

**File Containing the Data presented in the
R-04 Primary Analysis Paper
Greg Yothers, PhD: Protocol Statistician**

Publication reference:

Carmen J. Allegra, Greg Yothers, Michael J. O’Connell, Robert W. Beart, Timothy F. Wozniak, Henry C. Pitot, Anthony F. Shields, Jerome C. Landry, David P. Ryan, Amit Arora, Lisa S. Evans, Nathan Bahary, Gamini Soori, Janice F. Eakle, John M. Robertson, Dennis F. Moore, Michael R. Mullane, Benjamin T. Marchello, Patrick J. Ward, Saima Sharif, Mark S. Roh, Norman Wolmark; Neoadjuvant 5-FU or Capecitabine Plus Radiation With or Without Oxaliplatin in Rectal Cancer Patients: A Phase III Randomized Clinical Trial, JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute, Volume 107, Issue 11, 1 November 2015, djv248, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djv248>

This manuscript was originally published online September 14, 2015.

Data File: The file *NCT00058474-D1-Dataset.csv* contains all data necessary to produce the results reported in the above manuscript.

Data can be used to approximate published study findings, but exact reproduction of previous manuscripts may not be possible in some cases (e.g., when data must be modified for de-identification purposes or have undergone further data cleaning).

Notice of errors:

Several errors were identified in the published version of the manuscript. The errors are generally minor and do not materially change any stated conclusions with the exception of 3 points that are the subject of an erratum in progress.

- 1) On page 4 bottom of first column and top of the 2nd column: the text describes the high risk subset based on “clinical” nodal and TStage when in fact this subset is defined based on “**pathologic**” characteristics (will be part of erratum, point 1).
- 2) The caption for Figure 4 describes “event rates” when it should describe “**event-free rates**”.
- 3) On page 5, treatment compliance is reported as “5-FU without oxaliplatin, patients achieved a 90% compliance rate; for 5-FU with oxaliplatin they achieved 84% (P = .016). For capecitabine, 97% achieved protocol compliance without oxali-platin and 96% with (P = .55). For oxaliplatin, compliance was 69% with 5-FU and 62% with capecitabine (P = .069). Ninety-six percent to 98% achieved radiation therapy compliance; this did not differ statistically significantly by arm (P = .42).” should read “5-FU without oxaliplatin, patients achieved a **91%** compliance rate; for 5-FU with oxaliplatin they achieved **85%** (P = .016). For capecitabine, **86%** achieved protocol compliance without oxaliplatin and **87%** with (P = .69). For oxaliplatin, compliance was **83%** with 5-FU and **84%** with capecitabine (P = .063). **Ninety-seven** percent to **99%** achieved radiation therapy compliance; this did not differ statistically significantly by arm (P = .09).”
- 4) On page 5, deaths within 45 days of treatment are described as “these differences did not reach statistical significance (P = .064 Fisher’s exact test, postamendment, 2 vs 9 deaths) (0.091, pre- and postamendment, 3 vs 10 deaths)” should read “these differences **did** reach statistical significance (P = **0.037** Fisher’s exact test, postamendment, 2 vs 9 deaths (**0.056**, pre- and postamendment, 3 vs 10 deaths)). (will be part of erratum, point 2)

- 5) In figure 3B, the lower limit of the 95% confidence interval for the hazard ratio is reported as 0.67, it should be 0.69
- 6) Figure 5A reports a hazard ratio of 1.00, it should be 0.94. figure 5B reports a hazard ratio of 0.94, it should be 0.89. These hazard ratios are reported correctly in the original text of the results. (will be part of erratum, point 3)
- 7) On page 6 in the discussion we repeat that the deaths within 45 days of therapy “did not” reach statistical significance ... (HR = 1.0) (see point 4 above), should read “**did**” reach ... (HR = 0.94) (will be part of erratum, point 2)
- 8) On page 7 in the discussion we repeat that the high risk subset is based on clinical characteristics (see point 1 above), should be **pathologic** characteristics. (will be part of erratum, point 1)
- 9) Finally, the original toxicity data presented in table 2 on page 6 were taken from a toxicity listing produced by another computer system and not using the dataset frozen for the rest of the analysis. We have the original computer listing, but not the underlying data. This was standard practice at the time as we did not routinely produce toxicity listings via SAS at that time. The toxicity data that were frozen with the other data for this analysis produce a table with very small differences in the number of patients evaluated for toxicity in each arm, and in the percentage of patients experiencing some of the listed toxicities. None of the differences are considered material. We would describe this as a deviation rather than an error.

