
CHATGPT 100,000 PATIENT 24-MONTH *In Silico* PHASE III 5-ARM PANCREATIC CANCER CLINICAL TRIAL TRIPLICATE

Kevin Kawchak 

Chief Executive Officer

ChemicalQDevice

San Diego, CA

July 24, 2025

kevink@chemicalqdevice.com

03.S35.VER.02.P32

Prompt 32

The content is available under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

ChatGPT o3-pro Research Generation: 19 Pages, July 8, 2025

“Trial 1”

Prompt 32: Verification of S33.TRL.13.P30 (Paste), Log File Request (Upload)

Several human verifications passed. (Research + Log Upload + 3 Tables)

Your task is to generate a direct, head-to-head comparison that quantifies the correlation and consistency between the summary report tables and the attached log file csv. Show 3 human verifiable sample calculations below each new table, along with data sources: ie. Patient 000042, Table 5-1, etc..

Present your findings exclusively in the following 6 tables. Each table must have the specified dimensions, row names (R1, R2...), and column names (C1, C2...). The "Calculated" columns must be derived by analyzing the full attached log file csv, while the "Reported" columns must extract data directly from the clinical study report text and its tables. The final column in each table should provide a quantitative critique of the alignment between the two sources.

Table 1: Overall Cohort Distribution Verification (6R x 4C)

- **R1:** Arm A
- **R2:** Arm B
- **R3:** Arm C
- **R4:** Arm D
- **R5:** Arm E
- **R6:** Total
- **C1:** Arm/Group
- **C2:** Patient Count (per CSR Section 4)
- **C3:** Patient Count (Calculated from Log)
- **C4:** Discrepancy (C3 - C2)

- +3 Sample Calculations, verifiable with sources

Table 2: Baseline Characteristics Correlation Check (Focus on Arm A) (5R x 4C)

- **R1:** Mean Age (years)
- **R2:** Stage IV (%)
- **R3:** ECOG 1 (%)
- **R4:** KRAS-mutant (%)
- **R5:** gBRCA-mutant (%)
- **C1:** Characteristic
- **C2:** Reported Value (Table 5-1)
- **C3:** Calculated Value (from Log)
- **C4:** Deviation (Absolute Difference)
- +3 Sample Calculations, verifiable with sources

Table 3: Median Overall Survival (OS) Correlation (5R x 4C)

- **R1:** Arm A
- **R2:** Arm B
- **R3:** Arm C
- **R4:** Arm D
- **R5:** Arm E
- **C1:** Treatment Arm
- **C2:** Reported Median OS (months, Table 6-1)
- **C3:** Calculated Median OS (months, from Log time_to_death)
- **C4:** Difference (months)
- +3 Sample Calculations, verifiable with sources

Table 4: Median Progression-Free Survival (PFS) Correlation (5R x 4C)

- **R1:** Arm A
- **R2:** Arm B
- **R3:** Arm C
- **R4:** Arm D
- **R5:** Arm E
- **C1:** Treatment Arm
- **C2:** Reported Median PFS (months, Table 6-1)
- **C3:** Calculated Median PFS (months, from Log time_to_progression_or_death)
- **C4:** Difference (months)
- +3 Sample Calculations, verifiable with sources

Table 5: 12-Month Overall Survival Rate Verification (5R x 4C)

- **R1:** Arm A
- **R2:** Arm B
- **R3:** Arm C
- **R4:** Arm D
- **R5:** Arm E
- **C1:** Treatment Arm
- **C2:** Reported 12-Month OS Rate (% , Table 6-1)
- **C3:** Calculated 12-Month OS Rate (% , from Log time_to_death > 12)
- **C4:** Difference (%)
- +3 Sample Calculations, verifiable with sources

Table 6: Grade ≥3 Adverse Event Incidence Verification (5R x 4C)

- **R1:** Arm A
- **R2:** Arm B
- **R3:** Arm C
- **R4:** Arm D
- **R5:** Arm E
- **C1:** Treatment Arm
- **C2:** Reported ≥G3 AE Rate (% , Table 7-1)

- **C3:** Calculated \geq G3 AE Rate (% , from Log time_to_first_G3_AE \leq 24)
- **C4:** Difference (%)
- **+3** Sample Calculations, verifiable with sources

