

Errata

The February 20, 2017, article by Choueiri, et al, entitled “Cabozantinib Versus Sunitinib As Initial Targeted Therapy for Patients With Metastatic Renal Cell Carcinoma of Poor or Intermediate Risk: The Alliance A031203 CABOSUN Trial” (J Clin Oncol 35:591-597), was published with errors. The investigator team upon detailed review of the study charts found errors or significant changes from the original report.

The 3rd sentence in the Results paragraph in the Abstract was given as:

ORR was 46% (95% CI, 34 to 57) for cabozantinib versus 18% (95% CI, 10 to 28) for sunitinib.

It should have been given as:

ORR was **33%** (95% CI, **23 to 44**) for cabozantinib versus **12%** (95% CI, **5.4 to 21**) for sunitinib.

The 5th-7th sentences after the Efficacy heading were given as:

Cabozantinib was associated with a significant improvement in ORR, as assessed by investigator review. Complete or partial responses were confirmed in 36 patients (46%; 95% CI, 34% to 57%) in the cabozantinib group compared with 14 patients (18%; 95% CI, 10% to 28%) in the sunitinib group (Table 2). A best response of stable disease occurred in 26 patients (33%) with cabozantinib versus 28 patients (36%) with sunitinib, and progressive disease as best response occurred in 14 patients (18%) with cabozantinib versus 20 patients (26%) with sunitinib.

They should have been given as:

Cabozantinib was associated with a significant improvement in ORR, as assessed by investigator review. Complete or partial responses were confirmed in **26** patients (**33%**; 95% CI, **23%** to **44%**) in the cabozantinib group compared with **9** patients (**12%**; 95% CI, **5.4%** to **21%**) in the sunitinib group (Table 2). A best response of stable disease occurred in **36** patients (**46%**) with cabozantinib versus **33** patients (**42%**) with sunitinib, and progressive disease as best response occurred in 14 patients (18%) with cabozantinib versus 20 patients (26%) with sunitinib.

The 3rd sentence after the Safety header was given as:

Dose reductions occurred in 46 patients (58%) treated with cabozantinib and 38 patients (49%) treated with sunitinib.

It should have been given as:

Dose reductions occurred in **36** patients (**46%**) treated with cabozantinib and **25** patients (**35%**) treated with sunitinib.

The 3rd sentence after the Discussion heading was given as:

Objective tumor responses were higher with cabozantinib (46%) compared with sunitinib (18%).

It should have been given as:

Objective tumor responses were higher with cabozantinib (**33%**) compared with sunitinib (**12%**).

The online version has been corrected in departure from the print. The authors apologize for the errors.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.76.3292>; published November 13, 2017

The April 10, 2017, article by van den Bogaard et al, entitled “Validation and Modification of a Prediction Model for Acute Cardiac Events in Patients With Breast Cancer Treated With Radiotherapy Based on Three-Dimensional Dose Distributions to Cardiac Substructures” (J Clin Oncol 35:1171-1178), was published with errors.

The formula’s step 2 on page 1174 in the left column should have included an exponential function. The formula was given as:

2. The cumulative incidence for each individual patient at 9 years (CI_{9y}) can then be calculated using the following equation: $CI_{9y} = 1 - [EXP(-0.000025 \times LP_{MHD-model})]$.

Instead, it should read as:

2. The cumulative incidence for each individual patient at 9 years (CI_{9y}) can then be calculated using the following equation: $CI_{9y} = 1 - [EXP(-0.000025 \times EXP(LP_{MHD-model}))]$.

The formula’s step 2 on page 1175 in the right column should have included an exponential function. The formula was given as:

2. The cumulative incidence for each individual patient at 9 years (CI_{9y}) can then be calculated using the following equation: $CI_{9y} = 1 - [EXP(-0.000223 \times LP_{LV-V5-model})]$.

Instead, it should read as:

2. The cumulative incidence for each individual patient at 9 years (CI_{9y}) can then be calculated using the following equation: $CI_{9y} = 1 - [EXP(-0.000223 \times EXP(LP_{LV-V5-model}))]$.

The formula’s step 3 on page 1175 in the right column was given as:

3. The 9-year excess cumulative risk (CER_{9y}) can then be calculated by using Equation 2 minus the CI_{9y} assuming an MHD of 0 Gy (CI_{9y-0Gy}): $CER_{9y} = CI_{9y} - CI_{9y-0Gy}$.

Instead, it should read as:

3. The 9-year excess cumulative risk (CER_{9y}) can then be calculated by using Equation 2 minus the CI_{9y} assuming an **LV-V5 of 0%** ($CI_{9y-0\%}$): $CER_{9y} = CI_{9y} - CI_{9y-0\%}$.

Figures 3B, 3C and 3D on page 1176 contain errors due to an incorrect B-coefficient. The correct B-coefficient is 0.711 (table 3).

The online version has been corrected in departure from the print. The authors apologize for the errors.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.76.2732>; published November 10, 2017