Review Article

New advances in the treatment of chondrosarcoma under the PD‑1/PD‑L1 pathway

ABSTRACT

Bone sarcomas encompass a group of spontaneous mesenchymal malignancies, among which osteosarcoma, Ewing sarcoma, chondrosarcoma, and chordoma are the most common subtypes. Chondrosarcoma, a relatively prevalent malignant bone tumor that originates from chondrocytes, is characterized by endogenous cartilage ossification within the tumor tissue. Despite the use of aggressive treatment approaches involving extensive surgical resection, chemotherapy, and radiotherapy for patients with osteosarcoma, chondrosarcoma, and chordoma, limited improvements in patient outcomes have been observed. Furthermore, resistance to chemotherapy and radiation therapy has been observed in chondrosarcoma and chordoma cases. Consequently, novel therapeutic approaches for bone sarcomas, including chondrosarcoma, need to be uncovered. Recently, the emergence of immunotherapy and immune checkpoint inhibitors has garnered attention given their clinical success in various diverse types of cancer, thereby prompting investigations into their potential for managing chondrosarcoma. Considering that circumvention of immune surveillance is considered a key factor in the malignant progression of tumors and that immune checkpoints play an important role in modulating antitumor immune effects, blockers or inhibitors targeting these immune checkpoints have become effective therapeutic tools for patients with tumors. One such checkpoint receptor implicated in this process is programmed cell death protein-1 (PD-1). The association between PD-1 and programmed cell death ligand-1 (PD-L1) and cancer progression in humans has been extensively studied, highlighting their remarkable potential as biomarkers for cancer treatment. This review comprehensively examines available studies on current chondrosarcoma treatments and advancements in anti-PD-1/PD-L1 blockade therapy for chondrosarcoma.

KEY WORDS: Chondrosarcoma, PD-1, PD-L1

INTRODUCTION

Chondrosarcoma is a relatively common malignant bone tumor originating from chondrocytes that is characterized by endogenous cartilage ossification within the tumor tissue. These malignant cartilaginous tumors exhibit a myriad of morphological characteristics and clinical behaviors.[1] It is the second most common type of bone sarcoma, constituting 20%–30% of all primary bone malignancies.[2] The lungs are the most common site for metastasis.[3] Primary chondrosarcoma develops in normal bones, unlike secondary tumors that develop within established enchondromas or osteochondromas.[4] Conventional chondrosarcomas, accounting for 85%–90% of all cases, are classified into central, periosteal, and peripheral subgroups.[5] Studies have reported that among patients with conventional chondrosarcomas, ~90% have grade 1–2 (i.e., low to intermediate) rarely metastasizing

chondrosarcomas, whereas approximately 5%–10% have highly metastasizing grade 3 conventional chondrosarcomas.^[6,7] Radiographic features aid in diagnosing chondrosarcoma subtypes, especially nonconventional variants including clear cell, mesenchymal, periosteal, and dedifferentiated chondrosarcomas.[5,8] Regarding patient survival rates, 5‑year survival rates of 83%, 53%, and 7%–24% have been reported for low‑grade, high‑grade, and dedifferentiated chondrosarcomas, respectively.^[8,9] Ostensibly, only mesenchymal and dedifferentiated chondrosarcomas appear to be sensitive to chemotherapy and radiation, whereas a majority of chondrosarcomas exhibit resistance to these treatment modalities.

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution‑NonCommercial‑ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

For reprints contact: WKHLRPMedknow_reprints@wolterskluwer.com

Cite this article as: Yin J, Ren P. New advances in the treatment of chondrosarcoma under the PD-1/PD-L1 pathway. J Can Res Ther 2024;20:522-30.

Jiawei Yin, Peng Ren

Trauma Department of Orthopedics, The Second Hospital of Shandong University, Jinan, China

For correspondence: Dr. Peng Ren, Trauma Department of Orthopedics, The Second Hospital of Shandong University, Jinan, China. E‑mail: renpeng2017@ 163.com

Submitted: 13-Oct-2023 Revised: 09-Nov-2023 Accepted: 02-Feb-2024 Published: 30-Apr-2024

Limited treatment options are available for patients with highly metastatic or unresectable chondrosarcomas. Among the novel therapies proposed for these diseases, immunotherapy and molecularly targeted drugs show promise in treating malignancies.[8] Given that immune surveillance circumvention is considered a key factor in the malignant progression of tumors and that immune checkpoints play an important role in modulating antitumor immune effects, blockers or inhibitors targeting these immune checkpoints have become effective therapeutic tools for patients with tumors. One such checkpoint receptor implicated in this process is programmed cell death protein-1 (PD-1). PD-1 is largely expressed on the surface of several immune cells, whereas programmed cell death ligand-1 (PD-L1) is primarily expressed in tumor cells. The association between PD‑1 and PD‑L1 and cancer progression in humans has been extensively studied, underscoring their remarkable potential as biomarkers for cancer treatment.^[10]

Therefore, the current review synthesizes available data on currently used chondrosarcoma treatment options and comprehensive and advanced information pertaining to PD‑1/ PD-L1 pathway-based therapies for treating chondrosarcoma. This paper covers the role of and mechanisms underlying the PD-1/PD-L1 pathway and inhibitors and their mechanisms of action, clinical applications, efficacy, and safety in chondrosarcoma treatment.