“Start Tables” *Table 5-1. Baseline Characteristics by Arm (N=20,000 per arm).*

Arm	Age (years, mean)	Stage IV (%)	ECOG 0 (%)	ECOG 1 (%)	ECOG 2 (%)	KRAS-mu tant (%)	gBRCA-m utant (%)	CA 19-9 (U/mL, mean)
Arm A	66.2	88.0	20.0	74.2	5.8	91.1	5.0	5,854
Arm B	66.2	88.0	20.0	74.0	6.0	90.9	5.0	5,848
Arm C	66.3	87.9	19.6	74.4	6.0	90.8	5.0	5,863
Arm D	66.4	88.1	20.1	73.9	6.0	90.9	5.0	5,849
Arm E	66.2	87.9	20.0	74.3	5.8	91.1	5.0	5,875

Abbreviations: ECOG = Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status; KRAS-mutant = any KRAS mutation (including G12C); gBRCA-mutant = germline BRCA1/2 mutation; CA 19-9 = carbohydrate antigen 19-9 tumor marker.

Table 6-1. Primary Efficacy Outcomes by Arm (24-month KM analysis).

Arm	Median PFS (mo)	Median OS (mo)	12-month OS Rate (%)	PFS HR vs Control	OS HR vs Control
Arm A (Triplet D+M+I)	4.5 mo	8.7 mo	38.7%	0.68	0.69
Arm B (Doublet M+I)	3.3 mo	6.8 mo	29.6%	0.93	0.90

Arm C (Doublet D+I)	3.9 mo	7.3 mo	32.1%	0.78	0.84
Arm D (Doublet D+M)	4.1 mo	8.1 mo	35.9%	0.74	0.75
Arm E (Control chemo)	3.0 mo	6.1 mo	25.5%	1.00	1.00

Notes: Medians and rates are from Kaplan-Meier estimates (all data censored at 24 months). Hazard ratios (HR) < 1 favor the combination arms. D = Daraxonrasib; M = Mitazalimab; I = liposomal Irinotecan.

Table 7-1. Incidence of Grade ≥ 3 Adverse Events by Arm (0–24 months).

Arm	Patients with ≥ 3 AE (%)
Arm A (Triplet D+M+I)	94.2%
Arm B (Doublet M+I)	88.8%
Arm C (Doublet D+I)	85.0%
Arm D (Doublet D+M)	80.9%
Arm E (Control nal-IRI)	76.5%

“End Tables”

[Above: Tables 5-1, 6-1, 7-1]
[S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv]

Output:

Thanks for the detailed instructions and the uploaded log file. Before I begin the analysis, could you please confirm:

- 1. Is "time_to_death" and "time_to_progression_or_death" in months in the log file, or should I calculate it based on provided timestamps?
- 2. Are patient arms clearly labeled in the log file, or should I infer them from treatment details?
- 3. Should I exclude censored data for OS/PFS calculations, or include them as right-censored cases?

Once I have this, I'll start generating the six requested tables with sample verifications.

Input:
Use provided prompt.

Generation 35 (Formatted)
ChatGPT o3-pro Research
1642 words, 15 minutes 50.11 seconds

Understood. I will now begin a head-to-head comparison of the clinical study report tables and the attached CSV log file. I'll generate all six requested tables—each quantifying correlation and consistency between reported and calculated values, with 3 human-verifiable sample calculations per table.

I'll update you once the full set of results is ready.

Table 1: Overall Cohort Distribution Verification (6R x 4C)

Arm/Group	Patient Count (per CSR Section 4)	Patient Count (Calculated from Log)	Discrepancy (C3 – C2)
Arm A	20,000	20,000	0
Arm B	20,000	20,000	0
Arm C	20,000	20,000	0
Arm D	20,000	20,000	0
Arm E	20,000	20,000	0

Total	100,000	100,000	0
-------	---------	---------	---

- Arm A:** The CSR reports 20,000 patients in Arm A. The log file likewise contains 20,000 entries labeled as Arm A, yielding no discrepancy.
- Arm E:** Similarly, Arm E shows 20,000 patients in both the report and the log. For example, patient **000001** is listed in Arm E, and patients are numbered up to 100000, confirming the total of 100,000 (5 arms × 20,000 each).
- Total:** Summing all arms in the log yields **100,000** patients (20k per arm), exactly matching the reported total of **100,000**. This perfect alignment indicates no discrepancies in randomization or data entry for cohort sizes.

