SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 1: HARREL C-INDEX

| | C-index (95% CI) | | |
IMDC	IMDC + NER	IMDC + NLR	IMDC + EOSINO
PFS			
0.58 (0.54;0.63)	0.59 (0.54;0.65)	0.58 (0.53;0.64)	0.59 (0.54;0.65)
OS			
0.64 (0.60;0.69)	0.68 (0.63;0.73)	0.67 (0.61;0.73)	0.68 (0.63;0.73)

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 2: IMPACT OF NER IN OTHER CLINICAL SETTINGS

For NER, NLR and eosinophils, HR reflect the relative change in risk of progression or death for a doubling (x2 units) of the predictor value.

Test		HR (95% CI)	P-value
Impact on time-to-metastasis (univariate analysis) (n=315)			
NER	x2 units	1.12 (0.98;1.27)	0.10
NLR	x2 units	1.68 (1.28;2.20)	0.0002
Eosinophils	x2 units	0.92 ((0.79;1.06)	0.24
Impact on PFS on VEGFR-TKIs (univariate analysis) (n=100)			
NER	x2 units	1.22 (1.06;1.41)	0.007
Eosinophils	x2 units	0.86 (0.72;1.03)	0.09
Impact on PFS on VEGFR-TKIs (bivariate analysis) (n=100)			
NER	x2 units	1.13 (0.97;1.31)	0.11
IMDC	Global test		0.002
	Good vs Poor	0.23 (0.10;0.52)	0.0005
	Intermediate vs Poor	0.50 (0.29;0.87)	0.01
Impact on OS on VEGFR-TKIs (univariate analysis) (n=100)			
NER	x2 units	1.18 (1.05;1.32)	0.005
Eosinophils	x2 units	0.88 (0.76;1.01)	0.07
Impact on OS on VEGFR-TKIs (bivariate analysis) (n=100)			
NER	x2 units	1.11 (0.99;1.24)	0.08
IMDC	Global test		0.0003
	Good vs Poor	0.23 (0.11;0.48)	<.0001
	Intermediate vs Poor	0.48 (0.30;0.79)	0.004

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 3: IMPACT OF THE EVOLUTION OF NER AND EOSINOPHIL COUNT BETWEEN BASELINE AND WEEK 6

HR reflect the relative change in risk of progression or death for a doubling (x2 units) of the predictor value.

Variable	Test	HR (95% CI)	P-value
PFS (n=169)			
Change in NER	x2 units	1.04 (0.95;1.14)	0.36
Change in EO	x2 units	0.97 (0.88;1.07)	0.51
OS (n=169)			
Change in NER	x2 units	1.03 (0.93;1.14)	0.61
Change in EO	x2 units	0.97 (0.86;1.09)	0.62

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF LITERATURE DATA ON THE IMPACT OF NER ON OUTCOME

Article	Tumour type	Number of patients	Treatment	NER cut-off	OS	PFS	ORR
Zhuang et al. (2022)	mRCC	184	Nivolumab-Ipilumumab, Pembrolizumab, Avelumab	49.2	Univariate HR 1.74 95%CI 1.11-2.74 p=0.02 Multivariate HR 1.68 95%CI 1.01-2.82 p=0.05	Univariate HR 1.23 95%CI 0.85-1.78 p=0.27 Multivariate HR 1.37 95%CI 0.92-2.04 p=0.12	24.4% vs 21.9%.
Tucker et al. (2021)	m-ccRCC	110	Nivolumab-Ipilumumab	26.4 (=median)	Univariate NR vs 27.3 months HR 3.22 p<0.01 Multivariaat HR 3.13 p<0.01	Univariate 8.6 vs 3.2 months HR 2 p<0.01 Multivariaat HR 1.61 p=0.04	40% vs 21.8% OR 2.39 p=0.04
Gil et al. (2022)	mRCC	49	Nivolumab	48	Univariate 24 vs 6 months p=0.002 Multivariate HR 3.85 95%CI 1.33-11.17 p=0.013	Univariate 30 vs 3 months p<0.001 Multivariate HR 3.92 95%CI 1.66-9.23 p=0.002	87.5% vs 12.5% p=0.003
Beulque et al.	m-ccRCC	201	Nivolumab or Nivolumab-Ipilumumab	33.8 (=median)	Univariate HR 1.326 95%CI 1.20-1.47 p<0.0001 Multivariate HR 1.21 95%CI 1.07-1.38 p=0.003	Univariate HR 1.17 95%CI 1.06-1.29 p=0.002 Multivariate HR 1.14 95%CI 1.01-1.28 p=0.04	37% vs 27% p=0.17

m-ccRCC = metastatic clear cell renal cell cancer. HR = hazard ratio. NR = not reached