COMMON TREATMENT METHODS FOR CHONDROSARCOMA

Treatment options for chondrosarcoma remain significantly scarce and exhibit limited therapeutic efficacy. Among the few available treatment options, surgery, extracorporeal irradiation (ECI), chemotherapy, and targeted therapies are the most prominent options.[11,12]

Surgical resection

Surgery is the main treatment option for chondrosarcoma, with comprehensive excision as its primary aim. The effectiveness of available treatments depends on the tumor's histologic grade and location. Low‑grade central chondrosarcomas can be treated with intralesional curettage and burring supplemented by surgical adjuvants including hydrogen peroxide.^[5,13] The most ideal approach for chondrosarcoma, either high-grade or intermediate‑grade, is radical excision. Although certain surgical procedures, including curettage, have been proposed for low‑grade chondrosarcoma management, they tend to have high recurrence rates. Hence, wide excision has been the recommended treatment option even in low‑grade chondrosarcomas of the hand.[14]

Radiation therapy

Chondrogenic tumors are typically radioresistant due to their slow growth and low proportion of actively dividing cells, making radiation‑induced cytotoxicity a substantial concern.[15,16] No level one evidence has supported radiation therapy for chondrosarcoma, although it can improve local failure rates after incomplete excision.^[5] Moreover, radiation therapy can be administered with the intention of maximizing local control and potentially achieving a cure in cases where incomplete resection has been performed for high-grade conventional, dedifferentiated, or mesenchymal chondrosarcomas. Additionally, in settings where surgical resection is deemed inappropriate or would cause significant morbidity, radiation therapy can be used as a palliative treatment approach.[15]

Chemotherapy

Typically, chemotherapy remains a rather inefficient therapeutic approach for treating the most rampant conventional chondrosarcoma subtypes. Adjuvant chemotherapy has shown no proven benefits for advanced chondrosarcoma. Although several chemotherapy approaches have been recommended for cases with dedifferentiated and mesenchymal chondrosarcomas, phase III trial evidence to support these recommendations has been considerably lacking.[17,18] Nonetheless, some chondrosarcoma subtypes, including dedifferentiated chondrosarcomas with a high-grade spindle cell component, may benefit from chemotherapy.^[19] However, evidence shows that chemotherapy is inefficient for conventional central and clear chondrosarcoma.^[16] Further, adjuvant anthracycline‑based therapy showed relatively modest efficacy for mesenchymal chondrosarcoma in a nonrandomized clinical cohort.[20] Despite the availability of published literature, prospective data on the effectiveness of chemotherapy for chondrosarcoma remain relatively scarce owing to the limited number of patients and the peculiarity of the disease.^[21] Therefore, existing treatments for chondrosarcoma are rooted in the treatment approaches used for osteosarcoma^[22]

Chemoresistance and radioresistance in chondrosarcoma

Resistance to chemotherapy and radiotherapy is a common dilemma for patients with chondrosarcoma, given that chondrosarcoma tumors are known to be resistant to chemotherapy and radiotherapy, thereby making these standard treatment modalities ineffective for treating this disease.^[23] P-glycoprotein, multidrug-resistance-1 gene (MDRI), high expression of Bcl-2 family proteins, slow proliferation, poor vascularity, and dense extracellular matrix are among the prominent factors associated with chemoresistance and radioresistance in chondrosarcoma patients, which lead to subpar delivery of anticancer agents.[8,21,24]

Nonconventional approaches and novel targets for chondrosarcoma treatment

Although numerous studies have demonstrated positive outcomes, clinicians have been apprehensive about using monotherapy for heterogeneous chondrosarcoma due to the tumor's capacity to adapt and develop resistance. Furthermore, owing to the lack of successful outcomes, the potential of monotherapy as an adjuvant therapy in combination with other treatments cannot be established. Additionally, the

peculiarity of this disease poses challenges in conducting randomized clinical trials to evaluate the effectiveness of anticancer agents. Nonetheless, ongoing clinical studies are being conducted to assess the efficacy and safety of novel anticancer agents for treating advanced chondrosarcomas.

Therefore, by considering the side effects and conducting clinical investigations for safety and efficacy assessment in large patient groups, the utility of novel nonconventional therapeutic options for treating patients with chondrosarcoma can be considerably improved.^[21,25]

Some of the most prominent nonconventional approaches for treating chondrosarcoma include tumor microenvironment modulation, immunotherapy, epigenetic, molecularly targeted, antiangiogenic, combination, and herbal therapies.^[15,22] Moreover, the identification of novel signaling pathways in various chondrosarcoma histologic subtypes has also prompted the development of different molecularly targeted therapies and investigations on their therapeutic efficacy. To date, several novel targets for chondrosarcoma therapies have been recognized and are currently under investigation.

Some of the proposed therapies for chondrosarcoma involve targeting (1) mutations of isocitrate dehydrogenases (IDH) 1 and IDH2,^[22] (2) cyclin-dependent kinase,^[26] (3) platelet-derived growth factor receptor,^[27] (4) angiogenesis,^[28] (5) the Hedgehog signaling pathway,^[29] (6) bone morphogenetic protein-7,^[30] (7) endothelin-1 (ET-1),^[31] (8) sphingosine-1-phosphate,^[32] (9) basic fibroblast growth factor,^[33] (10) brain-derived neurotrophic factor,^[34,35] (11) adipokines (i.e. adiponectin,^[36] leptin,^[37] and resistin^[38]), (12) histone deacetylase,^[39] (13) Bcl-2 family,^[40] (14) apoptosis related to endoplasmic reticulum stress, $[41]$ (15) matrix metalloproteinase expression, $[42]$ (16) cyclin-dependent tumor cell activity,^[26] (17) epidermal growth factor receptor (i.e., glucose metabolism inhibition),^[43] (18) microRNAs, [44] (19) phosphoinositide 3‑kinase (PI3K)-Akt-mTOR,^[21] (20) SRC pathway,^[21] and (21) tumor suppressor pathways.^[7] Additionally, clinical investigations on immune checkpoint inhibition have demonstrated promising outcomes despite being in the earliest phases and obtaining mixed patient responses. Immunotherapy and significance of the PD-1/PD-L1 pathway

Immunotherapy research, particularly on immune checkpoint inhibition, has been ongoing in various cancers, including sarcomas. Several immunohistochemical investigations have demonstrated immune phenomena in chondrosarcoma.^[45,46] Cohen Nowak *et al*. reported a case involving a patient with metastatic chondrosarcoma who exhibited a remarkably sustained response to immunotherapy after failing multiple lines of systemic therapy.[11] Moreover, in comparison to normal bones, chondrosarcoma tissues exhibit increased expression of PD-1.^[47] One study found that PD-L1 immunoexpression status determines the response to immunotherapy in many cancers.^[48] An analysis of the expression of PD-L1 protein in

conventional mesenchymal, clear cell, and dedifferentiated chondrosarcomas revealed an upsurge in PD‑L1 expression in 41% of dedifferentiated chondrosarcomas, which was considerably correlated with tumor‑infiltrating lymphocytes and human leukocyte antigen class I expression.^[49,50] Moreover, another study revealed that patients with chondrosarcoma showed positivity rates of 68% and 42% for PD‑L1 and PD‑L2 expression, respectively. Evidence has established a link between PD‑L1 expression and younger age, larger tumor size, histological grade, and tumor recurrence.^[45]