Table 2: Baseline Characteristics Correlation Check (Focus on Arm A) (5R x 4C)

Characteristic	Reported Value (Table 5-1)	Calculated Value (from Log)	Deviation (Absolute Difference)
Mean Age (years)	66.2	66.4【11†】	0.2 years
Stage IV (%)	88.0%	87.9%【11†】	0.1%
ECOG 1 (%)	74.2%	73.7%【11†】	0.5%
KRAS-mutant (%)	91.1%	5.0%【11†】	86.1%
gBRCA-mutant (%)	5.0%	5.0%【11†】	0.0%

- Stage IV Disease:** In Arm A, 17,585 of 20,000 patients in the log are Stage IV (87.9%), closely matching the reported 88.0%. For example, patient **040007** in Arm A has `stage_iv=0` (Stage III) while the vast majority are `stage_iv=1`, consistent with ~88% Stage IV.
- KRAS Mutation:** The CSR indicates 91.1% of Arm A patients have a KRAS mutation. In the log, however, only 5.0% have `kras_g12c=1` (a specific KRAS G12C mutation). For instance, patient **055001** (Arm A) is flagged with a KRAS mutation (`kras_g12c=1`), but such cases are rare in the log. This large ~86% discrepancy suggests the log does not capture all KRAS mutations (only G12C), whereas the report considers any KRAS mutation.

- **gBRCA Mutation:** The germline BRCA mutation rate in Arm A is low and consistent (5.0% in both sources). The log shows exactly 1,000 of 20,000 Arm A patients with **gbrca=1** (5.0%)【11†】. For example, patient **054993** (Arm A) has **gbrca=1** in the log, in line with the reported 5.0%. All other baseline metrics (age, ECOG status) also align within <1% or <1 year differences, indicating strong concordance.

Table 3: Median Overall Survival (OS) Correlation (5R x 4C)

Treatment Arm	Reported Median OS (months, Table 6-1)	Calculated Median OS (months, from Log)	Difference (months)
Arm A	8.7 mo	9.0 mo	+0.3
Arm B	6.8 mo	6.8 mo	+0.0
Arm C	7.3 mo	7.2 mo	-0.1
Arm D	8.1 mo	8.1 mo	+0.0
Arm E	6.1 mo	6.2 mo	+0.1

- **Arm A (Triplet therapy):** The log’s median OS for Arm A is 8.96 months (~9.0 mo), very close to the reported 8.7 months. For example, half of Arm A patients died by ~8.96 mo in the log, indicating a +0.3 month difference from the CSR. This minor divergence suggests an excellent alignment of survival time data.
- **Arm B vs Control:** Arm B’s median OS is 6.8 months in both report and calculation. The log shows the median death time falling at ~6.815 months (rounded to 6.8) for Arm B, effectively identical to the reported figure. Such consistency (difference ~0.0 mo) is seen for Arm D as well (8.05 mo vs 8.1 mo).
- **Arm E (Control chemo):** The control arm’s median OS in the log is ~6.21 months (6.2) versus 6.1 months reported, a difference of only +0.1 month. For instance, patient survival times in Arm E span both below and above 6 months; the median falls in early month 6 for both datasets. Overall, all arms show median OS differences under 0.3 months, indicating the survival outcomes in the CSR are well supported by the raw log data.

Table 4: Median Progression-Free Survival (PFS) Correlation (5R x 4C)

Treatment Arm	Reported Median PFS (months, Table 6-1)	Calculated Median PFS (months, from Log)	Difference (months)
Arm A	4.5 mo	4.6 mo	+0.1
Arm B	3.3 mo	3.3 mo	+0.0
Arm C	3.9 mo	3.9 mo	-0.0
Arm D	4.1 mo	4.1 mo	+0.0
Arm E	3.0 mo	3.1 mo	+0.1

- Arm A:** Median PFS for Arm A in the log is ~4.57 months (\approx 4.6 mo), essentially the same as the reported 4.5 months. This +0.1 month difference is negligible – for example, the 10,000th patient progression in Arm A occurs at 4.57 months, confirming the CSR’s 4.5-month median.
- Arms B–D:** The combination arms B, C, D each show virtually zero difference (\leq 0.1 mo) between reported and calculated median PFS. Arm B’s median PFS is exactly 3.3 months in both sources. Such tight concordance indicates the time-to-progression events in the log align with the Kaplan-Meier estimates provided.
- Arm E:** The control arm’s median PFS is computed as ~3.07 months (\approx 3.1 mo) from the log, closely matching the reported 3.0 months. Only a +0.1 month difference is observed. Overall, all arms demonstrate PFS medians within a few days of the reported values, underscoring that the progression events recorded in the raw data mirror the CSR’s statistics.

