double-blind title-abstract screening was carried out by two researchers (EA and PB, with a consulting role by MJ), followed by full-text screening of the selected reports. For multitargeted TKIs, full-text screening and review was carried out by the same researchers. For ICIs and VEGF(R) inhibitors, representatives from ESMO (AG, AP, BD, JB, LCB, SOC) assisted during the full-text screening and review. The quality of the literature screening and review process was ensured through regular meetings and discussions with the screening researchers. Due to the high number of reports included in the ICI and VEGF(R) literature searches, an additional selection step was added to select the largest studies with the highest levels of evidence for each drug–RT scenario ([Supplementary Figure S1](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008), available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>).

In order to provide the evidence for drug-specific and irradiated area-specific safety recommendations, each drug target-specific systematic literature review was divided into six irradiated area-specific literature reviews: for irradiation of the skin, brain, head and neck, thorax, abdomen/pelvis, and musculoskeletal tissues ([Supplementary Material](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008), pages 2–41, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>). Summaries were written for each drug class and irradiated area. Additionally, information about commonly used drugs, their mechanisms, and the pathways involved was provided.

Literature database

All included reports were added to a searchable literature database in Microsoft Excel 2016 (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA), available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>, enabling selection of publications based on a specific drug target, irradiated area, and/or study type. Additional relevant information from each publication was recorded in this database, including the study type, number of patients, primary tumor, drug name, drug dose, drug scheduling relative to RT, RT technique, RT dose, RT fractionation scheme, tumor response, acute toxicity, late toxicity, and toxicity comparisons with monotherapy.

Safety recommendations

The project coordinators and coordinating committee members defined three safety measure options for each drug–RT scenario: not combining both treatments, a major treatment adaptation, or a minor/no treatment adaptation ([Figure 1](#)). Based on the systematic literature reviews, scenario-specific safety recommendations were written per drug class, specifically for each of the six irradiated areas and for three RT scenarios ([Table 1](#)). This resulted in at least 18 scenario-specific safety recommendations per drug class. Based on the systematic literature reviews, EA

selected one of the three predefined safety measure options for each safety recommendation.

The levels of evidence are derived from the ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines Standard Operating Procedures (adapted from the Infectious Diseases Society of America–United States Public Health Service Grading System) ([Supplementary Table S5](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008), available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>).^{27,28}

Modified Delphi process

A total of 20 experts, equally divided between ESMO and ESTRO representatives, were invited to participate in a modified Delphi process.²⁹ This Delphi process took place between 19 September 2023 and 7 February 2024. All participating Delphi experts were requested to read a briefing document summarizing general information, to read the systematic literature reviews ([Supplementary Material](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008), pages 2–41, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>), to use the literature database provided, to consider any other evidence that they might be aware of (e.g. published after our literature review time point), and to vote whether they agreed or disagreed with the proposed safety measure statement for each drug–RT scenario. If they disagreed, they were requested to explain their decision, preferably with supporting (new) literature references.

Two digital Delphi voting rounds were carried out. During round 1, statements with an agreement rate of $\geq 90\%$ were immediately regarded as consensus. During round 2, statements with $\geq 75\%$ agreement were accepted.³⁰ Statements with $\geq 90\%$ agreement are more strongly recommended than statements with 75%–89% agreement. For statements that were voted on in both Delphi rounds, the round 2 agreement rates were decisive.

Between round 1 and round 2, statements were reviewed by EA and selected experts (AP, CM, DDR, DP, KH). Delphi expert feedback was analyzed and statements were added, removed, or adapted, if necessary. The Delphi process was coordinated by the project coordinators and the ESMO office. Microsoft Excel 2016 was used for questionnaire development and analysis of the Delphi results.

RESULTS

Immune checkpoint inhibitors

Systematic literature review process results. After screening 3251 unique records for ICIs, 46 reports were included in the literature review and database. The PRISMA flow diagram³¹ ([Supplementary Figure S2](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008)) and the full systematic literature review are shown in [Supplementary Material](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008), pages 2–14, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>.

Drug class and systematic literature review summary. Commonly used ICIs are monoclonal antibodies targeted against programmed cell death protein 1 (PD-1), programmed death-ligand 1 (PD-L1), and cytotoxic T lymphocyte antigen 4 (CTLA-4). PD-1 and CTLA-4 are immune

Expected risk of combined therapy and corresponding safety measures			
Expected risk:	Strongly increased toxicity	No/marginally increased toxicity	
Consider:	Not combining	Major adaptation	Minor/no adaptation
Safety measure definitions			
Not combining	Consider protracted drug interruption or no radiotherapy, to avoid a drug–radiotherapy interaction.		
	If omitting radiotherapy is undesirable, it is important to reach an estimated drug ^a concentration unlikely to cause severe synergistic toxicity, before the start of radiotherapy. In this safety category, a time interval of at least 5 drug ^a elimination half-lives between drug interruption and the start of radiotherapy is proposed. This time interval can be individually adapted, based on clinical and pharmacological factors. Consider restarting the drug 1 week or later after radiotherapy completion.		
Major adaptation	Consider a clinically relevant drug interruption/dosage reduction or a major radiotherapy adaptation.		
	A major radiotherapy adaptation is defined as a ≥20% lower prescribed dose to the PTV and/or underdosing ≥20% of the PTV volume, compared with local standard therapy. When applying a drug interruption/dosage reduction, it is important to reach an estimated drug ^a concentration unlikely to cause severe synergistic toxicity, before the start of radiotherapy. In this safety category, this will usually concern a time interval of <5 drug ^a elimination half-lives between drug interruption/dosage reduction and the start of radiotherapy. When implemented, the drug dosage reduction should be clinically relevant with a perceived impact on the likelihood of efficacy. The time interval and/or drug dosage reduction can be individually adapted, based on clinical and pharmacological factors. Consider restarting the drug (or the original drug dosage) up to 1 week after radiotherapy completion, or later in case of persistent or severe acute radiotherapy toxicity.		
Minor/no adaptation	Consider a clinically insignificant drug interruption/dosage reduction, a minor radiotherapy adaptation, or no adaptations.		
	For minor radiotherapy adaptations, the BED/EQD ₂ to the target volume should not change. The following adaptations can be considered: - More fractionated radiotherapy. - More advanced radiotherapy techniques than standard practice (e.g. IMRT, VMAT, IGRT), to reduce the normal tissue dose. A clinically insignificant drug interruption/dosage reduction may be applied when it is unlikely to reduce drug efficacy.		

Figure 1. Predefined safety measure definitions for combining targeted agents with radiotherapy, based on the expected risk.

BED, biologically equivalent dose; EQD₂, equivalent dose in 2 Gy fractions; IGRT, image-guided radiotherapy; IMRT, intensity-modulated radiotherapy; PTV, planning target volume; VMAT, volumetric-modulated arc therapy.

^aDrug or active drug metabolites.

checkpoint receptors located on the membrane of T (and other) cells.^{32,33} In lymph nodes, upon T-cell activation by recognition of an antigen-presenting cell in a lymph node,

CTLA-4 is expressed on the cell surface of the T cell. Binding of CTLA-4 to B7 ligands on the antigen-presenting cell inhibits T-cell activation. CTLA-4 inhibitors prevent this CTLA-4-mediated suppression of T-cell activation, thereby enhancing the immune response.^{32,33} In the tumor micro-environment, PD-1 is expressed on the cell membrane of activated T cells, B cells, and natural killer cells.³²⁻³⁴ Engaging with (e.g. tumor) cells expressing PD-L1 or PD-L2 leads to inhibition of T-cell activation. PD-1 and PD-L1 inhibitors enhance the immune response by preventing this interaction.^{32,33} While the enhanced immune response by ICIs is favorable for suppressing tumor growth, it can cause various autoimmune, inflammatory adverse events, including rash, thyroid disorders, hypophysitis, hepatitis, diabetes mellitus, enterocolitis, and pneumonitis.³⁵

Despite a hypothetically increased risk of inflammation in the irradiated field when combining RT with ICIs, most clinical studies do not report a markedly increased risk of RT toxicity. However, there might be a higher risk of brain radionecrosis and pneumonitis. For RT with CTLA-4 inhibitors, less high-quality data are available than for RT with PD-(L)1 inhibitors. Also, combining RT with CTLA-4 inhibitors [$\pm$ PD-(L)1 inhibitors] possibly leads to more

Table 1. Radiotherapy scenario examples

RT scenario	Example
Low-dose palliative RT	Examples: 1×8 , 2×8 , 5×4 , 10×3 Gy. Often used in patients with metastases and for palliation of symptoms. It generally has a lower risk of RT-induced toxicity. However, low-dose whole-brain RT is relatively toxic compared with local high-dose stereotactic RT for brain metastases.
High-dose conventionally fractionated RT	Examples: 33×2 Gy (5 times per week), 5×5 Gy (daily) or similar. Often used in treatments with curative/radical (or) (neo) adjuvant intent.
High-dose stereotactic RT	Examples: ≥ 14 Gy in 1 fraction, 60 Gy in 5-8 fractions, or similar. Often used in treatments with curative/radical intent. Radical, high-dose stereotactic RT is also increasingly used in the oligometastatic or oligoprogressive setting or to treat brain metastases.

RT, radiotherapy.

toxicity than combining RT with PD-(L)1 inhibitors alone. In smaller studies with increased toxicity, it is difficult to distinguish if this is merely due to additive toxicity, or due to synergistic/supra-additive toxicity caused by an interaction between ICIs and RT. It remains important to consider the toxicity profiles of both individual treatments.

For the different irradiated areas, the following data were found:

- Skin³⁶⁻⁴⁴: apart from the skin toxicities typically associated with RT and ICIs alone, no increased risk of skin toxicity is observed when RT is combined with ICIs.
- Brain^{22,45-57}: the combination of brain RT concurrently with ICIs appears generally safe. However, some studies report an (often not statistically significant) increased risk of radionecrosis.
- Head and neck^{37,46,58-62}: generally, the concurrent combination of head and neck RT with ICIs does not markedly increase RT toxicity. For CTLA-4 inhibitors, high-quality data are very limited.
- Thorax^{39-43,46-48,59-70}: there are no serious safety concerns when combining thoracic RT with ICIs. However, it may slightly increase the risk of pneumonitis. Based on the mentioned studies, combining PD-(L)1 inhibitors with thoracic RT leads to a grade (G) ≥ 3 pneumonitis risk of 5.9% (95% confidence interval 2.6% to 12.8%) (Supplementary Figure S3, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>). For CTLA-4 inhibitors, high-quality data are limited.
- Abdomen/pelvis^{38,42,43,46,48,59,61,65,67,68,71-76}: despite a hypothetically increased risk of gastrointestinal toxicity (colitis or diarrhea) when combining abdominal/pelvic RT with ICIs, these combinations are generally manageable with no clear trend toward increased severe toxicities. For CTLA-4 inhibitors, high-quality data are limited.