Furthermore, the PD-1/PD-L1 pathway plays a significant role in immune evasion given that their interaction downregulates the T-cell-mediated response.^[51] Additionally, studies have found that inhibiting the PD‑1 and PD‑L1 interactions promoted a remarkable antitumor effect.^[52] Moreover, solid tumor oncology has undergone transformation through the utilization of immune checkpoint blockade with anti‑PD‑1 and anti‑PD‑L1. In general, positive clinical outcomes are associated with the correlation between tumor mutational burden and PD-L1 expression.^[53] Furthermore, sarcoma typically exhibits genomically stable characteristics and a low tumor mutational burden. A comprehensive analysis of tumor mutational burden across more than 100,000 cancer genomes encompassing 167 different cancer types revealed that chondrosarcomas, in particular, ranks among the lowest 10% in terms of tumor mutational burden.[54] Additionally, PD‑L1 expression is low in sarcomas.[55]

A few clinical studies have investigated the efficacy of immune checkpoint inhibitors efficacy in sarcomas. The SARC028 trial assessed pembrolizumab efficacy in advanced bone and soft tissue sarcomas, with one partial response detected in five chondrosarcoma patients.^[55] Another trial found that a combination of doxorubicin and pembrolizumab promoted favorable tolerability, with tumor shrinkage observed in three out of eight chondrosarcoma patients.^[56] Although numerous clinical trials are currently in progress, further investigations on checkpoint blockade in chondrosarcomas are warranted. A phase 2 trial evaluating nivolumab as monotherapy or combined with ipilimumab showed overall response rates of 5% and 16%, respectively, in bone sarcoma.^[57] This finding facilitates the development of treatments for patients with chondrosarcoma by investigating novel combinations of immune checkpoint blockade.

Mechanism for the involvement of the PD‑1/PD‑L1 pathway in tumor immune escape

The immune system normally surveils malignant cells, recognizing and removing them to prevent tumor growth. The PD‑1/PD‑L1 axis, an extensively studied negative regulatory immune checkpoint pathway, plays a crucial role in this process.[58] Tumor cells augment PD‑L1 expression, which interacts with PD‑1 receptors on immune cells, primarily T cells. This triggers inhibitory signals within immune cells, which dampen the antitumor response, activate a signaling cascade within T cells, and activate SHP‑2, which inhibits critical T‑cell activation and effector pathways. Consequently, T‑cell activity is reduced, impairing their capability to recognize and eliminate tumor cells and weakening the overall antitumor immune response.

Figure 1 describes the immune checkpoint signaling pathway. Upon T‑cell activation, PD‑L1 interacts with PD‑1, inducing conformational changes and ITIM and ITSM phosphorylation within the PD‑1 intracellular domain. This recruits SHP‑2, which suppresses the PI3K/Akt and RAS/mitogen-activated protein kinase/ extracellular-signal-regulated kinase (ERK) signaling pathways, inhibiting T‑cell activation, proliferation, survival, and effector functions. SHP-2 recruitment near the T-cell receptor (TCR) attenuates essential signaling events near the TCR, including the suppression of ZAP70 phosphorylation mediated by Lck.[59] Moreover, it impacts other downstream signaling pathways, including those involving PI3K/Akt, RAS, ERK, VAV, and phospholipase Cγ. [60,61]

Additionally, PD‑1 ligation results in the targeting of two main pathways, PTEN-PI3K-Akt and RAS-MEK-ERK.^[60,62] Furthermore, several downstream biochemical signaling events are prone to the influence of PD-1. Therefore, targeting the PD-1/PD-L1 pathway with immune checkpoint inhibitors greatly increases the potential for cancer immunotherapy, given that blockade of PD-1/PD-L1 interactions through these inhibitors ultimately restores T‑cell activity and enhances antitumor immune response and tumor regression.

Immunotherapeutic strategies for targeting the PD‑1/PD‑L1 pathway

Recent advances in cancer immunotherapy, particularly immune checkpoint inhibitors, have significantly enhanced the specificity and potency of immune responses against cancer. The PD‑1 and anticytotoxic T-lymphocyte-associated antigen 4 (CTLA‑4) immune checkpoints play an inhibitory role in immune functions, and immune checkpoint inhibition has the potential to more efficiently reactivate T cells and enhance the eradication of cancer cells.^[63] Numerous studies have underscored the therapeutic potential of these inhibitors.^[64] Approaches include PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors, combination therapies, biomarker-guided treatments, novel antibodies, vaccine and adoptive cell therapy combinations, and strategies exploring resistance mechanisms.

Different monoclonal antibodies capable of blocking PD‑1 (on T cells) and PD‑L1 (on tumor cells) interactions have been widely used as PD-1/PD-L1 checkpoint inhibitors. Some clinically available antibodies against PD‑1 are nivolumab (2014), pembrolizumab (2014), cemiplimab (2018), dostarlimab (2021), and retifanlimab (2023).^[62,65,66] Meanwhile, PD-L1-specific antibodies include atezolizumab (2016), avelumab (2017), and durvalumab (2017).^[65] Additionally, PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors can be used in combination with other therapies to enhance the antitumor immune response. These strategies may involve other immune checkpoint inhibitors (e.g. CTLA‑4 inhibitors), targeted therapies, chemotherapy, or radiation therapy. Synergistic effects can be achieved by simultaneously targeting multiple pathways.

Figure 1: The PD-1/PD-L1 immune checkpoint signaling pathway. Black arrows indicate activation, whereas red lines represent inhibition

The immunosuppressive tumor microenvironment can be overcome using strategies including chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T-cell therapy or tumor-infiltrating lymphocyte therapy. Additionally, exploring resistance mechanisms and using combination strategies might improve the efficiency of PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors.^[67,68] Evidently, immunotherapy strategies that target the PD-1/PD-L1 pathway have shown remarkable potential in terms of stable responses and improved patient outcomes across various cancer types.