Table 5: 12-Month Overall Survival Rate Verification (5R x 4C)

Treatment Arm	Reported 12-Month OS Rate (% , Table 6-1)	Calculated 12-Month OS Rate (% , from Log)	Difference (%)
Arm A	38.7%	39.0%【27†】	+0.3%

Arm B	29.6%	29.3%【27†】	−0.3%
Arm C	32.1%	31.6%【27†】	−0.5%
Arm D	35.9%	35.5%【27†】	−0.4%
Arm E	25.5%	25.7%【27†】	+0.2%

- Arm A Survivors:** At the 12-month mark, 39.0% of Arm A patients were alive per log data, versus 38.7% reported (a +0.3% difference). For example, patient **000042** (Arm A) survived 16.6 months, which counts toward the one-year OS rate, whereas patient **000020** (Arm A) died at 5.35 months (before 12 mo). These individual cases illustrate how ~39% reached at least one year of survival, confirming the CSR figure.
- Control vs Combo:** Arm E (control) shows a 12-month OS rate of 25.7% in the log, aligning with the reported 25.5%. For instance, patient **000001** (Arm E) was alive beyond 12 months (died at 23.41 mo), while patient **000003** (Arm E) died at 0.38 mo. Similarly, Arm B's calculated 29.3% vs reported 29.6% are nearly identical. Minor deviations (<0.5%) across all arms suggest the survival status at one year is very consistent between sources.
- All Arms Consistency:** Every treatment arm's one-year OS rate from the log falls within half a percentage point of the CSR value. This strong agreement indicates that censoring and survival status in the raw data were handled correctly. No notable discrepancies are observed, reinforcing the credibility of the reported survival rates.

Table 6: Grade ≥3 Adverse Event Incidence Verification (5R x 4C)

Treatment Arm	Reported ≥G3 AE Rate (% Table 7-1)	Calculated ≥G3 AE Rate (% Log 0–24 mo)	Difference (%)
Arm A	94.2%	94.4%【28†】	+0.2%
Arm B	88.8%	88.5%【28†】	−0.3%
Arm C	85.0%	85.6%【28†】	+0.6%

Arm D	80.9%	81.4%【28†】	+0.5%
Arm E	76.5%	76.7%【28†】	+0.2%

- Arm A (Triplet):** The incidence of \geq Grade 3 adverse events in Arm A is extremely high in both the CSR (94.2%) and the log (94.4%). Nearly all Arm A patients experienced a serious AE by 24 months. For example, patient **000007** (Arm A) had a Grade \geq 3 AE at **0.26 months** (within the first week), while patient **000047** (Arm A) did not have any \geq G3 AE until **37.6 months** (i.e., none during the 24-mo window). Such cases illustrate how ~94% of Arm A had an event by 2 years, perfectly consistent with the reported rate.
- Arm E (Control):** Arm E had the lowest severe AE rate (76.5% reported vs 76.7% in log). In the log, about a quarter of Arm E patients had no Grade \geq 3 AE during 24 months. For instance, patient **000018** (Arm E) had a severe AE at 6.03 mo, whereas patient **000028** (Arm E) had **no** \geq G3 event within 24 mo (first occurrence at 71.72 mo, beyond the analysis period). This aligns with roughly 23–24% of Arm E patients remaining free of severe AEs, as implied by the ~76% incidence rate.
- Across Arms:** All arms show only marginal differences between reported and calculated \geq G3 AE rates (\leq 0.6% discrepancy). For example, Arm B's log-derived rate is 88.5% vs 88.8% reported. We see patients like **000011** (Arm B) encountering a \geq G3 AE at 4.08 mo, while **000033** (Arm B) had none by 24 mo (first at 40.7 mo). Such granular data confirm that the frequency of serious adverse events reported in the CSR is well supported by the trial log, with no substantive discrepancies.

Generation 35 (Plain Text)

ChatGPT o3-pro Research

1642 words, 15 minutes 50.11 seconds

Understood. I will now begin a head-to-head comparison of the clinical study report tables and the attached CSV log file. I'll generate all six requested tables—each quantifying correlation and consistency between reported and calculated values, with 3 human-verifiable sample calculations per table.

I'll update you once the full set of results is ready.

****Table 1: Overall Cohort Distribution Verification (6R x 4C)****

Arm/Group	Patient Count (per CSR Section 4)		Patient Count (Calculated from Log)		Discrepancy (C3 – C2)
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Arm A	20,000	20,000	0		
Arm B	20,000	20,000	0		
Arm C	20,000	20,000	0		
Arm D	20,000	20,000	0		
Arm E	20,000	20,000	0		
Total	**100,000**	**100,000**	**0**		

****Arm A:**** The CSR reports 20,000 patients in Arm A. The log file likewise contains 20,000 entries labeled as Arm A, yielding no discrepancy.

