Author Correction: Exploratory analyses assessing the impact of early tumour shrinkage and depth of response on survival outcomes in patients with *RAS* wild-type metastatic colorectal cancer receiving treatment in three randomised panitumumab trials

Julien Taieb¹ · Fernando Rivera² · Salvatore Siena³ · Meinolf Karthaus⁴ · Manuel Valladares-Ayerbes⁵ · Javier Gallego⁶ · Michael Geissler⁷ · Reija Koukakis⁸ · Gaston Demonty⁹ · Marc Peeters¹⁰

Published online: 15 February 2018
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2018

Author correction to: J Cancer Res Clin Oncol 144(2):321–335 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00432-017-2534-z>

The authors would like to include the following changes in the published article.

In the section Results, under the subsection Depth of response, PEAK, the final sentence should read as follows

‘Median DoR was longer and the resection rate higher in patients with the greatest DpR; the number of responders was also highest in the second top DpR category (Table 3b).’

Table 3: The Group 3 range in the second half (PEAK) of this table should read ‘31–53%’.

Figure 6b: The DpR ranges for Groups 3, 4 and 5 in the key should read: ‘Group 3 (DpR 31–53%); Group 4 (DpR 54–82%); Group 5 (DpR 83–100%)’.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00432-017-2534-z>.

✉ Julien Taieb
julien.taieb@egp.aphp.fr; jtaieb75@gmail.com

- ¹ Department of Hepatogastroenterology and GI Oncology, Georges Pompidou European Hospital and Sorbonne Paris Cité / Université Paris Descartes, 20 rue Leblanc, 75015 Paris, France
- ² Hospital Universitario Marqués de Valdecilla, Santander, Spain
- ³ Niguarda Cancer Center, Grande Ospedale Metropolitano Niguarda and Dipartimento di Oncologia e Emato-Oncologia, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy

- ⁴ Städtisches Klinikum München, Klinikum Neuperlach, Munich, Germany
- ⁵ Virgen del Rocío Hospital, Seville, Spain
- ⁶ Hospital General Universitario de Elche, Elche, Spain
- ⁷ Klinikum Esslingen, Esslingen, Germany
- ⁸ Biostatistics, Amgen Ltd, Uxbridge, UK
- ⁹ Medical Development, Amgen (Europe) GmbH, Zug, Switzerland
- ¹⁰ Antwerp University Hospital, Antwerp, Belgium

Table 3 Efficacy outcomes by depth of response category (a, PRIME; b, PEAK studies) (RAS wild-type population)

a	DpR continuous (n = 460)	Group 1 <0% (n = 43)	Group 2 0–30% (n = 83)	Group 3 31–52% (n = 116)	Group 4 53–70% (n = 104)	Group 5 71–100% (n = 114)
DpR category						
PFS events, n (%)	–	43 (100.0)	79 (95.2)	107 (92.2)	96 (92.3)	87 (76.3)
Median PFS (95% CI), months	–	2.1 (1.9, 3.3)	5.4 (3.9, 6.1)	9.3 (7.6, 10.6)	11.3 (9.7, 13.7)	16.8 (14.6, 21.6)
HR (95% CI) ^a	0.78 (0.76, 0.81)	9.86 (6.7, 14.6)	1.70 (1.3, 2.3)	–	0.79 (0.60, 1.04)	0.46 (0.34, 0.61)
P value	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	0.0004	–	0.0915	< 0.0001
OS events, n (%)	–	42 (97.7)	79 (95.2)	103 (88.8)	90 (86.5)	66 (57.9)
Median OS (95% CI), months	–	7.5 (5.5, 9.4)	12.9 (9.2, 16.1)	18.9 (15.7, 21.4)	30.0 (23.8, 32.5)	48.1 (42.5, 56.0)
HR (95% CI) ^a	0.83 (0.81, 0.85)	2.92 (2.03, 4.19)	1.48 (1.10, 1.98)	–	0.63 (0.48, 0.84)	2.60 (0.19, 0.36)
P value	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	0.0092	–	0.0015	< 0.0001
Responders, n (%)	–	–	–	72 (62.1)	96 (92.3)	97 (85.1)
Median DoR (95% CI), months	–	–	–	7.6 (5.5, 9.5)	9.4 (7.9, 10.1)	13.9 (11.1, 19.3)
Any resection, n (%)	–	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	6 (5.2)	6 (5.8)	51 (44.7)
R0 resection, n (%)	–	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (4.3)	1 (1.0)	39 (34.2)
b	DpR continuous (n = 158)	Group 1 <0% (n = 3)	Group 2 0–30% (n = 33)	Group 3 31–53% (n = 41)	Group 4 54–82% (n = 40)	Group 5 83–100% (n = 41)
DpR category						
PFS events, n (%)	–	3 (100.0)	30 (90.9)	39 (95.1)	39 (97.5)	28 (68.3)
Median PFS (95% CI), months	–	3.9 (1.8, 3.9)	7.6 (5.7, 11.6)	9.5 (7.2, 12.6)	13.0 (10.7, 15.1)	18.8 (13.2, 24.8)
HR (95% CI) ^a	0.80 (0.75, 0.85)	18.98 (5.0, 72.4)	1.54 (1.0, 2.5)	–	0.69 (0.44, 1.08)	0.27 (0.16, 0.45)
P value	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	0.0781	–	0.1007	< 0.0001
OS events, n (%)	–	2 (66.7)	29 (87.9)	37 (90.2)	29 (72.5)	9 (22.0)
Median OS (95% CI), months	–	15.0 (8.9, 21.2)	17.3 (11.1, 21.8)	23.9 (16.9, 28.9)	36.5 (26.0, 43.8)	63.0 (48.0, NE)
HR (95% CI) ^a	0.78 (0.73, 0.83)	2.62 (0.62, 11.05)	1.26 (0.77, 2.05)	–	0.49 (0.30, 0.80)	0.09 (0.04, 0.19)
P value	< 0.0001	0.1898	0.3543	–	0.0046	< 0.0001
Responders, n (%)	–	–	–	34 (82.9)	38 (95.0)	33 (80.5)
Median DoR (95% CI), months	–	–	–	7.9 (5.5, 9.2)	11.1 (8.4, 13.5)	17.0 (10.3, 23.2)
Any resection, n (%)	–	0 (0.0)	1 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (5.0)	20 (48.8)
R0 resection, n (%)	–	0 (0.0)	1 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	15 (36.6)

CI confidence interval, DpR depth of response, HR hazard ratio, NE not evaluable, OS overall survival, PFS progression-free survival, R0 complete resection

^aGroup HR compared with Group 3, continuous HR estimate is for the HR associated with a 10% difference in DpR

^bTest for trend

Fig. 6 Impact of depth of response (DpR) on survival in the PEAK study (**a** progression-free survival; **b** overall survival) (*RAS* wild-type population) censor indicated by vertical bar