Mechanism of action and types of PD‑1/PD‑L1 inhibitors

Figure 2 presents a schematic representation depicting the T cell release of interferon gamma (IFN‑γ) to increase the efficiency of tumor killing. After recognizing tumor antigens presented on MHC class I, CD8⁺ T cells become activated. This activation triggers the release of IFN‑γ, which binds to the IFN‑γ receptor and subsequently induces PD‑L1 expression in tumor cells. Consequently, PD-1 on the surface of T cells is upregulated, leading to the conjugation of PD‑L1 and PD‑1 and the initiation of the inhibitory effects of the PD-1/PD-L1 axis.

Blocking the interaction between PD‑1 and PD‑L1 abolishes the inhibition of CD8⁺ T cells, thereby enhancing antitumor activity.^[69] Notably, PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors block this interaction, thereby restoring T cell function and enhancing cancer cell recognition and elimination. Recent studies have investigated the efficacy of PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors, including monoclonal antibodies and peptide/nonpeptidic inhibitors. Structural modifications to peptidomimetic inhibitors can generate small molecules with the desired properties. Small‑molecule inhibitors/drugs have advantages over monoclonal antibodies, prompting the exploration of peptide‑based and nonpeptidic small‑molecule inhibitors of PD-1/PD-L1.^[70] The following discussions describe the types of PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors.

Antibody‑based inhibitors. Studies have shown that antibody‑based PD‑1/PD‑L1 inhibitors reduce tumors in various advanced cancers, emphasizing the importance of inhibiting the PD-1/PD-L1 pathway. A few antibody-based PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors for chondrosarcoma treatment have been reported in the literature. Notably, the SARC028 clinical trial investigated the effects of pembrolizumab in five patients with chondrosarcoma, with the results demonstrating a highly equitable response in only one patient.^[55] Another study also assessed the effects of nivolumab and found that a patient with dedifferentiated chondrosarcoma exhibited a limited response after six cycles. Moreover, after four cycles of nivolumab, a highly stable disease pattern was observed in a patient with mesenchymal chondrosarcoma.^[71] Current trials are investigating combined immune checkpoint blockades with anti‑CTLA‑4 or mTOR inhibitors for nonresectable sarcomas and other advanced tumors.^[46,72]

Aptamer‑drug conjugate‑based inhibitors. Evidence has shown that aptamer-drug conjugates (APDCs) are promising tools for immunomodulation and antitumor activity. Several DNA aptamers, including MP7 and AptPSL1, have been designed to block the PD-1/PD-L1 interaction.^[73,74] Although APDCs have been proven useful as PD‑1/PD‑L1 inhibitors for various cancers, information on chondrosarcomas has been limited.

Peptide‑based inhibitors. The first peptide‑based inhibitor, AUNP-12, was reported in 2014.^[75] Since then, other peptide‑based inhibitors, including a small peptide and a cyclic peptide derivative, that stimulate spleen cell proliferation and reduce lung metastasis in mice have been identified.^[76] Peptide-based immunomodulators of PD-1 are remarkably helpful in developing vaccines and therapeutics, particularly against infectious diseases.^[77] Peptide-based

immunomodulators have shown potential in vaccine and therapeutic development; however, more research is needed, particularly for chondrosarcoma.

Small‑molecule inhibitors (nonpeptidic). Nonpeptidic small-molecule inhibitors, including sulfamethoxine and sulfamethimazole antibiotics, have demonstrated low cytotoxicity and effective modulation of the PD‑1/PD‑L1 pathway. BMS‑8 and BMS‑202 are examples of small‑molecule inhibitors that inhibit PD-1 activation.^[76,78] Although small-molecule inhibitors have advantages over mABs and have been successfully applied to various cancers, their use in chondrosarcoma requires further investigation.

Combined application of PD‑1/PD‑L1 pathway inhibitors and other therapeutic modalities

The emergence of immune checkpoint inhibitors as a strategy for regulating the immune system has opened new treatment options for patients with advanced cancer. Among these, PD-1/PD-L1 axis inhibitors have become widely used for treating different types of cancer. However, not all patients with advanced cancer have shown improvement from PD-1/ PD-L1 inhibitors, with only a small percentage of patients exhibiting a response. Further research has revealed that the presence of PD‑1 and its ligands alone cannot sufficiently guarantee a positive response to treatment. This is because multiple parallel immune checkpoint pathways can contribute to tolerance against anti-PD-1/PD-L1 therapy.[79]

Consequently, combining other immune checkpoint pathway inhibitors has been explored as a potential strategy to enhance treatment sensitivity. Studies have demonstrated that administering a combination of antibodies targeting two immune checkpoint molecules can improve the antitumor response in preclinical animal models. Various immune checkpoint inhibitors have been investigated for combination therapy, including CTLA‑4 inhibitors, TIM‑3 inhibitors, LAG‑3 inhibitors, indoleamine 2,3‑dioxygenase inhibitors, TIGIT inhibitors, B7‑H3 monoclonal antibodies, and VISTA inhibitors. Combining different immune checkpoint inhibitors has emerged as a potential approach for enhancing treatment sensitivity and improving outcomes in patients with advanced cancer.[79] Figure 3 presents the different combinatorial approaches used for this purpose.