****Arm E:**** Similarly, Arm E shows 20,000 patients in both the report and the log. For example, patient ****000001**** is listed in Arm E, and patients are numbered up to 100000, confirming the total of 100,000 (5 arms × 20,000 each).

****Total:**** Summing all arms in the log yields ****100,000**** patients (20k per arm), exactly matching the reported total of ****100,000****. This perfect alignment indicates no discrepancies in randomization or data entry for cohort sizes.

****Table 2: Baseline Characteristics Correlation Check (Focus on Arm A) (5R x 4C)****

Characteristic	Reported Value (Table 5-1)		Calculated Value (from Log)		Deviation (Absolute Difference)
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Mean Age (years)	66.2	66.4【11†】	0.2 years		
Stage IV (%)	88.0%	87.9%【11†】	0.1%		
ECOG 1 (%)	74.2%	73.7%【11†】	0.5%		
KRAS-mutant (%)	91.1%	5.0%【11†】	86.1%		
gBRCA-mutant (%)	5.0%	5.0%【11†】	0.0%		

****Stage IV Disease:**** In Arm A, 17,585 of 20,000 patients in the log are Stage IV (87.9%), closely matching the reported 88.0%. For example, patient ****040007**** in Arm A has `stage_iv=0` (Stage III) while the vast majority are `stage_iv=1`, consistent with ~88% Stage IV.

****KRAS Mutation:**** The CSR indicates 91.1% of Arm A patients have a KRAS mutation. In the log, however, only 5.0% have `kras_g12c=1` (a specific KRAS G12C mutation). For instance, patient ****055001**** (Arm A) is flagged with a KRAS

mutation (kras_g12c=1'), but such cases are rare in the log. This large ~86% discrepancy suggests the log does not capture all KRAS mutations (only G12C), whereas the report considers any KRAS mutation.

gBRCA Mutation: The germline BRCA mutation rate in Arm A is low and consistent (5.0% in both sources). The log shows exactly 1,000 of 20,000 Arm A patients with `gbrca=1` (5.0%)^[11†]. For example, patient **054993** (Arm A) has `gbrca=1` in the log, in line with the reported 5.0%. All other baseline metrics (age, ECOG status) also align within <1% or <1 year differences, indicating strong concordance.

Table 3: Median Overall Survival (OS) Correlation (5R x 4C)

Treatment Arm	Reported Median OS (months, Table 6-1)	Calculated Median OS (months, from Log)	Difference (months)
Arm A	8.7 mo	9.0 mo	+0.3
Arm B	6.8 mo	6.8 mo	+0.0
Arm C	7.3 mo	7.2 mo	-0.1
Arm D	8.1 mo	8.1 mo	+0.0
Arm E	6.1 mo	6.2 mo	+0.1

Arm A (Triplet therapy): The log's median OS for Arm A is 8.96 months (~9.0 mo), very close to the reported 8.7 months. For example, half of Arm A patients died by ~8.96 mo in the log, indicating a +0.3 month difference from the CSR. This minor divergence suggests an excellent alignment of survival time data.

Arm B vs Control: Arm B's median OS is 6.8 months in both report and calculation. The log shows the median death time falling at ~6.815 months (rounded to 6.8) for Arm B, effectively identical to the reported figure. Such consistency (difference ~0.0 mo) is seen for Arm D as well (8.05 mo vs 8.1 mo).

Arm E (Control chemo): The control arm's median OS in the log is ~6.21 months (6.2) versus 6.1 months reported, a difference of only +0.1 month. For instance, patient survival times in Arm E span both below and above 6 months; the median falls in early month 6 for both datasets. Overall, all arms show median OS differences under 0.3 months, indicating the survival outcomes in the CSR are well supported by the raw log data.

Table 4: Median Progression-Free Survival (PFS) Correlation (5R x 4C)

Treatment Arm	Reported Median PFS (months, Table 6-1)	Calculated Median PFS (months, from Log)	Difference (months)
Arm A	4.5 mo	4.6 mo	+0.1
Arm B	3.3 mo	3.3 mo	+0.0
Arm C	3.9 mo	3.9 mo	-0.0
Arm D	4.1 mo	4.1 mo	+0.0

Arm E	3.0 mo	3.1 mo	+0.1	
-------	--------	--------	------	--

* **Arm A:** Median PFS for Arm A in the log is ~4.57 months (~4.6 mo), essentially the same as the reported 4.5 months. This +0.1 month difference is negligible – for example, the 10,000th patient progression in Arm A occurs at 4.57 months, confirming the CSR’s 4.5-month median.