- Musculoskeletal tissues^{22,38,47,48,59,67,74,75,77-80}: there are no serious safety concerns based on the available data.

Delphi process results. All 20 Delphi experts completed both Delphi questionnaires, resulting in a response rate of 100%. For certain scenarios, one expert deliberately refrained from making a decision during round 1, but no answers were missing. The Delphi statement flow diagram, the first Delphi round, and the second Delphi round agreement rates are provided in Supplementary Figure S4, and Tables S6-S9, respectively, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>. The final Delphi results for PD-(L)1 and CTLA-4 inhibitors are shown in Tables 2 and 3, respectively.

Delphi consensus statements. Considering a minor/no adaptation is recommended for all RT combinations with PD-(L)1 inhibitors (Table 2). For CTLA-4 inhibitors, we recommend considering a major adaptation with some high-dose RT schedules (Table 3). For CTLA-4 inhibitors combined with high-dose conventionally fractionated RT to the head and neck, no consensus was reached (70%). We did not develop separate statements for RT combined with both PD-(L)1 inhibitors and CTLA-4 inhibitors. Although the ICI toxicity is increased, the added toxicity of RT is expected to be comparable to the combination of RT with CTLA-4 inhibitors alone or slightly increased.

For patients and treatments with a high risk of brain radionecrosis or pneumonitis, it is relevant to take into account that ICIs could potentially increase the risk of these inflammatory toxicities. When applying treatment adaptations, it is essential to be aware of the long drug elimination half-lives of most ICIs (Supplementary Material, page 2, available at <https://doi.org/>

Table 2. PD-(L)1 inhibitor consensus statements

For the combination of PD-(L)1 inhibitors with radiotherapy to the:			Agreement rate ^a	Level of evidence
Irradiated area	Radiotherapy scenario	Recommendation		
Skin	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	I ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Minor/no adaptation	100%	I
	High-dose stereotactic	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III
Brain	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Minor/no adaptation	100%	V
	High-dose stereotactic	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III
Head and neck	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	II ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Minor/no adaptation	95%	II
	High-dose stereotactic	Minor/no adaptation	95%	V
Thorax	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	I ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Minor/no adaptation	100%	I
	High-dose stereotactic	Minor/no adaptation	100%	II
Abdomen/pelvis	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III
Musculoskeletal tissues	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	I ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Minor/no adaptation	100%	I
	High-dose stereotactic	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III

Drug examples: nivolumab, pembrolizumab, atezolizumab, avelumab, durvalumab. The recommendation color codes reflect the corresponding safety levels and their associated toxicity risks, as shown in Figure 1.

PD-1, programmed cell death protein 1; PD-L1, programmed death-ligand 1.

^aAgreement rates $\geq 90\%$: strongly recommended.

^bLevel of evidence based on data from high radiotherapy dose scenarios.

Table 3. CTLA-4 inhibitor consensus statements

For the combination of CTLA-4 inhibitors with radiotherapy to the:			Agreement rate ^a	Level of evidence
Irradiated area	Radiotherapy scenario	Recommendation		
Skin	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	I
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III
Brain	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Minor/no adaptation	95%	V
	High-dose stereotactic	Minor/no adaptation	95%	III
Head and neck	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	90%	III ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation (no consensus)	70%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	85%	V
Thorax	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	III ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	90%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	85%	III
Abdomen/pelvis	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	95%	I
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	90%	V
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	100%	III
Musculoskeletal tissues	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	I
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Minor/no adaptation	95%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Minor/no adaptation	95%	III

Drug examples: ipilimumab, tremelimumab.

CTLA-4, cytotoxic T lymphocyte antigen 4.

^aAgreement rates $\geq 90\%$: strongly recommended.

^bLevel of evidence based on data from high radiotherapy dose scenarios.

10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008), as well as their prolonged immunological effects after drug discontinuation. This limits the applicability of the drug adaptation options, which increases the relevance of considering RT adaptations for this drug category.

VEGF(R) inhibitors

Systematic literature review process results. After screening 2113 unique records for VEGF(R) inhibitors, 31 reports were included in the literature review and database. The PRISMA flow diagram³¹ (Supplementary Figure S5, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>) and the full systematic literature review are shown in Supplementary Material, pages 15-24, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>.

Drug class and systematic literature review summary.

There are five types of VEGF glycoproteins, VEGFA-VEGFD and placental growth factor (PlGF).^{81,82} Upon binding to one of the three VEGF receptors (I-III), downstream cascades are activated, leading to endothelial cell proliferation, migration and invasion, increased blood vessel permeability, and recruitment of bone marrow-derived vascular precursor cells.⁸¹⁻⁸⁴ This ultimately leads to (tumor) angiogenesis and vasculogenesis, resulting in increased blood flow and increased tumor oxygenation.⁸¹ VEGF(R) inhibition aims to disrupt blood vessel formation and, consequently, tumor growth and development, while normalizing existing tumor vasculature, thereby possibly optimizing tumor oxygenation and susceptibility to antineoplastic agents.^{81,85} Additional effects of VEGF(R) inhibition may be direct tumor cell growth inhibition, restoration of dendritic cell function (and, hence, a potentially increased antitumor immune response), and vasoconstriction, leading to hypertension, a well-known adverse effect of VEGF(R) inhibitors.^{81,86}

Other adverse events of VEGF(R) inhibitors include diarrhea, fatigue, hemorrhage, thrombosis, proteinuria, and gastrointestinal perforation.⁸⁶

The available evidence indicates that concurrent VEGF axis inhibition can increase the risk of RT-related toxicity. In particular, mucosal and other gastrointestinal toxicity may increase. Hemorrhages and fistulae, well-known risks of VEGF(R) inhibitors, should be carefully considered as these events are also observed when these agents are combined with RT. Skin toxicity may also moderately increase. With regard to brain RT, data on radiation necrosis/pseudoprogression are conflicting.

For the different irradiated areas, the following data were found:

- Skin⁸⁷⁻⁹⁷: the risk of skin toxicity appears moderately increased when RT is combined with bevacizumab.
- Brain^{87,88,97-108}: most of the selected prospective studies focus on high-grade gliomas. The observed safety profile of adding VEGF(R) inhibitors aligns with the expected outcomes from standard-of-care adjuvant RT and temozolomide (TMZ) in patients with newly diagnosed glioblastoma (GBM), combined with the well-known toxicities of VEGF(R) inhibitors. The toxicity of combined treatment was often manageable. The most common toxicities of combined therapy are hematological or extracranial, indicating that there is no absolute contraindication to combining VEGF(R) inhibition with brain RT. However, data on radiation necrosis/pseudoprogression are conflicting. Intracranial and extracranial bleeding risk may increase upon use of VEGF(R) inhibitors. Furthermore, data regarding cognitive function and late toxicity are often limited.
- Head and neck^{90,109,110}: there are limited data available, but the combination of VEGF(R) inhibitors (bevacizumab) with concurrent cisplatin and cetuximab-based RT may

result in increased toxicity, including hemorrhage, lymphopenia, mucositis, and dermatitis.

- Thorax^{89,96,111-114}: the selected studies indicate that RT-related toxicities, like esophagitis, may increase with concurrent VEGF(R) inhibition. It is relevant to note that for lung tumors, both bevacizumab¹¹⁵ and ultracentral stereotactic RT¹¹⁶ may increase the risk of G5 hemorrhage, both individually and when combined.¹¹⁷
- Abdomen/pelvis^{91-95,118,119}: the available studies combining VEGF(R) inhibitors with RT suggest that there may be an increased risk of wound complications, gastrointestinal toxicities, and vascular toxicities with the addition of bevacizumab to RT. Less high-quality clinical data are available for other VEGF(R) inhibitors, such as aflibercept.
- Musculoskeletal tissues¹²⁰⁻¹²²: most studies do not indicate an evidently increased risk of RT-related toxicities, although VEGF(R) inhibitor therapy might increase the risk of myositis.

Delphi consensus statements. All 20 Delphi experts completed both Delphi questionnaires, resulting in a response rate of 100%. For one scenario, one expert deliberately refrained from making a decision during round 1, but no answers were missing. The Delphi statement flow diagram, the first Delphi round, and the second Delphi round agreement rates are provided in [Supplementary Figure S6](#), and [Tables S10](#) and [S11](#), respectively, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>. The final Delphi results for VEGF(R) inhibitors are shown in [Table 4](#).

These Delphi statements were primarily developed for anti-VEGF(R) antibodies (e.g. bevacizumab and ramucirumab) and VEGFR fusion proteins (e.g. aflibercept). Due to the risk of increased toxicity, we recommend considering a major adaptation for most RT combinations with VEGF(R) inhibitors. For low-dose palliative skin RT and for all musculoskeletal RT, considering a minor/no adaptation is recommended. For low-dose palliative brain RT, no consensus was reached (60%) for the proposed major adaptation.

Our recommendation is to consider not combining these treatments in case of (ultra)central lung stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT) or stereotactic ablative radiotherapy (SABR), when large blood vessels, main bronchi, or the esophagus are included in the high-dose region. This exception was based on studies indicating that both bevacizumab and (ultra)central lung SBRT can individually increase the risk of G5 hemorrhage and a study indicating an increased risk of fatal pulmonary hemorrhage when ultracentral SBRT was combined with anti-angiogenic agents.¹¹⁵⁻¹¹⁷

Multitargeted TKIs

Systematic literature review process results.

After screening 557 unique records for multitargeted TKIs, focusing on cabozantinib, lapatinib, pazopanib, sorafenib,

sunitinib, and vandetanib, 82 reports were included in the literature review and database. The PRISMA flow diagram³¹ ([Supplementary Figure S7](#), available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>) and the full, drug-specific systematic literature review are shown in [Supplementary Material](#), pages 25-41, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>.

Drug class and systematic literature review summary.