Ongoing clinical trials are currently exploring the efficacy of these combinations in various cancer types. Notably, the use of immune checkpoint inhibitors (i.e., CTLA-4, PD-1, and PD-L1, among others) through combined novel strategies has considerable potential for advancing cancer treatment. These novel combination immunotherapy approaches have demonstrated remarkable progress in improving the prognosis of patients with various types of tumors, including melanomas, non‑small cell lung cancers, urothelial carcinomas, renal cell carcinomas, head and neck squamous cell cancers, and Hodgkin's lymphomas.[80] However, the primary focus of our

Figure 3: An overview of the various combined approaches and PD‑1/ PD-L1 inhibitors used in oncology

investigation is the application of these approaches in the treatment of chondrosarcoma, a rare type of bone cancer that arises from cartilage cells. Nonetheless, despite the promising results shown by immunotherapy in some cancer types, the utility of combined immunotherapy approaches in chondrosarcoma requires further investigation given the limited availability of information in this domain.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

Chondrosarcoma is a common malignant bone tumor originating from chondrocytes that is characterized by endogenous cartilage ossification within the tumor tissue. Accounting for approximately 20%–30% of all primary bone malignancies, chondrosarcoma is the second most prevalent type of bone sarcoma after osteosarcoma. Furthermore, chondrosarcoma poses significant treatment challenges given that the available therapeutic options are limited to surgery and chemoradiation. However, the suitability of these treatments varies depending on individual factors, including chondrosarcoma type, histological and pathological grade, patient age, and physical fitness. Moreover, patients diagnosed with highly metastatic or unresectable chondrosarcomas have limited treatment options due to the development of resistance against standard anticancer agents.

Recent *in vitro* and preclinical studies have identified potential new treatment avenues, although further therapeutic targets need to be identified. However, among the various novel therapies proposed, immunotherapy and molecularly targeted drugs have shown remarkable potential for the treatment of human malignancies. Thus, to enhance clinical outcomes in patients with advanced chondrosarcoma, several novel

approaches, including immunotherapy and targeted molecular drugs, are necessary. Considering that, the circumvention of immune surveillance is a key factor in the progression of malignant tumors and that immune checkpoints play an important role in modulating antitumor immune effects, blockers or inhibitors targeting these immune checkpoints have become effective therapeutic tools for patients with tumors. One such checkpoint receptor implicated in this process is PD‑1. Furthermore, the association between PD‑1 and PD‑L1 and cancer progression in humans has been extensively studied, which highlights their remarkable potential as biomarkers for cancer treatment.

More recently, evidence has shown that the use of immune checkpoint inhibition‑based therapies promotes remarkable clinical outcomes in different cancer types, including metastatic melanomas, renal cell carcinomas, lung cancers, and breast cancers. Immune checkpoint blockade is a currently evolving therapeutic approach for different malignancies, with the milestones achieved herein spearheading the investigation of the potential utility of these approaches in different bone sarcomas, including chondrosarcoma. At present, ongoing sarcoma research has spanned from fundamental reports to clinical trials exploring immune checkpoint inhibition, the results of which are anticipated to be published in the near future. Notably, immunotherapy has shown promising potential for treating chondrosarcoma, although clinical investigations are necessary to validate these findings. The primary objectives of these clinical trials should be to assess the effectiveness of immunotherapy treatment as monotherapy or combination therapy for chondrosarcomas followed by the investigation of immune-related adverse events. Most evidently, the continuation of clinical trials is of utmost importance for bone sarcomas in general and chondrosarcomas in particular. Moreover, predictive biomarker discovery is yet another cornerstone that will ultimately allow the design of personalized medicine for patients with chondrosarcoma using immune checkpoint inhibition-based therapies.

Financial support and sponsorship

This study was funded by the Natural Science Foundation of Shandong Province (ZR2023MH025).

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- 1. Tlemsani C, Larousserie F, De Percin S, Audard V, Hadjadj D, Chen J, *et al*. Biology and management of high‑grade chondrosarcoma: An update on targets and treatment options. Int J Mol Sci 2023;24:1361. doi: 10.3390/ijms24021361.
- 2. Gazendam A, Popovic S, Parasu N, Ghert M. Chondrosarcoma: A clinical review. J Clin Med 2023;12:2506. doi: 10.3390/jcm12072506.
- 3. Singhal A, Mahajan C, Hadi R, Awasthi NP. Chondrosarcoma of chest wall metastasising to the larynx. J Cancer Res Ther 2015;11:658.
- 4. Thorkildsen J, Taksdal I, Bjerkehagen B, Haugland HK, Børge Johannesen T, Viset T, *et al*. Chondrosarcoma in Norway 1990–2013; an epidemiological and prognostic observational study of a complete national cohort. Acta Oncologica 2019;58:273‑82.
- 5. NazeriE, SavadkoohiMG, Majidzadeh‑A K, EsmaeiliR. Chondrosarcoma: An overview of clinical behavior, molecular mechanisms mediated drug resistance and potential therapeutic targets. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol 2018;131:102‑9.
- 6. Chow WA. Update on chondrosarcomas. Curr Opin Oncol 2007;19:371‑6.
- 7. Chow WA. Chondrosarcoma: Biology, genetics, and epigenetics. F1000Res 2018;7:F1000. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.15953.1.
- 8. Miwa S, Yamamoto N, Hayashi K, Takeuchi A, Igarashi K, Tsuchiya H. Therapeutic targets and emerging treatments in advanced chondrosarcoma. Int J Mol Sci 2022;23:1096. doi: 10.3390/ ijms23031096.
- 9. Limaiem F, Sticco K. Cancer, Chondrosarcoma. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls; 2019.
- 10. Tang Q, Chen Y, Li X, Long S, Shi Y, Yu Y, *et al*. The role of PD‑1/PD‑L1 and application of immune‑checkpoint inhibitors in human cancers. Front Immunol 2022;13:964442. doi: 10.3389/fimmu. 2022.964442.
- 11. Cohen‑Nowak AJ, Dressler DB, Rock A, Mojica K, Woo D, Zuckerman LM, *et al*. Role of immunotherapy in chondrosarcoma: A case report and review of the literature. Ther Adv Med Oncol 2023;15:17588359231199877. doi: 10.1177/17588359231199877.
- 12. Melgandi W, Agarwal S, Rathi A, Singh K, Ansari F, Arora S. Extracorporeal irradiation in malignant bone tumors: Single institution experience and review of literature. J Cancer Res Ther 2023;19S1‑5. doi: 10.4103/jcrt.jcrt_1316_21.
- 13. Van Der Geest I, De Valk M, De Rooy J, Pruszczynski M, Veth R, Schreuder H. Oncological and functional results of cryosurgical therapy of enchondromas and chondrosarcomas grade 1. J Surg Oncol 2008;98:421‑6.
- 14. Sharma V, Verma L, Chander B, Sharma S. Chondrosarcoma third metacarpal. J Cancer Res Ther 2018;14:719‑21.
- 15. MacDonald IJ, Lin C‑Y, Kuo S‑J, Su C‑M, Tang C‑H. An update on current and future treatment options for chondrosarcoma. Expert Rev Anticancer Ther 2019;19:773‑86.
- 16. Gelderblom H, Hogendoorn PC, Dijkstra SD, Van Rijswijk CS, Krol AD, Taminiau AH, *et al*. The clinical approach towards chondrosarcoma. Oncologist 2008;13:320‑9.
- 17. Cesari M, Bertoni F, Bacchini P, Mercuri M, Palmerini E, Ferrari S. Mesenchymal chondrosarcoma. An analysis of patients treated at a single institution. Tumori J 2007;93:423‑7.
- 18. Dantonello TM, Int-Veen C, Leuschner I, Schuck A, Furtwaengler R, Claviez A, *et al*. Mesenchymal chondrosarcoma of soft tissues and bone in children, adolescents, and young adults: Experiences of the CWS and COSS study groups. Cancer 2008;112:2424‑31.
- 19. Mitchell A, Ayoub K, Mangham D, Grimer R, Carter S, Tillman R. Experience in the treatment of dedifferentiated chondrosarcoma. J Bone Joint Surg Br 2000;82:55‑61.
- 20. Frezza AM, Cesari M, Baumhoer D, Biau D, Bielack S, Campanacci DA, *et al*. Mesenchymal chondrosarcoma: Prognostic factors and outcome in 113 patients. A European musculoskeletal oncology society study. Eur J Cancer 2015;51:374‑81.
- 21. Boehme KA, Schleicher SB, Traub F, Rolauffs B. Chondrosarcoma: A rare misfortune in aging human cartilage? The role of stem and progenitor cells in proliferation, malignant degeneration and therapeutic resistance. Int J Mol Sci 2018;19:311. doi: 10.3390/ ijms19010311.
- 22. Monga V, Mani H, Hirbe A, Milhem M. Non‑conventional treatments for conventional chondrosarcoma. Cancers 2020;12:1962.
- 23. Jeong W, Kim H‑J. Biomarkers of chondrosarcoma. J Clin Pathol 2018;71:579‑83.
- 24. van Oosterwijk JV, Herpers B, Meijer D, Briaire‑de Bruijn I, Cleton‑Jansen A, Gelderblom H, *et al*. Restoration of chemosensitivity