* **Arms B–D:** The combination arms B, C, D each show virtually zero difference (≤ 0.1 mo) between reported and calculated median PFS. Arm B’s median PFS is exactly 3.3 months in both sources. Such tight concordance indicates the time-to-progression events in the log align with the Kaplan-Meier estimates provided.

* **Arm E:** The control arm’s median PFS is computed as ~3.07 months (~3.1 mo) from the log, closely matching the reported 3.0 months. Only a +0.1 month difference is observed. Overall, all arms demonstrate PFS medians within a few days of the reported values, underscoring that the progression events recorded in the raw data mirror the CSR’s statistics.

****Table 5: 12-Month Overall Survival Rate Verification (5R x 4C)****

Treatment Arm	Reported 12-Month OS Rate (% , Table 6-1)	Calculated 12-Month OS Rate (% , from Log)	Difference (%)	
---------------	---	--	----------------	--

-----	-----	-----	-----	
Arm A	38.7%	39.0%【27†】	+0.3%	
Arm B	29.6%	29.3%【27†】	–0.3%	
Arm C	32.1%	31.6%【27†】	–0.5%	
Arm D	35.9%	35.5%【27†】	–0.4%	
Arm E	25.5%	25.7%【27†】	+0.2%	

* **Arm A Survivors:** At the 12-month mark, 39.0% of Arm A patients were alive per log data, versus 38.7% reported (a +0.3% difference). For example, patient **000042** (Arm A) survived 16.6 months, which counts toward the one-year OS rate, whereas patient **000020** (Arm A) died at 5.35 months (before 12 mo). These individual cases illustrate how ~39% reached at least one year of survival, confirming the CSR figure.

* **Control vs Combo:** Arm E (control) shows a 12-month OS rate of 25.7% in the log, aligning with the reported 25.5%. For instance, patient **000001** (Arm E) was alive beyond 12 months (died at 23.41 mo), while patient **000003** (Arm E) died at 0.38 mo. Similarly, Arm B’s calculated 29.3% vs reported 29.6% are nearly identical. Minor deviations ($<0.5\%$) across all arms suggest the survival status at one year is very consistent between sources.

* **All Arms Consistency:** Every treatment arm’s one-year OS rate from the log falls within half a percentage point of the CSR value. This strong agreement indicates that censoring and survival status in the raw data were handled correctly. No notable discrepancies are observed, reinforcing the credibility of the reported survival rates.

****Table 6: Grade ≥ 3 Adverse Event Incidence Verification (5R x 4C)****

Treatment Arm Reported ≥G3 AE Rate (% , Table 7-1) Calculated ≥G3 AE Rate (% , from Log 0–24 mo) Difference (%)				
----- ----- ----- -----				
Arm A	94.2%	94.4%【28†】	+0.2%	
Arm B	88.8%	88.5%【28†】	-0.3%	
Arm C	85.0%	85.6%【28†】	+0.6%	
Arm D	80.9%	81.4%【28†】	+0.5%	
Arm E	76.5%	76.7%【28†】	+0.2%	

***Arm A (Triplet):** The incidence of ≥Grade 3 adverse events in Arm A is extremely high in both the CSR (94.2%) and the log (94.4%). Nearly all Arm A patients experienced a serious AE by 24 months. For example, patient **000007** (Arm A) had a Grade ≥3 AE at **0.26 months** (within the first week), while patient **000047** (Arm A) did not have any ≥G3 AE until **37.6 months** (i.e., none during the 24-mo window). Such cases illustrate how ~94% of Arm A had an event by 2 years, perfectly consistent with the reported rate.

***Arm E (Control):** Arm E had the lowest severe AE rate (76.5% reported vs 76.7% in log). In the log, about a quarter of Arm E patients had no Grade ≥3 AE during 24 months. For instance, patient **000018** (Arm E) had a severe AE at 6.03 mo, whereas patient **000028** (Arm E) had **no** ≥G3 event within 24 mo (first occurrence at 71.72 mo, beyond the analysis period). This aligns with roughly 23–24% of Arm E patients remaining free of severe AEs, as implied by the ~76% incidence rate.

***Across Arms:** All arms show only marginal differences between reported and calculated ≥G3 AE rates (≤0.6% discrepancy). For example, Arm B’s log-derived rate is 88.5% vs 88.8% reported. We see patients like **000011** (Arm B) encountering a ≥G3 AE at 4.08 mo, while **000033** (Arm B) had none by 24 mo (first at 40.7 mo). Such granular data confirm that the frequency of serious adverse events reported in the CSR is well supported by the trial log, with no substantive discrepancies.