**Description of NCT00058474-D1-Dataset.csv file for
NSABP R-04 Primary Results Paper
Description updated 24Oct2019
Greg Yothers, PhD**

Variable Name	Definition
PatientID	Unique patient identifier
Eligible	0 = 'Ineligible' 1 = 'Eligible '
WithFU	0 = 'No Follow-up' 1 = 'Yes Followed'
Trt	1 = '5-FU (2 Arm)' 2 = 'Cape (2 Arm)' 3 = '5-FU (4 Arm)' 4 = '5-FU+Oxa (4 Arm)' 5 = 'Cape (4 Arm)' 6 = 'Cape +Oxa (4 Arm)'
Treatment	1 = '5-FU ' 2 = '5-FU+Oxa' 3 = 'Cape ' 4 = 'Cape+Oxa'
Female	Possibly corrected value of stratification factor 0 = 'Male ' 1 = 'Female'
ClinStageIII	Possibly corrected value of stratification factor 0 = ' Stage II ' 1 = ' Stage III ' Missing = 'Unknown'
Intent2SaveSphincter	Possibly corrected value of stratification factor 0 = 'Non-sphincter ' 1 = 'Sphincter saving'
FemaleAsRand	Unaltered value of stratification factor 0 = 'Male ' 1 = 'Female'
ClinStageIIIAsRand	Unaltered value of stratification factor 0 = ' Stage II ' 1 = ' Stage III'
Intent2SaveSphincterAsRand	Unaltered value of stratification factor 0 = 'Non-sphincter ' 1 = 'Sphincter saving'
PreAmendment	Trial opened as 2 arm comparison of 5-FU to Cape. Amendment created a 2x2 factorial design with further randomization to Oxali or Not, also changed dosing of 5-FU and Cape. 0 = 'Post-Amendment' 1 = 'Pre-Amendment '
LymphPos	Number of positive lymph nodes from pathology Missing value = no surgery or no pathology report on nodes

Variable Name	Definition
PathTStage	Character description of pathologic T Stage (AJCC 6 th Ed) Missing value = no surgery or no pathology report on TStage
Cap	Fluoropyrimidine randomization 0 = '5-Fu ' 1 = 'Cape '
Oxa	Oxaliplatin randomization 0 = 'No Oxali ' 1 = 'Oxali '
OxGroup	Randomized when Oxali available 0 = 'Pre-Amendment' 1 = 'No Oxali ' 2 = 'Yes Oxali '
Age60Plus	Age in Years 0 = '0-59' 1 = '60 +';
InadSurg	1 = 'Inadequate Surgery' Missing value = 'R0 resection '
Yrs2Surg	Time in years from Randomization to Surgery Missing = No follow-up
PrimaryEndPoint	Event indicator for loco-regional recurrence or inadequate surgery 0 = 'Censor' 1 = 'Event '
Yrs2PrimaryEndPoint	Time from randomization in years to loco-regional recurrence, inadequate surgery, or censor Missing = No follow-up
Yrs2PrimEndPtAfterR0	Time from R0 surgery in years to loco-regional recurrence Missing = No follow-up
DFS	Event indicator for DFS (local, regional or distant recurrence, inadequate surgery, invasive second primary cancer, or death) 0 = 'Censor' 1 = 'Event '
Yrs2DFS	Time from randomization in years to DFS event or censor Missing = No follow-up
OS	Event indicator for OS (death) 0 = 'Censor' 1 = 'Event '
Yrs2OS	Time from randomization in years to OS event or censor Missing = No follow-up
GotFU	0 = Assigned 5-FU but did not receive any 1 = Received some 5-FU, regardless of assignment Missing value = Not assigned 5-FU and did not receive 5-FU
GotCap	0 = Assigned Cape but did not receive any 1 = Received some Cape, regardless of assignment Missing value = Not assigned Cape and did not receive Cape
GotOxa	0 = Assigned Oxali but did not receive any 1 = Received some Oxali, regardless of assignment Missing value = Not assigned Oxali and did not receive Oxali

Variable Name	Definition
GotRT	0 = Did not receive any radiation 1 = Received at least some radiation
FU80	0 = Assigned 5-FU post-amendment, got less than 80% of protocol dose 1 = Assigned 5-FU post-amendment, got at least 80% of protocol dose Missing value = Not assigned 5-FU or pre-amendment
Cap80	0 = Assigned Cape post-amendment, got less than 80% of protocol dose 1 = Assigned Cape post-amendment, got at least 80% of protocol dose Missing value = Not assigned Cape or pre-amendment
Oxa80	0 = Assigned Oxali post-amendment, got less than 80% of protocol dose 1 = Assigned Oxali post-amendment, got at least 80% of protocol dose Missing value = Not assigned Oxali or pre-amendment
RT80	0 = Got less than 80% of protocol dose of radiation 1 = Got at least 80% of protocol dose of radiation
MaxAEGrade	Maximum Adverse Event Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
DiaGrade	Maximum Diarrhea Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
NauGrade	Maximum Nausea Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
VomGrade	Maximum Vomiting Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
FatGrade	Maximum Fatigue Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
AbdGrade	Maximum Abdominal Pain Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
AnaGrade	Maximum Anal Pain Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
RadGrade	Maximum Radiation Dermatitis Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
DehGrade	Maximum Dehydration Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
HanGrade	Maximum Hand-Foot Syndrome Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
PerGrade	Maximum Peripheral Sensory Neuropathy Grade observed 0-5 Missing value = not assessed for AE
DeathWithin45Days	Death during or within 45 days of protocol therapy