It is important to realize that many multitargeted TKIs not only bind to VEGF(R), their presumed primary mode of action, but also bind to tyrosine kinase domains of other (partly 'non-target') receptors.⁸² While these broad (partly 'off-target') effects of some VEGF(R) TKIs may increase efficacy, they may also negatively influence their toxicity profile. The only multitargeted TKI analyzed in this systematic review that does not target VEGF(R) is lapatinib. Common toxicities of VEGF(R) TKIs include hematological toxicity, hypertension, proteinuria, fatigue, hand-foot skin reaction, diarrhea, and hypothyroidism.¹²³

The toxicity data are limited for the combination of RT with this heterogeneous drug class. Combined treatment can result in increased RT toxicity, but this is often manageable. Increased hematological toxicity is a concern, which should be taken into account when irradiating larger (bone marrow) volumes. Furthermore, some studies indicate increased risks of gastrointestinal toxicity, hepatotoxicity, or mucosal toxicity. Particularly for cabozantinib, pazopanib, and vandetanib, toxicity data are scarce, warranting more caution with these combinations.

For the different irradiated areas, the following data were found:

- Skin¹²⁴⁻¹⁷⁴: generally, no increased radiation-induced toxicity rates are observed.
- Brain^{125,129-131,140,150,151,158,160,161,163,166,168,169,171,172,175-182}: most studies do not report increased radiation-induced toxicity rates, but hematological toxicities are common. However, late toxicity data are not always available, which warrants caution.
- Head and neck^{124,127,133,134,167,183,184}: generally, toxicity data are scarce, warranting caution. Lapatinib may increase the risk of G 3-4 mucositis.
- Thorax^{126,132,135,137,139,140,142,157,158,170,185-192}: most studies do not report increased radiation-induced toxicity rates. However, toxicity data are scarce for some drugs.
- Abdomen/pelvis^{14,135,139-143,148,153,154,157-159,162,164,165,185,188-191,193-207}: for most drugs, toxicity data are scarce or not available, warranting caution. Most toxicity data were derived from sorafenib and sunitinib studies. Combining sorafenib with liver RT may lead to excessive hepatotoxicity, particularly with larger irradiated liver volumes. Gastrointestinal toxicity may be increased with the sorafenib-RT combination as well. For the combination with sunitinib, primarily hematological toxicity should be taken into account, as well as possible gastrointestinal toxicity.

Table 4. VEGF(R) inhibitor consensus statements

For the combination of anti-VEGF(R) antibodies (or VEGFR fusion proteins) with radiotherapy to the:			Agreement rate ^a	Level of evidence
Irradiated area	Radiotherapy scenario	Recommendation		
Skin	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	95%	I ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	85%	I
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	85%	V
Brain	Low-dose palliative	Major adaptation (no consensus)	60%	I ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	95%	I
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	95%	IV
Head and neck	Low-dose palliative	Major adaptation	95%	III ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	95%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	95%	V
Thorax	Low-dose palliative	Major adaptation	90%	II ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	95%	II
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	95%	V
Abdomen/pelvis	Low-dose palliative	Major adaptation	95%	III ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	100%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	100%	V
Musculoskeletal tissues	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	100%	II ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Minor/no adaptation	95%	II
	High-dose stereotactic	Minor/no adaptation	90%	V
Exception: in case of (ultra)central lung SBRT/SABR (when large blood vessels, main bronchi or the esophagus are included in the high-dose region):				
Thorax	High-dose stereotactic	Not combining	100%	IV

Drug examples: bevacizumab, ramucirumab, aflibercept. The recommendation color codes reflect the corresponding safety levels and their associated toxicity risks, as shown in Figure 1.

SABR, stereotactic ablative radiotherapy; SBRT, stereotactic body radiotherapy; VEGF(R), vascular endothelial growth factor (receptor).

^aAgreement rates $\geq 90\%$: strongly recommended.

^bLevel of evidence based on data from high radiotherapy dose scenarios.

- Musculoskeletal tissues^{135,136,138,139,147,149,152,164,165,202,203,206,208}: the available data primarily indicate a possible increased risk of hematological toxicities. For some drugs, toxicity data are not available, warranting caution.

Delphi consensus statements. All 20 Delphi experts completed both Delphi questionnaires, resulting in a response rate of 100%. For one scenario, one expert deliberately refrained from making a decision, but no answers were missing. The Delphi statement flow diagram, the first Delphi round, and the second Delphi round agreement rates are provided in [Supplementary Figure S8](#), and [Tables S12](#) and [S13](#), respectively, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2025.09.008>. The final Delphi results for multitargeted TKIs are shown in [Table 5](#).

Due to the lack of high-quality toxicity data, the potential for increased toxicity, and the previously described toxicities when RT is combined with VEGF(R) inhibitors, we recommend considering a major adaptation for most RT combinations with multitargeted TKIs ([Table 5](#)). For low-dose palliative RT to the skin and musculoskeletal tissues, considering a minor/no adaptation is recommended. Similar to VEGF(R) inhibitors, our recommendation is to consider not combining multitargeted TKIs with RT in case of (ultra)central lung SBRT/SABR, when large blood vessels, main bronchi, or the esophagus are included in the high-dose region. Due to the excessive hepatotoxicity observed when sorafenib was combined with liver RT, it is recommended to consider not combining sorafenib with high-dose RT to the liver.

DISCUSSION

These are the first, evidence-based ESMO–ESTRO consensus statements to provide guidance on combining RT with targeted cancer therapies and immunotherapy. To the best of our knowledge, this is the most complete exercise coupling systematic reviews with experts' opinion consensus to increase the level of evidence in this field.

In the current publication, we systematically review and provide recommendations regarding the safety of combining RT with ICIs, VEGF(R) inhibitors, and multitargeted TKIs. Generally, the expected synergistic or additive toxicity of combining RT with ICIs is low, particularly for PD-(L)1 inhibitors. For most combinations with VEGF(R) inhibitors and multitargeted TKIs, we recommend exercising caution, while considering the irradiated site and the clinical goals (e.g. palliative versus curative intention).

These multidisciplinary and scenario-specific ESMO–ESTRO consensus statements were developed through intensive interdisciplinary collaboration and by developing systematic reviews for each drug–RT scenario. The purpose of these statements is to provide evidence-based safety recommendations for real-world clinical practice. They are not intended to serve as strict guidelines, nor as guidance or substitute for high-quality registries or clinical trials evaluating the combination of RT with targeted agents or immunotherapy. The anticipated toxicity should always be weighed against the expected treatment efficacy.

This project has some limitations. Due to the large scale of the systematic literature reviews and Delphi process in this project, there is a considerable time gap between the

Table 5. Multitargeted TKI consensus statements

For the combination of multitargeted TKIs with radiotherapy to the:			Agreement rate ^a	Level of evidence
Irradiated area	Radiotherapy scenario	Recommendation		
Skin	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	90%	II ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	90%	II
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	90%	V
Brain	Low-dose palliative	Major adaptation	75%	III
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	80%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	85%	V
Head and neck	Low-dose palliative	Major adaptation	90%	III ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	95%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	95%	V
Thorax	Low-dose palliative	Major adaptation	85%	III
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	100%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	95%	III
Abdomen/pelvis	Low-dose palliative	Major adaptation	95%	III
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	90%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	90%	III
Musculoskeletal tissues	Low-dose palliative	Minor/no adaptation	95%	II ^b
	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Major adaptation	90%	II
	High-dose stereotactic	Major adaptation	85%	III
Exceptions: For the combination of 'sorafenib' with radiotherapy to the:				
Liver	High-dose conventionally fractionated	Not combining	100%	III
	High-dose stereotactic	Not combining	95%	III
Exception: In case of (ultra)central lung SBRT/SABR (when large blood vessels, main bronchi or the esophagus are included in the high-dose region):				
Thorax	High-dose stereotactic	Not combining	90%	IV

Drug examples: cabozantinib, lapatinib, pazopanib, sorafenib, sunitinib, vandetanib. The recommendation color codes reflect the corresponding safety levels and their associated toxicity risks, as shown in Figure 1.

SABR, stereotactic ablative radiotherapy; SBRT, stereotactic body radiotherapy; TKI, tyrosine kinase inhibitor.

^aAgreement rates $\geq 90\%$: strongly recommended.

^bLevel of evidence based on data from high radiotherapy dose scenarios.

original literature searches and the Delphi process. Furthermore, the levels of evidence are low for the toxicity of many RT–drug combinations, particularly regarding late toxicity. To mitigate this, we further developed the Delphi process and experts were requested to consider and mention (new) literature references if they disagreed with a statement. The amount of suggested new literature was low, and the agreement rates were high, indicating the relevance and validity of the consensus statements.

The clinical challenges arising from the rapid introduction of new systemic agents, without toxicity data regarding the combination with RT, underscore the need for strategies to acquire these data. This could be achieved by raising awareness among pharmaceutical companies, practitioners, and regulators for optimal pharmacovigilance, and by collaborative efforts to develop clinical trials, prospective cohort studies and registries, real-world studies, or preclinical models (e.g. organoids) that capture the effects of these agents combined with RT.^{8,209,210}

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The panel would like to acknowledge the contributions of Klizia Ambra Marinoni and Fiona Perdomo from the Scientific and Medical Affairs Department at ESMO for their expert consultation on the Delphi methodology and the shared project coordination, and of Eralda Azizaj for providing logistical and administrative support from ESTRO.

FUNDING

This project was financially supported by the KWF Dutch Cancer Society [grant number: 12702]. Production costs have been covered by ESMO and ESTRO from central funds.