Research Summary Generation 35: 980 Words

Clinical Study Report vs Log File Correlation Analysis

ChatGPT

I’m pulling together sections, CSV files, and sample data for a comprehensive overview.

Read from S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

ChatGPT

I’m examining patient entries, calculating counts by arm, baseline characteristics, and median times for overall survival and progression.

Read from S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

ChatGPT

Table 1's patient counts are confirmed at 20,000 per arm, totaling 100,000.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm mapping out the unique arms and their counts from the 100k lines dataset.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

Ensuring patient tallies across arms align with the provided data, cross-checking from baseline table and text references.

This involves discussing and verifying reported versus calculated differences.

Searched for sample size N=20,000

ChatGPT

I'm selecting specific values from tables and creating a text file, focusing on baseline data, PFS, OS, G3 AE%, and patient distribution.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

Considering if a cursor is needed when providing a specific path.

I'm thinking about adding a "source" field with "user_files" and a path. This could streamline how we handle file sources.

I'm starting to think about structuring "table 5-1" within the user_files. This organization plan ensures a clear progression in our data management approach.

Searched for Table 5-1 baseline characteristics

ChatGPT

I'm considering using `browse.search` with a `user_files` query, assessing if it includes `/mnt/data`. Also, I'm thinking about reading and printing the file content with Python for potential references.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm examining the format for citing lines, considering browsing options, Python output with line numbers, and annotating lines in Python.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

OK, let me see. I'm gathering patient IDs, totals, and sample calculations to match reported and log values. Might also compare entries for extra evidence.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm mapping out baseline characteristics for Arm A, focusing on age, stage IV, ECOG 1, KRAS-mutant, and gBRCA-mutant. Calculating and comparing values to ensure precision.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm checking the data's accuracy by comparing distributions, confirming mean age consistency, and validating stage IV fraction calculations. Progress is evident in these comparisons.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm piecing together the significant gap between the reported "KRAS-mutant 91.1%" and the log's "kras_g12c" 5%. This suggests "kras_g12c" likely indicates a specific KRAS mutation, not the broader "KRAS-mutant".

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm thinking about aligning baseline details to reported values, using absolute differences and consistent units. Testing with specific patient examples helps validate the approach.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

Patient ID 40007 is near the start, requiring precise location to ensure accuracy. Progressing through 39990 might provide a clearer context.

Read from S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

ChatGPT

Mapping out patient IDs and arm details, confirming stage IV status for Arm A patients. Moving forward, I will verify age and ECOG scores.

Read from S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

ChatGPT

Taking a closer look to pinpoint lines where "kras_g12c=1" appears, and considering Python to find a specific patient ID.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm curious about where patient ID 55001 fits into Arm A, considered together with kras=1.

Read from S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

ChatGPT

OK, I'm checking the data for KRAS and gBRCA status in various patients. Noticeably, patient 055001 from Arm A shows KRAS G12C mutation, while patient 54993 in Arm A has gBRCA=1.

Read from S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

ChatGPT

I'm thinking through how to cite multiple lines of interest within a specific range, checking for clarity and relevance.

Read from S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

ChatGPT

Finalizing citations for three sample calculations, choosing Stage IV, KRAS, and gBRCA examples to ensure comprehensive representation.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm mapping out the differences between reported and calculated medians for various arms, considering statistical variability and potential calculation methods.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm checking that for Arm A, the mid-low and mid-high values are identical. This confirms the precise median OS is 8.96, matching the reference [21].

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm curious to see if the differences are just rounding or if they indicate something more nuanced. This makes me think that examining the base counts and comparing raw and log scores is essential.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm pulling together reported and calculated medians for progress-free survival by referring to the relevant lines in the source for each arm.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

Here's the analysis of median progression-free survival (PFS) data, focusing on the precision of reported versus calculated values. The differences are minimized, allowing for one decimal rounding for consistency across segments.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm gathering the 12-month overall survival rates for various treatment arms. This involves comparing reported rates with calculated rates, considering event times and censoring at 24 months.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

Examining survival rates with detailed patient examples to highlight discrepancies in various arms. Progress is steady, revealing significant insights into survival dynamics.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm tracking the differences in reported and logged percentages for $\geq G3$ AE events in Arms A and E, noting patient data within and beyond 24 months.

Read from S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

ChatGPT

I'm examining lines 18 to 20 in [29], noticing that 000018 E has an AE time of 6.03 months, while 000019 E lacks one due to exceeding the window.

Read from S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

ChatGPT

I'm gathering examples from different arms of a study to illustrate data trends in serious adverse events, like a patient in Arm A having an early event and another in Arm E with no event within 24 months.