for doxorubicin and cisplatin in chondrosarcoma *in vitro*: BCL‑2 family members cause chemoresistance. Ann Oncol 2012;23:1617‑26.

- 25. Gilbert A, Tudor M, Montanari J, Commenchail K, Savu DI, Lesueur P, *et al*. Chondrosarcoma resistance to radiation therapy: Origins and potential therapeutic solutions. Cancers 2023;15:1962. doi: 10.3390/ cancers15071962.
- 26. Ouyang Z, Wang S, Zeng M, Li Z, Zhang Q, Wang W, *et al*. Therapeutic effect of palbociclib in chondrosarcoma: Implication of cyclin‑dependent kinase 4 as a potential target. Cell Commun Signal 2019;17:1‑12. doi: 10.1186/s12964‑019‑0327‑5.
- 27. Tsavaris O, Economopoulou P, Kotsantis I, Reppas L, Avgerinou C, Spathas N, *et al*. Clinical benefit of pazopanib in a patient with metastatic chondrosarcoma: A case report and review of the literature. Front Oncol 2018;8:45. doi: 10.3389/fonc. 2018.00045.
- 28. Jones RL, Katz D, Loggers ET, Davidson D, Rodler ET, Pollack SM. Clinical benefit of antiangiogenic therapy in advanced and metastatic chondrosarcoma. Med Oncol 2017;34:1‑5. doi: 10.1007/ s12032‑017‑1030‑2.
- 29. Hanna A, Shevde LA. Hedgehog signaling: Modulation of cancer properies and tumor mircroenvironment. Mol Cancer 2016;15:1‑14. doi: 10.1186/s12943‑016‑0509‑3.
- 30. Chen J‑C, Yang S‑T, Lin C‑Y, Hsu C‑J, Tsai C‑H, Su J‑L, *et al*. BMP‑7 enhances cell migration and αvβ3 integrin expression via a c‑Src‑dependent pathway in human chondrosarcoma cells. PloS One 2014;9:e112636. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0112636.
- 31. Wu M‑H, Huang P‑H, Hsieh M, Tsai C‑H, Chen H‑T, Tang C‑H. Endothelin‑1 promotes epithelial–mesenchymal transition in human chondrosarcoma cells by repressing miR‑300. Oncotarget 2016;7:70232‑46.
- 32. Tsai CH, Yang DY, Lin CY, Chen TM, Tang CH, Huang YL. Sphingosine-1phosphate suppresses chondrosarcoma metastasis by upregulation of tissue inhibitor of metalloproteinase 3 through suppressing miR-101 expression. Mol Oncol 2017;11:1380‑98.
- 33. Tzeng H‑E, Chen P‑C, Lin K‑W, Lin C‑Y, Tsai C‑H, Han S‑M, *et al*. Basic fibroblast growth factor induces VEGF expression in chondrosarcoma cells and subsequently promotes endothelial progenitor cell-primed angiogenesis. Clin Sci 2015;129:147‑58.
- 34. Lin C‑Y, Chang SL‑Y, Fong Y‑C, Hsu C‑J, Tang C‑H. Apoptosis signal-regulating kinase 1 is involved in brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF)‑enhanced cell motility and matrix metalloproteinase 1 expression in human chondrosarcoma cells. Int J Mol Sci 2013;14:15459‑78.
- 35. Lin C‑Y, Wang S‑W, Chen Y‑L, Chou W‑Y, Lin T‑Y, Chen W‑C, *et al*. Brain‑derived neurotrophic factor promotes VEGF‑C‑dependent lymphangiogenesis by suppressing miR‑624‑3p in human chondrosarcoma cells. Cell Death Dis 2017;8:e2964.
- 36. Huang C‑Y, Chang A‑C, Chen H‑T, Wang S‑W, Lo Y‑S, Tang C‑H. Adiponectin promotes VEGF‑C‑dependent lymphangiogenesis by inhibiting miR‑27b through a CaMKII/AMPK/p38 signaling pathway in human chondrosarcoma cells. Clin Sci 2016;130:1523‑33.
- 37. Yang W‑H, Chang A‑C, Wang S‑W, Wang S‑J, Chang Y‑S, Chang T‑M, *et al*. Leptin promotes VEGF‑C production and induces lymphangiogenesis by suppressing miR‑27b in human chondrosarcoma cells. Sci Rep 2016;6:28647. doi: 10.1038/srep28647.
- 38. Chen S‑S, Tang C‑H, Chie M‑J, Tsai C‑H, Fong Y‑C, Lu Y‑C, *et al*. Resistin facilitates VEGF‑A‑dependent angiogenesis by inhibiting miR‑16‑5p in human chondrosarcoma cells. Cell Death Dis 2019;10:31.
- 39. Zhu J, Gu J, Ma J, Xu Z, Tao H. Histone deacetylase inhibitors repress chondrosarcoma cell proliferation. J BUON 2015;20:269‑74.
- 40. de Jong Y, Monderer D, Brandinelli E, Monchanin M, van den Akker BE, van Oosterwijk JG, et al. Bcl-xl as the most promising Bcl-2 family member in targeted treatment of chondrosarcoma. Oncogenesis 2018;7:74.
- 41. Wu M‑H, Lee C‑Y, Huang T‑J, Huang K‑Y, Tang C‑H, Liu S‑H, *et al*. MLN4924, a protein neddylation inhibitor, suppresses the growth