DISCLOSURE

BD declares no financial interests; non-financial interests as a member of ASTRO, Indian Society of Neuro-Oncology, Indian Society of Oncology, and Association of Radiation Oncologists; leadership role for Oncoalert. AP declares speaker's engagement from Lilly, MEDSIR, Novartis, and Roche; advisory board role for AstraZeneca, BMS, and Janssen; institutional funding as local PI for BAYER, BMS, Lilly, MSD, and Roche; institutional funding as coordinating PI for AstraZeneca and Spectrum; travel grant from Janssen; funding for training of personnel from AstraZeneca and Italfarma. LCB declares speaker engagements from AicME, Eversana, and Novacure; employment from ESMO (2021-2023); advisory role with the World Health Organization. DMB declares full-time employment from the European Society for Medical Oncology since 1 September 2023; participation as medical research fellow in research studies institutionally funded by Eli Lilly, F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd, and Novartis to Institut Jules Bordet (2021-2023); and non-financial interests as a board member of Associação de Investigação e Cuidados de Suporte em Oncologia (2022-2024) and member of American Society of Clinical Oncology, Associação Portuguesa de Cuidados

Paliativos, Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer, and Sociedade Portuguesa de Oncologia. MAG declares speaker engagements and evaluation of scientific texts for MSD and GSK. AL declares speaker's engagement from AAA, Advanz Pharma, AstraZeneca, Eisai, GenFit, Incyte, Ipsen, Merck, Pfizer, QED, Roche, and Servier; advisory board role for Albireo Pharma, AstraZeneca, Boston Scientific, Eisai, GenFit, Ipsen, Nutricia, QED, Roche, Servier, and Taiho; institutional funding from AstraZeneca and Roche; writer's engagement for Incyte, QED, and Servier; non-financial interests as principal investigator for AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Camurus, Jazz Therapeutics, Merck, Novocure, Panbela Therapeutics, QED, Roche, Servier, and Taiho; travel support from AAA, Advanz Pharma, Bayer, Delcath, Ipsen, Mylan, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, and Sirtex. KH declares speaker's engagement from Amgen, AstraZeneca, BMS, and Boehringer-Ingelheim; advisory board membership for ALX Oncology, Amgen, Arch Oncology, ARTIOS, AstraZeneca, Beigene, BMS, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Codiak, GSK, Johnson and Johnson, Merck-Serono, MSD, Onchilles, Oncolys, Pfizer, PsiVac, Qbiotics, and Replimune; research funding from AstraZeneca, Boehringer-Ingelheim, and Replimune. GM declares speaker engagement for BrainLab and Pfizer; advisory board role and AstraZeneca, Servier, and Novocure; non-financial interests as a member of EORTC Brain Tumour Group (treasurer) and member of Executive Board of The European Association on Neuro-Oncology (EANO). MH declares advisory board role for Merck Serono, MSD, BMS, AstraZeneca, and Sanofi; speaker engagement for Merck Serono, MSD, BMS, AstraZeneca, Sanofi, and Varian; travel support from Merck Serono, MSD, BMS, AstraZeneca, and Sanofi; institutional research funding from MSD and AstraZeneca. DP declares speaker's engagement from Amgen, BMS, Ipsen, Merck Serono, and Servier; advisory board role for BMS, Ipsen, and Servier; institutional research grants from MSD; non-financial interests as a member of the board of directors of Cyprus Cancer Research Institute; editorial roles with ESMO GI journal and the *European Journal of Surgery*; advisory role for European School of Oncology and Servier; and member of SIOG. MK received funding for support of symposia by IBA, for research projects by Merck KGaA (2014–2018 for preclinical study; 2018–2020 for clinical study), Medipan GmbH (2014–2018). MK was involved in a publicly funded (German Federal Ministry of Education and Research) project with the companies Medipan (2019–2022), Attomol GmbH (2019–2022), GA Generic Assays GmbH (2019–2022), Gesellschaft für medizinische und wissenschaftliche genetische Analysen (2019–2022), Lipotype GmbH (2019–2022), and PolyAn GmbH (2019–2022). MK confirms that none of the above-mentioned funding sources were involved in the preparation of this paper. RC declares advisory board role for Accord, Astellas, AstraZeneca, Bayer, BMS, Debiopharm, Ipsen, Janssen, Merck, MSD, Pfizer, and Roche; speaker engagements for Astellas, Merck, and Janssen; expert testimony for Sandoz; non-financial interests as a board member of the SAKK Swiss

Working Group for Clinical Cancer Research. KL declares advisory board role for AstraZeneca; speaker engagement for AstraZeneca; tutoring for AstraZeneca; institutional support from Amgen for investigator-initiated study. SMOC declares advisory board role for Artios Pharmaceuticals; speaker engagement for Servier; and institutional research grant from Varian Medical Systems. JB declares expert testimony for AAA; speaker engagement for Ipsen, Nanostring, Pfizer, RAND, and Servier; and advisory board role for NADENO and Nutricia. UR declares advisory board role and speaker engagement for AstraZeneca; and institutional support from BrainLab. FL declares speaker engagement for Art Temp, Astellas, AstraZeneca, BMS, Daiichi Sankyo, Eli Lilly, Immedex, Incyte, Medscape, MedUpdate, Merck Serono, MSD, Servier, and StreamedUp!; advisory board role for Astellas, Beigene, BMS, Daiichi Sankyo, MSD, and PAGE; institutional research grants from AstraZeneca, BMS, and Gilead; writing engagement for Deutscher Ärzteverlag, Elsevier, and Iomedico; expert testimony for Biontech; institutional interest as coordination PI for Beigene and Daiichi Sankyo. DDR declares institutional financial interests (no personal financial interests) for AstraZeneca, BMS, Beigene, Philips, Olink, and Eli-Lilly. GP declares full-time employment as Chief Medical Officer at ESMO; non-financial interests as a member of ASCO, Hellenic Cooperative Oncology Group (HeCOG), and Hellenic Society of Medical Oncology. All other authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI) and DeepL (DeepL SE) in order to improve language and readability. After using these tools/services, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication. These AI tools were not used in the systematic review process, nor to generate content.

DISCLAIMER

ESMO and ESTRO do neither guarantee nor assume any responsibility for the relevancy, accuracy, completeness, reliability, or quality of the information, statements, or opinions provided in this publication. Any statements are based on information available at the time the writing panel conducted its research and discussions on the topic. This publication should neither be deemed inclusive of all proper methods of care or of all factors influencing the decision making, nor is it intended to be exclusive of other methods reasonably directed to obtaining the same results. There may be new developments since publication that are not reflected in this article and that may, over time, be a basis for ESMO and ESTRO to revisit and update the publication. The publications are not intended or implied as a substitute for professional advice from a physician or qualified health care provider, nor as a substitute for medical care, diagnosis, or treatment. The advice of a

medical professional should always be sought before commencing any form of medical treatment. The ESMO and ESTRO publication provides scientific and medical opinions for educational and informational purposes only. Commercial use of any content in the publication without the prior written consent of ESMO and ESTRO is strictly prohibited. In no event shall ESMO or ESTRO, their officers, directors, employees, members, or agents be held liable for any direct or indirect damage arising from or in connection with the content of the publication or any action taken by third parties based on and in reliance of the content. Furthermore, ESMO and ESTRO do not endorse, recommend, or sponsor any third-party material, product, or services mentioned in the publication, nor the references or links made to any third-party websites or information channels. ESMO and ESTRO do not make any representations and are neither responsible nor liable with regard to any third-party digital or non-digital content its relevancy, accuracy, completeness, decency, legality, reliability, or the quality of information.

REFERENCES

- Scott EC, Baines AC, Gong Y, et al. Trends in the approval of cancer therapies by the FDA in the twenty-first century. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2023;22:625-640.
- Yap ML, Zubizarreta E, Bray F, et al. Global access to radiotherapy services: have we made progress during the past decade? *J Glob Oncol*. 2016;2:207-215.
- Citrin DE. Recent developments in radiotherapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377:1065-1075.
- De Ruyscher D, Niedermann G, Burnet NG, et al. Radiotherapy toxicity. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2019;5:13.
- Cheung P. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for oligoprogressive cancer. *Br J Radiol*. 2016;89:20160251.
- Lievens Y, Guckenberger M, Gomez D, et al. Defining oligometastatic disease from a radiation oncology perspective: an ESTRO-ASTRO consensus document. *Radiother Oncol*. 2020;148:157-166.
- Lutz ST, Chow EL, Hartsell WF, et al. A review of hypofractionated palliative radiotherapy. *Cancer*. 2007;109:1462-1470.
- van Aken ESM, van der Linden YM, van Thienen JV, et al. Hypofractionated radiotherapy combined with targeted therapy or immunotherapy: Dutch survey on current practice, knowledge and challenges. *Clin Transl Radiat Oncol*. 2022;33:93-98.
- van Aken ESM, Beeker A, Houtenbos I, et al. Unexpected toxicity of CDK4/6 inhibitor palbociclib and radiotherapy. *Cancer Rep (Hoboken)*. 2022;5:e1470.
- de Haan R, van den Heuvel MM, van Diessen J, et al. Phase I and pharmacologic study of olaparib in combination with high-dose radiotherapy with and without concurrent cisplatin for non-small cell lung cancer. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2021;27:1256-1266.
- Hecht M, Zimmer L, Loquai C, et al. Radiosensitization by BRAF inhibitor therapy-mechanism and frequency of toxicity in melanoma patients. *Ann Oncol*. 2015;26:1238-1244.
- Harding JJ, Barker CA, Carvajal RD, et al. Cutis verticis gyrata in association with vemurafenib and whole-brain radiotherapy. *J Clin Oncol*. 2014;32:e54-e56.
- Barney BM, Markovic SN, Laack NN, et al. Increased bowel toxicity in patients treated with a vascular endothelial growth factor inhibitor (VEGF) after stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT). *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2013;87:73-80.
- Peters NA, Richel DJ, Verhoeff JJ, et al. Bowel perforation after radiotherapy in a patient receiving sorafenib. *J Clin Oncol*. 2008;26:2405-2406.
- Kroeze SGC, Fritz C, Schaule J, et al. Continued versus interrupted targeted therapy during metastasis-directed stereotactic radiotherapy: a retrospective multi-center safety and efficacy analysis. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2021;13:4780.
- Chaff JE, Oxnard GR, Sima CS, et al. Disease flare after tyrosine kinase inhibitor discontinuation in patients with EGFR-mutant lung cancer and acquired resistance to erlotinib or gefitinib: implications for clinical trial design. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2011;17:6298-6303.
- Pop O, Pirvu A, Toffart AC, et al. Disease flare after treatment discontinuation in a patient with EML4-ALK lung cancer and acquired resistance to crizotinib. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2012;7:e1-e2.
- Amirault M, Choo S, Waxweiler T, et al. Tumor flare of brain metastases upon dose interruption of sunitinib in a patient with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *Cancer Treat Res Commun*. 2021;27:100367.
- Amin NP, Remick J, Agarwal M, et al. Concurrent radiation and immunotherapy: survey of practice patterns in the United States. *Am J Clin Oncol*. 2019;42:208-214.
- Kraus KM, Fischer JC, Borm KJ, et al. Evaluation of practical experiences of German speaking radiation oncologists in combining radiation therapy with checkpoint blockade. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11:7624.
- van Aken ESM, Devnani B, Castelo-Branco L, et al. ESMO-ESTRO framework for assessing the interactions and safety of combining radiotherapy with targeted cancer therapies or immunotherapy. *Radiother Oncol*. 2025;208:110910.
- Couty E, Vallard A, Sotton S, et al. Safety assessment of anticancer drugs in association with radiotherapy in metastatic malignant melanoma: a real-life report: radiation/systemic drug combo in metastatic melanoma. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol*. 2019;83:881-892.
- Langrand-Escure J, Vallard A, Rivoirard R, et al. Safety assessment of molecular targeted therapies in association with radiotherapy in metastatic renal cell carcinoma: a real-life report. *Anticancer Drugs*. 2016;27:427-432.
- Hallare JGV. Half life. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island, FL: StatPearls Publishing; June 20, 2023.
- Shargel L, Yu ABC. *Applied Biopharmaceutics & Pharmacokinetics*. 7th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education; 2016.
- Meattini I, Becherini C, Caini S, et al. International multidisciplinary consensus on the integration of radiotherapy with new systemic treatments for breast cancer: European Society for Radiotherapy and Oncology (ESTRO)-endorsed recommendations. *Lancet Oncol*. 2024;25:e73-e83.
- Dykewicz CA. Summary of the guidelines for preventing opportunistic infections among hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2001;33:139-144.
- Gross PA, Barrett TL, Dellinger EP, et al. Purpose of quality standards for infectious diseases. Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis*. 1994;18:421.
- Nasa P, Jain R, Juneja D. Delphi methodology in healthcare research: how to decide its appropriateness. *World J Methodol*. 2021;11:116-129.
- Barrios M, Guileria G, Nuño L, et al. Consensus in the Delphi method: what makes a decision change? *Technol Forecast Soc Change*. 2021;163:120484.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Br Med J*. 2021;372:n71.
- Wei SC, Duffy CR, Allison JP. Fundamental mechanisms of immune checkpoint blockade therapy. *Cancer Discov*. 2018;8:1069-1086.
- Abril-Rodriguez G, Ribas A. Snapshot: immune checkpoint inhibitors. *Cancer Cell*. 2017;31:848.e1.
- Cao Y, Wang X, Jin T, et al. Immune checkpoint molecules in natural killer cells as potential targets for cancer immunotherapy. *Signal Transduct Target Ther*. 2020;5:250.
- Haanen J, Obeid M, Spain L, et al. Management of toxicities from immunotherapy: ESMO Clinical Practice Guideline for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol*. 2022;33:1217-1238.
- Yan BY, Wasilewski G, Lacouture ME, et al. Incidence of dermatologic adverse events in patients with cancer treated with concurrent

- immune checkpoint inhibitors and radiation therapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2021;84:871-875.
37. Tao Y, Aupeirin A, Sun X, et al. Avelumab-cetuximab-radiotherapy versus standards of care in locally advanced squamous-cell carcinoma of the head and neck: the safety phase of a randomised phase III trial GORTEC 2017-01 (REACH). *Eur J Cancer*. 2020;141:21-29.
 38. Kwon ED, Drake CG, Scher HI, et al. Ipilimumab versus placebo after radiotherapy in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer that had progressed after docetaxel chemotherapy (CA184-043): a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2014;15:700-712.
 39. Antonia SJ, Villegas A, Daniel D, et al. Durvalumab after chemoradiotherapy in stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377:1919-1929.
 40. Verma V, Cushman TR, Selek U, et al. Safety of combined immunotherapy and thoracic radiation therapy: analysis of 3 single-institutional phase I/II trials. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2018;101:1141-1148.
 41. Peters S, Felip E, Dafni U, et al. Safety evaluation of nivolumab added concurrently to radiotherapy in a standard first line chemoradiotherapy regimen in stage III non-small cell lung cancer - the ETOP NICOLAS trial. *Lung Cancer*. 2019;133:83-87.
 42. Welsh J, Menon H, Chen D, et al. Pembrolizumab with or without radiation therapy for metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: a randomized phase I/II trial. *J Immunother Cancer*. 2020;8:e001001.
 43. Welsh JW, Tang C, de Groot P, et al. Phase II trial of ipilimumab with stereotactic radiation therapy for metastatic disease: outcomes, toxicities, and low-dose radiation-related abscopal responses. *Cancer Immunol Res*. 2019;7:1903-1909.
 44. Lavaud J, Blom A, Longvert C, et al. Pembrolizumab and concurrent hypo-fractionated radiotherapy for advanced non-resectable cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma. *Eur J Dermatol*. 2019;29:636-640.
 45. Sahebjam S, Forsyth PA, Tran ND, et al. Hypofractionated stereotactic re-irradiation with pembrolizumab and bevacizumab in patients with recurrent high-grade gliomas: results from a phase I study. *Neuro Oncol*. 2021;23:677-686.
 46. Levy A, Massard C, Soria JC, et al. Concurrent irradiation with the anti-programmed cell death ligand-1 immune checkpoint blocker durvalumab: single centre subset analysis from a phase 1/2 trial. *Eur J Cancer*. 2016;68:156-162.
 47. Trommer M, Kinsky J, Adams A, et al. Addition of radiotherapy to immunotherapy: effects on outcome of different subgroups using a propensity score matching. *Cancers*. 2020;12:2429.
 48. Desideri I, Francolini G, Scotti V, et al. Benefit of ablative versus palliative-only radiotherapy in combination with nivolumab in patients affected by metastatic kidney and lung cancer. *Clin Transl Oncol*. 2019;21:933-938.
 49. Williams NL, Wuthrick EJ, Kim H, et al. Phase 1 study of ipilimumab combined with whole brain radiation therapy or radiosurgery for melanoma patients with brain metastases. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2017;99:22-30.
 50. Gerber NK, Young RJ, Barker CA, et al. Ipilimumab and whole brain radiation therapy for melanoma brain metastases. *J Neurooncol*. 2015;121:159-165.
 51. Bauer-Nilsen K, Trifiletti DM, Chatrath A, et al. Stereotactic radiosurgery for brain metastases from malignant melanoma and the impact of hemorrhagic metastases. *J Neurooncol*. 2018;140:83-88.
 52. Yang L, Liu L, Wu X. Hypofractionated radiation therapy with versus without immune checkpoint inhibitors in patients with brain metastases: a meta-analysis. *Int Immunopharmacol*. 2020;80:106148.
 53. Voronova V, Lebedeva S, Sekacheva M, et al. Quantification of scheduling impact on safety and efficacy outcomes of brain metastasis radio- and immuno-therapies: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Oncol*. 2020;10:1609.
 54. He Q, Zhang C, Tang S, et al. Intracranial radiotherapy with or without immune checkpoint inhibition for brain metastases: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Transl Cancer Res*. 2020;9:5909-5924.
 55. Kowalski ES, Remick JS, Sun K, et al. Immune checkpoint inhibition in patients treated with stereotactic radiation for brain metastases. *Radiat Oncol*. 2020;15:245.
 56. Lanier CM, Hughes R, Ahmed T, et al. Immunotherapy is associated with improved survival and decreased neurologic death after SRS for brain metastases from lung and melanoma primaries. *Neurooncol Pract*. 2019;6:402-409.
 57. Arscott WT, Zhu S, Plastaras JP, et al. Acute neurologic toxicity of palliative radiotherapy for brain metastases in patients receiving immune checkpoint blockade. *Neurooncol Pract*. 2019;6:297-304.
 58. Weiss J, Sheth S, Deal AM, et al. Concurrent definitive immunoradiotherapy for patients with stage III-IV head and neck cancer and cisplatin contraindication. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2020;26:4260-4267.
 59. Sundahl N, Seremet T, Van Dorpe J, et al. Phase 2 trial of nivolumab combined with stereotactic body radiation therapy in patients with metastatic or locally advanced inoperable melanoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2019;104:828-835.
 60. Chintakuntlawar AV, Yin J, Foote RL, et al. A phase 2 study of pembrolizumab combined with chemoradiotherapy as initial treatment for anaplastic thyroid cancer. *Thyroid*. 2019;29:1615-1622.
 61. Salama AKS, Palta M, Rushing CN, et al. Ipilimumab and radiation in patients with high-risk resected or regionally advanced melanoma. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2021;27:1287-1295.
 62. Arscott WT, Doucette A, Kumar P, et al. Tolerability of sequential immune therapy and palliative radiotherapy to the cervical and thoracic spine. *J Radiat Oncol*. 2018;7:233-239.
 63. Antonia SJ, Villegas A, Daniel D, et al. Overall survival with durvalumab after chemoradiotherapy in stage III NSCLC. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379:2342-2350.
 64. Hui R, Ozguroglu M, Villegas A, et al. Patient-reported outcomes with durvalumab after chemoradiotherapy in stage III, unresectable non-small-cell lung cancer (PACIFIC): a randomised, controlled, phase 3 study. *Lancet Oncol*. 2019;20:1670-1680.
 65. McBride S, Sherman E, Tsai CJ, et al. Randomized phase II trial of nivolumab with stereotactic body radiotherapy versus nivolumab alone in metastatic head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol*. 2021;39:30-37.
 66. Ho AY, Barker CA, Arnold BB, et al. A phase 2 clinical trial assessing the efficacy and safety of pembrolizumab and radiotherapy in patients with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer. *Cancer*. 2020;126:850-860.
 67. Barroso-Sousa R, Krop IE, Trippa L, et al. A phase II study of pembrolizumab in combination with palliative radiotherapy for hormone receptor-positive metastatic breast cancer. *Clin Breast Cancer*. 2020;20:238-245.
 68. Tang C, Welsh JW, de Groot P, et al. Ipilimumab with stereotactic ablative radiation therapy: phase I results and immunologic correlates from peripheral T cells. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2017;23:1388-1396.
 69. Chen D, Patel RR, Verma V, et al. Interaction between lymphopenia, radiotherapy technique, dosimetry, and survival outcomes in lung cancer patients receiving combined immunotherapy and radiotherapy. *Radiother Oncol*. 2020;150:114-120.
 70. von Reibnitz D, Chaff JE, Wu AJ, et al. Safety of combining thoracic radiation therapy with concurrent versus sequential immune checkpoint inhibition. *Adv Radiat Oncol*. 2018;3:391-398.
 71. Duska LR, Scalici JM, Temkin SM, et al. Results of an early safety analysis of a study of the combination of pembrolizumab and pelvic chemoradiation in locally advanced cervical cancer. *Cancer*. 2020;126:4948-4956.
 72. Smith WH, Ru M, McGee HM, et al. Safety of nivolumab in combination with prior or concurrent radiation therapy in hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Radiat Oncol*. 2020;9:45-52.
 73. Yu JI, Lee SJ, Lee J, et al. Clinical significance of radiotherapy before and/or during nivolumab treatment in hepatocellular carcinoma. *Cancer Med*. 2019;8:6986-6994.
 74. Tolay S, Nair R, McIntosh AF, et al. Dramatic response to concurrent anti-PD-1 therapy and radiation in resistant tumors with sarcomatoid differentiation. *Oncologist*. 2019;24:e49-e52.