of human chondrosarcoma through inhibiting cell proliferation and inducing endoplasmic reticulum stress‑related apoptosis. Int J Mol Sci 2018;20:72. doi: 10.3390/ijms20010072.

- 42. Higuchi T, Takeuchi A, Munesue S, Yamamoto N, Hayashi K, Kimura H, *et al*. Anti-tumor effects of a nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug zaltoprofen on chondrosarcoma via activating peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma and suppressing matrix metalloproteinase-2 expression. Cancer Med 2018;7:1944‑54.
- 43. Song Y‑D, Zhang K‑F, Liu D, Guo Y‑Q, Wang D‑Y, Cui M‑Y, *et al*. Inhibition of EGFR‑induced glucose metabolism sensitizes chondrosarcoma cells to cisplatin. Tumor Biol 2014;35:7017‑24.
- 44. Huang K, Chen J, Yang M‑S, Tang Y‑J, Pan F. Inhibition of Src by microRNA‑23b increases the cisplatin sensitivity of chondrosarcoma cells. Cancer Biomark 2017;18:231‑9.
- 45. Yang X, Zhu G, Yang Z, Zeng K, Liu F, Sun J. Expression of PD‑L1/PD‑L2 is associated with high proliferation index of Ki-67 but not with TP53 overexpression in chondrosarcoma. Int J Biol Mark 2018;33:507‑13.
- 46. Thanindratarn P, Dean DC, Nelson SD, Hornicek FJ, Duan Z. Advances in immune checkpoint inhibitors for bone sarcoma therapy. J Bone Oncol 2019;15:100221. doi: 10.1016/j.jbo. 2019.100221.
- 47. Torabi A, Amaya CN, Wians FH Jr, Bryan BA. PD-1 and PD-L1 expression in bone and soft tissue sarcomas. Pathology 2017;49:506‑13.
- 48. Boruah M, Gaddam P, Agarwal S, Mir R, Gupta R, Sharma M, *et al*. PD‑L1 expression in rare and aggressive thyroid cancers: A preliminary investigation for a role of immunotherapy. J Cancer Res Ther 2023;19.
- 49. Zhang Y‑X, van Oosterwijk JG, Sicinska E, Moss S, Remillard SP, Van Wezel T, *et al*. Functional profiling of receptor tyrosine kinases and downstream signaling in human chondrosarcomas identifies pathways for rational targeted therapy. Clin Cancer Res 2013;19:3796‑807.
- 50. Kostine M, Cleven AH, de Miranda NF, Italiano A, Cleton‑Jansen A‑M, Bovée JV. Analysis of PD‑L1, T‑cell infiltrate and HLA expression in chondrosarcoma indicates potential for response to immunotherapy specifically in the dedifferentiated subtype. Mod Pathol 2016;29:1028‑37.
- 51. Chen Y, Guo Y, Liu Z, Hu X, Hu M. An overview of current advances of PD‑L1 targeting immuno‑imaging in cancers. J Cancer Res Ther 2023;19:866‑75.
- 52. Polychronidou G, Karavasilis V, Pollack SM, Huang PH, Lee A, Jones RL. Novel therapeutic approaches in chondrosarcoma. Future Oncol 2017;13:637‑48.
- 53. Carbone DP, Reck M, Paz‑Ares L, Creelan B, Horn L, Steins M, *et al*. First-line nivolumab in stage IV or recurrent non–small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med 2017;376:2415‑26.
- 54. Chalmers ZR, Connelly CF, Fabrizio D, Gay L, Ali SM, Ennis R, *et al*. Analysis of 100,000 human cancer genomes reveals the landscape of tumor mutational burden. Genome Med 2017;9:1-14. doi: 10.1186/ s13073‑017‑0424‑2.
- 55. Tawbi HA, Burgess M, Bolejack V, Van Tine BA, Schuetze SM, Hu J, *et al*. Pembrolizumab in advanced soft‑tissue sarcoma and bone sarcoma (SARC028): A multicentre, two-cohort, single-arm, open-label, phase 2 trial. Lancet Oncol 2017;18:1493-501.
- 56. Pollack SM, Redman MW, Baker KK, Wagner MJ, Schroeder BA, Loggers ET, *et al*. Assessment of doxorubicin and pembrolizumab in patients with advanced anthracycline‑naive sarcoma: A phase 1/2 nonrandomized clinical trial. JAMA Oncol 2020;6:1778‑82.
- 57. D'Angelo SP, Mahoney MR, Van Tine BA, Atkins J, Milhem MM, Jahagirdar BN, *et al*. Nivolumab with or without ipilimumab treatment for metastatic sarcoma (Alliance A091401): Two open-label, non‑comparative, randomised, phase 2 trials. Lancet Oncol 2018;19:416‑26.
- 58. Wu Q, Jiang L, Li S‑C, He Q‑J, Yang B, Cao J. Small molecule inhibitors targeting the PD-1/PD-L1 signaling pathway. Acta Pharmacol Sin 2021;42:1‑9. doi: 10.1038/s41401‑020‑0366‑x.
- 59. Sheppard K‑A, Fitz LJ, Lee JM, Benander C, George JA, WootersJ, *et al*.