75. Fizazi K, Drake CG, Beer TM, et al. Final analysis of the ipilimumab versus placebo following radiotherapy phase III trial in postdocetaxel metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer identifies an excess of long-term survivors. *Eur Urol*. 2020;78:822-830.
76. Xie C, Duffy AG, Brar G, et al. Immune checkpoint blockade in combination with stereotactic body radiotherapy in patients with metastatic pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2020;26:2318-2326.
77. Slovin SF, Higano CS, Hamid O, et al. Ipilimumab alone or in combination with radiotherapy in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: results from an open-label, multicenter phase I/II study. *Ann Oncol*. 2013;24:1813-1821.
78. Jiang DM, Fyles A, Nguyen LT, et al. Phase I study of local radiation and tremelimumab in patients with inoperable locally recurrent or metastatic breast cancer. *Oncotarget*. 2019;10:2947-2958.
79. Ratnayake G, Reinwald S, Shackleton M, et al. Stereotactic radiation therapy combined with immunotherapy against metastatic melanoma: long-term results of a phase 1 clinical trial. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2020;108:150-156.
80. Postow MA, Knox SJ, Goldman DA, et al. A prospective, phase 1 trial of nivolumab, ipilimumab, and radiotherapy in patients with advanced melanoma. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2020;26:3193-3201.
81. Ellis LM, Hicklin DJ. VEGF-targeted therapy: mechanisms of anti-tumour activity. *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2008;8:579-591.
82. Gotink KJ, Verheul HM. Anti-angiogenic tyrosine kinase inhibitors: what is their mechanism of action? *Angiogenesis*. 2010;13:1-14.
83. Lyden D, Hattori K, Dias S, et al. Impaired recruitment of bone-marrow-derived endothelial and hematopoietic precursor cells blocks tumor angiogenesis and growth. *Nat Med*. 2001;7:1194-1201.
84. Rafii S, Lyden D, Benezra R, et al. Vascular and hematopoietic stem cells: novel targets for anti-angiogenesis therapy? *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2002;2:826-835.
85. Jain RK. Normalization of tumor vasculature: an emerging concept in antiangiogenic therapy. *Science*. 2005;307:58-62.
86. Kamba T, McDonald DM. Mechanisms of adverse effects of anti-VEGF therapy for cancer. *Br J Cancer*. 2007;96:1788-1795.
87. Chinot OL, Wick W, Mason W, et al. Bevacizumab plus radiotherapy-temozolomide for newly diagnosed glioblastoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;370:709-722.
88. Saran F, Chinot OL, Henriksson R, et al. Bevacizumab, temozolomide, and radiotherapy for newly diagnosed glioblastoma: comprehensive safety results during and after first-line therapy. *Neuro Oncol*. 2016;18:991-1001.
89. Pernin V, Belin L, Cottu P, et al. Late toxicities and outcomes of adjuvant radiotherapy combined with concurrent bevacizumab in patients with triple-negative non-metastatic breast cancer. *Br J Radiol*. 2015;88:20140800.
90. Argiris A, Bauman JE, Ohr J, et al. Phase II randomized trial of radiation therapy, cetuximab, and pemetrexed with or without bevacizumab in patients with locally advanced head and neck cancer. *Ann Oncol*. 2016;27:1594-1600.
91. Velenik V, Zadnik V, Omejc M, et al. Influence of concurrent capecitabine based chemoradiotherapy with bevacizumab on the survival rate, late toxicity and health-related quality of life in locally advanced rectal cancer: a prospective phase II CRAB trial. *Radiol Oncol*. 2020;54:461-469.
92. Velenik V, Ocvirk J, Music M, et al. Neoadjuvant capecitabine, radiotherapy, and bevacizumab (CRAB) in locally advanced rectal cancer: results of an open-label phase II study. *Radiat Oncol*. 2011;6:105.
93. Sadahiro S, Suzuki T, Tanaka A, et al. Phase II study of preoperative concurrent chemoradiotherapy with S-1 plus bevacizumab for locally advanced resectable rectal adenocarcinoma. *Oncology*. 2015;88:49-56.
94. Berlin JD, Feng Y, Catalano P, et al. An intergroup randomized phase II study of bevacizumab or cetuximab in combination with gemcitabine and in combination with chemoradiation in patients with resected pancreatic carcinoma: a trial of the ECOG-ACRIN Cancer Research Group (E2204). *Oncology*. 2018;94:39-46.
95. Van Buren G 2nd, Ramanathan RK, Krasinskas AM, et al. Phase II study of induction fixed-dose rate gemcitabine and bevacizumab followed by 30 Gy radiotherapy as preoperative treatment for potentially resectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2013;20:3787-3793.
96. Bendell JC, Meluch A, Peyton J, et al. A phase II trial of preoperative concurrent chemotherapy/radiation therapy plus bevacizumab/erlotinib in the treatment of localized esophageal cancer. *Clin Adv Hematol Oncol*. 2012;10:430-437.
97. Vredenburg JJ, Desjardins A, Reardon DA, et al. The addition of bevacizumab to standard radiation therapy and temozolomide followed by bevacizumab, temozolomide, and irinotecan for newly diagnosed glioblastoma. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2011;17:4119-4124.
98. Zheng MH, Sun HT, Xu JG, et al. A network meta-analysis of treatment for newly diagnosed glioblastoma based on radiotherapy plus temozolomide. *Neurol Asia*. 2017;22:49-58.
99. Su J, Cai M, Li W, et al. Molecularly targeted drugs plus radiotherapy and temozolomide treatment for newly diagnosed glioblastoma: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *Oncol Res*. 2016;24:117-128.
100. Wick W, Chinot OL, Bendszus M, et al. Evaluation of pseudoprogression rates and tumor progression patterns in a phase III trial of bevacizumab plus radiotherapy/temozolomide for newly diagnosed glioblastoma. *Neuro Oncol*. 2016;18:1434-1441.
101. Chauffert B, Feuvret L, Bonnetain F, et al. Randomized phase II trial of irinotecan and bevacizumab as neo-adjuvant and adjuvant to temozolomide-based chemoradiation compared with temozolomide-chemoradiation for unresectable glioblastoma: final results of the TEMAVIR study from ANOCEF. *Ann Oncol*. 2014;25:1442-1447.
102. Nayak L, de Groot J, Wefel JS, et al. Phase I trial of aflibercept (VEGF trap) with radiation therapy and concomitant and adjuvant temozolomide in patients with high-grade gliomas. *J Neurooncol*. 2017;132:181-188.
103. Cohen AL, Anker CJ, Johnson B, et al. Repeat radiation with bevacizumab and minocycline in bevacizumab-refractory high grade gliomas: a prospective phase 1 trial. *J Neurooncol*. 2020;148:577-585.
104. Gerstner ER, Eichler AF, Plotkin SR, et al. Phase I trial with biomarker studies of vatalanib (PTK787) in patients with newly diagnosed glioblastoma treated with enzyme inducing anti-epileptic drugs and standard radiation and temozolomide. *J Neurooncol*. 2011;103:325-332.
105. Levy C, Allouache D, Lacroix J, et al. REBECA: a phase I study of bevacizumab and whole-brain radiation therapy for the treatment of brain metastasis from solid tumours. *Ann Oncol*. 2014;25:2351-2356.
106. Pinho MC, Polaskova P, Kalpathy-Cramer J, et al. Low incidence of pseudoprogression by imaging in newly diagnosed glioblastoma patients treated with cediranib in combination with chemoradiation. *Oncologist*. 2014;19:75-81.
107. Back M, Gzell CE, Kastelan M, et al. Large volume re-irradiation with bevacizumab is a feasible salvage option for patients with refractory high-grade glioma. *Neurooncol Pract*. 2015;2:48-53.
108. Juloori A, Miller JA, Parsai S, et al. Overall survival and response to radiation and targeted therapies among patients with renal cell carcinoma brain metastases. *J Neurosurg*. 2019;132:188-196.
109. Li J, Zhao Z, Wu X, et al. Bevacizumab plus cisplatin and helical tomotherapy in treatment of locally advanced nasopharyngeal carcinoma. *Oncotargets Ther*. 2015;8:1315-1319.
110. Fury MG, Xiao H, Sherman EJ, et al. Phase II trial of bevacizumab + cetuximab + cisplatin with concurrent intensity-modulated radiation therapy for patients with stage III/IVB head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Head Neck*. 2016;38(suppl 1):E566-E570.
111. Ku GY, Bains MS, Park DJ, et al. Phase II study of bevacizumab and preoperative chemoradiation for esophageal adenocarcinoma. *J Gastrointest Oncol*. 2016;7:828-837.

112. Mazzola R, Tebano U, Aiello D, et al. Increased efficacy of stereotactic ablative radiation therapy after bevacizumab in lung oligometastases from colon cancer. *Tumori*. 2018;104:423-428.
113. Spigel DR, Hainsworth JD, Yardley DA, et al. Tracheoesophageal fistula formation in patients with lung cancer treated with chemoradiation and bevacizumab. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010;28:43-48.
114. Lind JS, Senan S, Smit EF. Pulmonary toxicity after bevacizumab and concurrent thoracic radiotherapy observed in a phase I study for inoperable stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012;30:e104-e108.
115. Reck M, von Pawel J, Zatloukal P, et al. Phase III trial of cisplatin plus gemcitabine with either placebo or bevacizumab as first-line therapy for nonsquamous non-small-cell lung cancer: AVAIL. *J Clin Oncol*. 2009;27:1227-1234.
116. Lindberg K, Grozman V, Karlsson K, et al. The HILUS-trial-a prospective Nordic multicenter phase 2 study of ultracentral lung tumors treated with stereotactic body radiotherapy. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2021;16:1200-1210.
117. Wang C, Rimner A, Gelblum DY, et al. Analysis of toxic effects with antiangiogenic agents plus stereotactic body radiation in ultracentral lung tumors. *JAMA Oncol*. 2019;5:737-739.
118. Bendell JC, Thompson D, Hemphill BM, et al. A phase 2 study of 5-fluorouracil (5-FU), ziv-aflibercept, and radiation for the preoperative and adjuvant treatment of patients with stage II/III rectal cancer. *Cancer Invest*. 2017;35:535-540.
119. Guo Q, Sun Y, Kong E, et al. Apatinib combined with chemotherapy or concurrent chemo-brachytherapy in patients with recurrent or advanced cervical cancer: a phase 2, randomized controlled, prospective study. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2020;99:e19372.
120. Yoon SS, Duda DG, Karl DL, et al. Phase II study of neoadjuvant bevacizumab and radiotherapy for resectable soft tissue sarcomas. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2011;81:1081-1090.
121. Lockney DT, Jia AY, Lis E, et al. Myositis following spine radiosurgery for metastatic disease: a case series. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2018;28:416-421.
122. Mbagui R, Langrand-Escure J, Annede P, et al. Safety of spinal radiotherapy in metastatic cancer patients receiving bevacizumab therapy: a bi-institutional case series. *Anticancer Drugs*. 2015;26:443-447.
123. Van Nguyen T, Hamdan D, Falgarone G, et al. Anti-angiogenic tyrosine kinase inhibitor-related toxicities among cancer patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Target Oncol*. 2024;19:533-545.
124. Kumar V, Meghal T, Wu E, et al. Radiation recall dermatitis consecutive to cabozantinib use. *Am J Ther*. 2019;26:e559-e561.
125. Schiff D, Desjardins A, Cloughesy T, et al. Phase 1 dose escalation trial of the safety and pharmacokinetics of cabozantinib concurrent with temozolomide and radiotherapy or temozolomide after radiotherapy in newly diagnosed patients with high-grade gliomas. *Cancer*. 2016;122:582-587.
126. Ajayi OD, Leggett CL, Myburgh SJ, et al. Esophageal stricture following radiation, concurrent immunochemotherapy, treated with hyperbaric oxygen and dilation. *Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual Outcomes*. 2019;3:241-245.
127. Harrington K, Temam S, Mehanna H, et al. Postoperative adjuvant lapatinib and concurrent chemoradiotherapy followed by maintenance lapatinib monotherapy in high-risk patients with resected squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck: a phase III, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015;33:4202-4209.
128. Blackwell KL, Pegram MD, Tan-Chiu E, et al. Single-agent lapatinib for HER2-overexpressing advanced or metastatic breast cancer that progressed on first- or second-line trastuzumab-containing regimens. *Ann Oncol*. 2009;20:1026-1031.
129. Lin NU, Freedman RA, Ramakrishna N, et al. A phase I study of lapatinib with whole brain radiotherapy in patients with human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2)-positive breast cancer brain metastases. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2013;142:405-414.
130. Christodoulou C, Kalogera-Fountzila A, Karavasilis V, et al. Lapatinib with whole brain radiotherapy in patients with brain metastases from breast and non-small cell lung cancer: a phase II study of the Hellenic Cooperative Oncology Group (HeCOG). *J Neurooncol*. 2017;134:443-451.
131. Yu A, Faiq N, Green S, et al. Report of safety of pulse dosing of lapatinib with temozolomide and radiation therapy for newly-diagnosed glioblastoma in a pilot phase II study. *J Neurooncol*. 2017;134:357-362.
132. Kimple RJ, Horton JK, Livasy CA, et al. Phase I study and biomarker analysis of lapatinib and concurrent radiation for locally advanced breast cancer. *Oncologist*. 2012;17:1496-1503.
133. Harrington KJ, El-Hariry IA, Holford CS, et al. Phase I study of lapatinib in combination with chemoradiation in patients with locally advanced squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck. *J Clin Oncol*. 2009;27:1100-1107.
134. Harrington K, Berrier A, Robinson M, et al. Randomised phase II study of oral lapatinib combined with chemoradiotherapy in patients with advanced squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck: rationale for future randomised trials in human papilloma virus-negative disease. *Eur J Cancer*. 2013;49:1609-1618.
135. De Wolf K, Rottey S, Vermaelen K, et al. Combined high dose radiation and pazopanib in metastatic renal cell carcinoma: a phase I dose escalation trial. *Radiat Oncol*. 2017;12:157.
136. Haas RL, Gelderblom H, Sleijfer S, et al. A phase I study on the combination of neoadjuvant radiotherapy plus pazopanib in patients with locally advanced soft tissue sarcoma of the extremities. *Acta Oncol*. 2015;54:1195-1201.
137. Goyal S, Shah S, Khan AJ, et al. Evaluation of acute locoregional toxicity in patients with breast cancer treated with adjuvant radiotherapy in combination with pazopanib. *ISRN Oncol*. 2012;2012:896202.
138. Weiss AR, Chen YL, Scharschmidt TJ, et al. Pathological response in children and adults with large unresected intermediate-grade or high-grade soft tissue sarcoma receiving preoperative chemoradiotherapy with or without pazopanib (ARST1321): a multicentre, randomised, open-label, phase 2 trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2020;21:1110-1122.
139. Azad A, Maddison C, Stewart J. Radiation recall dermatitis induced by pazopanib. *Onkologie*. 2013;36:674-676.
140. Staehler M, Haseke N, Nuhn P, et al. Simultaneous anti-angiogenic therapy and single-fraction radiosurgery in clinically relevant metastases from renal cell carcinoma. *BJU Int*. 2011;108:673-678.
141. Chen SW, Lin LC, Kuo YC, et al. Phase 2 study of combined sorafenib and radiation therapy in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2014;88:1041-1047.
142. Murray L, Longo J, Wan J, et al. Phase I dose escalation study of concurrent palliative radiation therapy with sorafenib in three anatomical cohorts (Thorax, Abdomen, Pelvis): the TAP study. *Radiother Oncol*. 2017;124:74-79.
143. von Moos R, Koeberle D, Schacher S, et al. Neoadjuvant radiotherapy combined with capecitabine and sorafenib in patients with advanced KRAS-mutated rectal cancer: a phase I/II trial (SAKK 41/08). *Eur J Cancer*. 2018;89:82-89.
144. Kim GE, Song HS, Ahn KJ, et al. Radiation recall dermatitis triggered by sorafenib after radiation therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Radiat Oncol J*. 2017;35:289-294.
145. Hsieh CH, Lin SC, Shueng PW, et al. Recall radiation dermatitis by sorafenib following stereotactic body radiation therapy. *Onco Targets Ther*. 2014;7:1111-1114.
146. Oh D, Park HC, Lim HY, et al. Sorafenib-triggered radiation recall dermatitis with a disseminated exanthematous reaction. *Radiat Oncol J*. 2013;31:171-174.
147. Mehta K, Kaubisch A, Tang J, et al. Radiation recall dermatitis in patients treated with sorafenib. *Case Rep Oncol Med*. 2018;2018:2171062.
148. Que J, Wu HC, Lin CH, et al. Comparison of stereotactic body radiation therapy with and without sorafenib as treatment for