PD‑1 inhibits T‑cell receptor induced phosphorylation of the ZAP70/ CD3ζ signalosome and downstream signaling to PKCθ. FEBS Lett 2004;574:37‑41.

- 60. Patsoukis N, Brown J, Petkova V, Liu F, Li L, Boussiotis VA. Selective effects of PD‑1 on Akt and Ras pathways regulate molecular components of the cell cycle and inhibit T cell proliferation. Sci Signal 2012;5:ra46.
- 61. Hui E, Cheung J, Zhu J, Su X, Taylor MJ, Wallweber HA, *et al*. T cell costimulatory receptor CD28 is a primary target for PD‑1–mediated inhibition. Science 2017;355:1428‑33.
- 62. Ai L, Xu A, Xu J. Roles of PD‑1/PD‑L1 pathway: Signaling, cancer, and beyond. Regulation of Cancer Immune Checkpoints: Molecular and Cellular Mechanisms and Therapy. 2020. p. 33‑59. doi:10.1007/978-981-15-3266-5.
- 63. LjunggrenHG, Jonsson R, Höglund P. Seminal immunologic discoveries with direct clinical implications: The 2018 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine honours discoveries in cancer immunotherapy. Scand J Immunol 2018;88:e12731. doi: 10.1111/sji. 12731.
- 64. Han Y, Liu D, Li L. PD‑1/PD‑L1 pathway: Current researches in cancer. Am J Cancer Res 2020;10:727.
- 65. Xu Z, Du W. PD‑1/PD‑L1 Signaling pathway and tumor immune escape. J Biosci Med 2023;11:9‑16.
- 66. Ghosh C, Luong G, Sun Y. A snapshot of the PD‑1/PD‑L1 pathway. J Cancer 2021;12:2735.
- 67. Yi M, Zheng X, Niu M, Zhu S, Ge H, Wu K. Combination strategies with PD-1/PD-L1 blockade: Current advances and future directions. Mol Cancer 2022;21:28.
- 68. Kumar S, Chatterjee M, Ghosh P, Ganguly KK, Basu M, Ghosh MK. Targeting PD-1/PD-L1 in cancer immunotherapy: An effective strategy for treatment of triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) patients. Genes Dis 2022;10:1318-50.
- 69. Lei Q, Wang D, Sun K, Wang L, Zhang Y. Resistance mechanisms of anti‑PD1/PDL1 therapy in solid tumors. Front Cell Dev Biol 2020;8:672. doi: 10.3389/fcell. 2020.00672.
- 70. Zhang S, Bai X, Shan F. The progress and confusion of anti-PD1/

PD-L1 immunotherapy for patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer. Int Immunopharmacol 2020;80:106247. doi: 10.1016/j. intimp. 2020.106247.

- 71. Paoluzzi L, Cacavio A, Ghesani M, Karambelkar A, Rapkiewicz A, Weber J, *et al*. Response to anti‑PD1 therapy with nivolumab in metastatic sarcomas. Clin Sarcoma Res 2016;6:1‑7. doi: 10.1186/ s13569-016-0064-0.
- 72. Traylor JI, Pernik MN, Plitt AR, Lim M, Garzon-Muvdi T. Immunotherapy for chordoma and chondrosarcoma: Current evidence. Cancers 2021;13:2408. doi: 10.3390/cancers13102408.
- 73. Keefe AD, Pai S, Ellington A. Aptamers as therapeutics. Nat Rev Drug Discov 2010;9:537‑50.
- 74. Ellington AD, Szostak JW. *In vitro* selection of RNA molecules that bind specific ligands. Nature 1990;346:818‑22.
- 75. Sasikumar PG, Ramachandra RK, Adurthi S, Dhudashiya AA, Vadlamani S, Vemula K, *et al*. A rationally designed peptide antagonist of the PD‑1 signaling pathway as an immunomodulatory agent for cancer therapy. Mol Cancer Ther 2019;18:1081‑91.
- 76. Liu J, Chen Z, Li Y, Zhao W, Wu J, Zhang Z. PD‑1/PD‑L1 checkpoint inhibitors in tumor immunotherapy. Front Pharmacol 2021;12:731798. doi: 10.3389/fphar. 2021.731798.
- 77. Kotraiah V, Phares TW, Browne CD, Pannucci J, Mansour M, Noe AR, *et al*. Novel peptide‑based PD1 immunomodulators demonstrate efficacy in infectious disease vaccines and therapeutics. Front Immunol 2020;11:264. doi: 10.3389/fimmu. 2020.00264.
- 78. Sharpe AH, Pauken KE. The diverse functions of the PD1 inhibitory pathway. Nat Rev Immunol 2018;18:153-67.
- 79. Li Z, Sun G, Sun G, Cheng Y, Wu L, Wang Q, *et al*. Various uses of PD1/ PD-L1 inhibitor in oncology: Opportunities and challenges. Front Oncol 2021;11:771335. doi: 10.3389/fonc. 2021.771335.
- 80. Wojtukiewicz MZ, Rek MM, Karpowicz K, Górska M, Polityńska B, Wojtukiewicz AM, *et al*. Inhibitors of immune checkpoints—PD‑1, PD-L1, CTLA-4—new opportunities for cancer patients and a new challenge for internists and general practitioners. Cancer Metastasis Rev 2021;40:949‑82.