- hepatocellular carcinoma with portal vein tumor thrombosis. *Medicine*. 2020;99:e19660.
149. Meyer JM, Perlewitz KS, Hayden JB, et al. Phase I trial of preoperative chemoradiation plus sorafenib for high-risk extremity soft tissue sarcomas with dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI correlates. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2013;19:6902-6911.
 150. Den RB, Kamrava M, Sheng Z, et al. A phase I study of the combination of sorafenib with temozolomide and radiation therapy for the treatment of primary and recurrent high-grade gliomas. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2013;85:321-328.
 151. Arneson K, Mondschein J, Stavas M, et al. A phase I trial of concurrent sorafenib and stereotactic radiosurgery for patients with brain metastases. *J Neurooncol*. 2017;133:435-442.
 152. Canter RJ, Borys D, Olusanya A, et al. Phase I trial of neoadjuvant conformal radiotherapy plus sorafenib for patients with locally advanced soft tissue sarcoma of the extremity. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2014;21:1616-1623.
 153. Kim R, Prithviraj GK, Shridhar R, et al. Phase I study of pre-operative continuous 5-FU and sorafenib with external radiation therapy in locally advanced rectal adenocarcinoma. *Radiother Oncol*. 2016;118:382-386.
 154. Zhao Y, Zhu X, Wang H, et al. Safety and efficacy of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization plus radiotherapy combined with sorafenib in hepatocellular carcinoma showing macrovascular invasion. *Front Oncol*. 2019;9:1065.
 155. Escudier B, Eisen T, Stadler WM, et al. Sorafenib in advanced clear-cell renal-cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;356:125-134.
 156. Llovet JM, Ricci S, Mazzaferro V, et al. Sorafenib in advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;359:378-390.
 157. Kao J, Chen CT, Tong CC, et al. Concurrent sunitinib and stereotactic body radiotherapy for patients with oligometastases: final report of a prospective clinical trial. *Target Oncol*. 2014;9:145-153.
 158. Staehler M, Haseke N, Stadler T, et al. Feasibility and effects of high-dose hypofractionated radiation therapy and simultaneous multi-kinase inhibition with sunitinib in progressive metastatic renal cell cancer. *Urol Oncol*. 2012;30:290-293.
 159. Chi KH, Liao CS, Chang CC, et al. Angiogenic blockade and radiotherapy in hepatocellular carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2010;78:188-193.
 160. Wuthrick EJ, Kamrava M, Curran WJ Jr, et al. A phase 1b trial of the combination of the antiangiogenic agent sunitinib and radiation therapy for patients with primary and metastatic central nervous system malignancies. *Cancer*. 2011;117:5548-5559.
 161. Wuthrick EJ, Curran WJ Jr, Camphausen K, et al. A pilot study of hypofractionated stereotactic radiation therapy and sunitinib in previously irradiated patients with recurrent high-grade glioma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2014;90:369-375.
 162. Corn PG, Song DY, Heath E, et al. Sunitinib plus androgen deprivation and radiation therapy for patients with localized high-risk prostate cancer: results from a multi-institutional phase 1 study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2013;86:540-545.
 163. Balana C, Gil MJ, Perez P, et al. Sunitinib administered prior to radiotherapy in patients with non-resectable glioblastoma: results of a phase II study. *Target Oncol*. 2014;9:321-329.
 164. Jakob J, Simeonova A, Kasper B, et al. Combined radiation therapy and sunitinib for preoperative treatment of soft tissue sarcoma. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2015;22:2839-2845.
 165. Jakob J, Simeonova A, Kasper B, et al. Combined sunitinib and radiation therapy for preoperative treatment of soft tissue sarcoma: results of a phase I trial of the German Interdisciplinary Sarcoma Group (GISG-03). *Radiat Oncol*. 2016;11:77.
 166. Broniscer A, Baker JN, Tagen M, et al. Phase I study of vandetanib during and after radiotherapy in children with diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010;28:4762-4768.
 167. Papadimitrakopoulou VA, Frank SJ, Cohen EW, et al. Phase I study of vandetanib with radiation therapy with or without cisplatin in locally advanced head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Head Neck*. 2016;38:439-447.
 168. Drappatz J, Norden AD, Wong ET, et al. Phase I study of vandetanib with radiotherapy and temozolomide for newly diagnosed glioblastoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2010;78:85-90.
 169. Gupta A, Roberts C, Tysoe F, et al. RADVAN: a randomised phase 2 trial of WBRT plus vandetanib for melanoma brain metastases - results and lessons learnt. *Br J Cancer*. 2016;115:1193-1200.
 170. Boland PM, Meyer JE, Berger AC, et al. Induction therapy for locally advanced, resectable esophagogastric cancer: a phase I trial of vandetanib (ZD6474), paclitaxel, carboplatin, 5-fluorouracil, and radiotherapy followed by resection. *Am J Clin Oncol*. 2017;40:393-398.
 171. Lee EQ, Kaley TJ, Duda DG, et al. A multicenter, phase II, randomized, noncomparative clinical trial of radiation and temozolomide with or without vandetanib in newly diagnosed glioblastoma patients. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2015;21:3610-3618.
 172. Fields EC, Damek D, Gaspar LE, et al. Phase I dose escalation trial of vandetanib with fractionated radiosurgery in patients with recurrent malignant gliomas. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2012;82:51-57.
 173. Natale RB, Thongprasert S, Greco FA, et al. Phase III trial of vandetanib compared with erlotinib in patients with previously treated advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2011;29:1059-1066.
 174. Wells SA Jr, Robinson BG, Gagel RF, et al. Vandetanib in patients with locally advanced or metastatic medullary thyroid cancer: a randomized, double-blind phase III trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012;30:134-141.
 175. Parsai S, Miller JA, Juloori A, et al. Stereotactic radiosurgery with concurrent lapatinib is associated with improved local control for HER2-positive breast cancer brain metastases. *J Neurosurg*. 2019;132:503-511.
 176. Kim JM, Miller JA, Kotecha R, et al. Stereotactic radiosurgery with concurrent HER2-directed therapy is associated with improved objective response for breast cancer brain metastasis. *Neuro Oncol*. 2019;21:659-668.
 177. Hottinger AF, Ben Aissa A, Espeli V, et al. Phase I study of sorafenib combined with radiation therapy and temozolomide as first-line treatment of high-grade glioma. *Br J Cancer*. 2014;110:2655-2661.
 178. Stupp R, Mason WP, van den Bent MJ, et al. Radiotherapy plus concomitant and adjuvant temozolomide for glioblastoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2005;352:987-996.
 179. Stierner U, Taheri-Kadkhoda Z. Successful treatment of brain metastases from renal cell cancer using radiotherapy in combination with sorafenib. *Target Oncol*. 2008;3:259-264.
 180. Salama JK, Gu L, Wang X, et al. Positive interaction between prophylactic cranial irradiation and maintenance sunitinib for untreated extensive-stage small cell lung cancer patients after standard chemotherapy: a secondary analysis of CALGB 30504 (ALLIANCE). *J Thorac Oncol*. 2016;11:361-369.
 181. Broniscer A, Baker SD, Wetmore C, et al. Phase I trial, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics of vandetanib and dasatinib in children with newly diagnosed diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2013;19:3050-3058.
 182. Patay Z, Merchant TE, Nguyen R, et al. Treatment-related noncontiguous radiologic changes in children with diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma treated with expanded irradiation fields and antiangiogenic therapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2017;99:1295-1305.
 183. Lalami Y, Specenier PM, Awada A, et al. EORTC 24051: unexpected side effects in a phase I study of TPF induction chemotherapy followed by chemoradiation with lapatinib, a dual EGFR/ErbB2 inhibitor, in patients with locally advanced resectable larynx and hypopharynx squamous cell carcinoma. *Radiother Oncol*. 2012;105:238-240.
 184. Cortes-Mateus KS, Holub K, et al. Concurrent palliative external radiotherapy with sorafenib or doxorubicin for bulky differentiated thyroid carcinoma: a case report. *Oncol Lett*. 2018;16:4085-4089.
 185. Shepard G, Arrowsmith ER, Murphy P, et al. A phase II study with lead-in safety cohort of 5-fluorouracil, oxaliplatin, and lapatinib in combination with radiation therapy as neoadjuvant Treatment for patients with localized HER2-positive esophagogastric adenocarcinomas. *Oncologist*. 2017;22:1152-e98.

186. Sun T, He J, Zhang S, et al. Simultaneous multitarget radiotherapy using helical tomotherapy and its combination with sorafenib for pulmonary metastases from hepatocellular carcinoma. *Oncotarget*. 2016;7:48586-48599.
187. Li C, Zhang F, Zhang W, et al. Feasibility of (125)I brachytherapy combined with sorafenib treatment in patients with multiple lung metastases after liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol*. 2010;136:1633-1640.
188. Chen KH, Weng MT, Chou YH, et al. Epigastric distress caused by esophageal candidiasis in 2 patients who received sorafenib plus radiotherapy for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2016;95:e3133.
189. Kao J, Packer S, Vu HL, et al. Phase 1 study of concurrent sunitinib and image-guided radiotherapy followed by maintenance sunitinib for patients with oligometastases: acute toxicity and preliminary response. *Cancer*. 2009;115:3571-3580.
190. Kao J, Timmins J, Ozao-Choy J, et al. Effects of combined sunitinib and extracranial stereotactic radiotherapy on bone marrow hematopoiesis. *Oncol Lett*. 2016;12:2139-2144.
191. Tong CC, Ko EC, Sung MW, et al. Phase II trial of concurrent sunitinib and image-guided radiotherapy for oligometastases. *PLoS One*. 2012;7:e36979.
192. Basille D, Andrejak M, Bentayeb H, et al. Bronchial fistula associated with sunitinib in a patient previously treated with radiation therapy. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2010;44:383-386.
193. Goody RB, Brade AM, Wang L, et al. Phase I trial of radiation therapy and sorafenib in unresectable liver metastases. *Radiother Oncol*. 2017;123:234-239.
194. Brade AM, Ng S, Brierley J, et al. Phase 1 trial of sorafenib and stereotactic body radiation therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2016;94:580-587.
195. Swaminath A, Knox JJ, Brierley JD, et al. Changes in liver volume observed following sorafenib and liver radiation therapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2016;94:729-737.
196. Wada Y, Takami Y, Matsushima H, et al. The safety and efficacy of combination therapy of sorafenib and radiotherapy for advanced hepatocellular carcinoma: a retrospective study. *Intern Med*. 2018;57:1345-1353.
197. Lee DY, Park JW, Kim TH, et al. Prognostic indicators for radiotherapy of abdominal lymph node metastases from hepatocellular carcinoma. *Strahlenther Onkol*. 2015;191:835-844.
198. Cha J, Seong J, Lee IJ, et al. Feasibility of sorafenib combined with local radiotherapy in advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. *Yonsei Med J*. 2013;54:1178-1185.
199. Aparicio J, Garcia-Mora C, Martin M, et al. A phase I, dose-finding study of sorafenib in combination with gemcitabine and radiation therapy in patients with unresectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a Grupo Espanol Multidisciplinario en Cancer Digestivo (GEMCAD) study. *PLoS One*. 2014;9:e82209.
200. Chiorean EG, Schneider BP, Akisik FM, et al. Phase 1 pharmacogenetic and pharmacodynamic study of sorafenib with concurrent radiation therapy and gemcitabine in locally advanced unresectable pancreatic cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2014;89:284-291.
201. Milosevic MF, Townsley CA, Chaudary N, et al. Sorafenib increases tumor hypoxia in cervical cancer patients treated with radiation therapy: results of a phase 1 clinical study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2016;94:111-117.
202. Inoue T, Kinoshita H, Komai Y, et al. Two cases of gastrointestinal perforation after radiotherapy in patients receiving tyrosine kinase inhibitor for advanced renal cell carcinoma. *World J Surg Oncol*. 2012;10:167.
203. Kashiwara T, Murakami N, Iizumi S, et al. Hemorrhage from ascending colon and gluteal muscle associated with sorafenib and radiation therapy: radiation dose distribution corresponded with colonoscopy findings and computed tomography images. *Pract Radiat Oncol*. 2019;9:214-219.
204. Lee J, Lee JH, Yoon H, et al. Extraordinary radiation super-sensitivity accompanying with sorafenib combination therapy: what lies beneath? *Radiat Oncol J*. 2017;35:185-188.
205. Yanai S, Nakamura S, Ooho A, et al. Radiation-induced hemorrhagic duodenitis associated with sorafenib treatment. *Clin J Gastroenterol*. 2015;8:116-119.
206. O'Sullivan B, Davis AM, Turcotte R, et al. Preoperative versus postoperative radiotherapy in soft-tissue sarcoma of the limbs: a randomised trial. *Lancet*. 2002;359:2235-2241.
207. Kwan A, McGrath S, Falconer A, et al. Small bowel perforation in a patient with metastatic renal cancer treated with radiotherapy and sunitinib. *Br J Med Surg Urol*. 2010;3:253-255.
208. Lewin J, Khamly KK, Young RJ, et al. A phase Ib/II translational study of sunitinib with neoadjuvant radiotherapy in soft-tissue sarcoma. *Br J Cancer*. 2014;111:2254-2261.
209. Ahmad SS, Crittenden MR, Tran PT, et al. Clinical development of novel drug-radiotherapy combinations. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2019;25:1455-1461.
210. Sharma RA, Plummer R, Stock JK, et al. Clinical development of new drug-radiotherapy combinations. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*. 2016;13:627-642.