Analyzed with python

ChatGPT

I'm mapping out enumeration accuracy in [9], checking patient counts and reported percentages. Progressing through data mapping to final table formatting and sample calculations.

Research completed in 13m · 1 sources

Citations Generation 35

Citations

file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd

S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

patient_id,arm,archetype,age,stage_iv,ecog,kras_g12c,gbrca,ca19_9,time_to_progre

ssion_or_death,time_to_death,time_to_first_G3_AE 000001,E,ARCH-01,56.0,1,0,0,0,3981.9,8.45,23.41,26.13

000002,B,ARCH-01,43.5,1,1,0,0,4746.3,0.27,19.04,6.36 000003,E,ARCH-01,73.2,1,1,0,0,4482.0,10.52,0.38,44.11

file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd

S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

040007,A,ARCH-03,74.1,0,1,0,0,3698.7,3.81,1.62,3.35 040008,C,ARCH-03,54.3,0,0,0,0,3647.8,2.89,15.97,5.07

040009,D,ARCH-03,62.6,0,0,0,0,3801.4,2.85,7.76,1.14 040010,C,ARCH-03,58.0,0,1,0,0,1270.3,5.55,21.89,1.27

file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd

S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

054993,A,ARCH-04,49.7,1,0,0,1,1483.5,2.74,30.49,3.92 054994,E,ARCH-04,56.9,1,0,0,1,6407.8,4.03,1.94,0.96

054995,D,ARCH-04,53.1,1,0,0,1,0.0,6.2,56.16,8.19 054996,A,ARCH-04,54.3,1,0,0,1,5004.2,13.56,21.61,5.92

054997,C,ARCH-04,68.1,1,0,0,1,27.3,8.63,13.24,11.23

file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd

S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

055001,A,ARCH-05,75.0,1,1,1,0,3276.5,0.42,0.73,0.58 055002,D,ARCH-05,57.3,1,0,1,0,2237.2,2.48,20.7,10.33

055003,E,ARCH-05,75.9,1,0,1,0,5627.4,0.04,33.16,2.09 055004,E,ARCH-05,62.2,1,1,1,0,6463.6,3.76,13.17,3.6

file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd

S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

054991,E,ARCH-04,62.2,1,0,0,1,772.0,12.13,3.69,2.17 054992,E,ARCH-04,63.6,1,0,0,1,1344.5,0.97,30.47,32.94

054993,A,ARCH-04,49.7,1,0,0,1,1483.5,2.74,30.49,3.92 054994,E,ARCH-04,56.9,1,0,0,1,6407.8,4.03,1.94,0.96

file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd

S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

000040,C,ARCH-01,68.2,1,0,0,0,14138.5,3.81,4.61,6.58 000041,C,ARCH-01,68.1,1,0,0,0,3271.8,16.73,8.07,2.16

000042,A,ARCH-01,58.5,1,1,0,0,3053.8,0.48,16.6,9.24 000043,A,ARCH-01,56.6,1,0,0,0,6631.9,8.87,17.35,2.21

file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd

S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

000020,A,ARCH-01,61.1,1,1,0,0,10686.1,0.38,5.35,11.38 000021,D,ARCH-01,64.4,1,1,0,0,5090.3,2.15,1.48,18.88

000022,C,ARCH-01,44.0,1,0,0,0,4113.2,2.37,22.77,3.71 000023,E,ARCH-01,55.3,1,0,0,0,7515.9,13.79,43.44,2.73

file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd

S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

000001,E,ARCH-01,56.0,1,0,0,0,3981.9,8.45,23.41,26.13 000002,B,ARCH-01,43.5,1,1,0,0,4746.3,0.27,19.04,6.36

000003,E,ARCH-01,73.2,1,1,0,0,4482.0,10.52,0.38,44.11 000004,B,ARCH-01,66.4,1,1,0,0,14512.8,14.3,9.34,16.09

file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd

S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv

000005,C,ARCH-01,53.5,1,1,0,0,6198.0,5.09,10.71,5.03 000006,C,ARCH-01,51.6,1,0,0,0,320.6,3.84,13.85,21.53
000007,A,ARCH-01,66.1,1,0,0,0,3159.3,14.84,14.59,0.26 000008,D,ARCH-01,42.0,1,0,0,0,11224.1,2.33,2.58,19.87
file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd
S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv
000045,C,ARCH-01,46.5,1,0,0,0,8420.8,7.4,16.63,22.6 000046,C,ARCH-01,69.8,1,0,0,0,1081.8,1.04,1.61,5.6
000047,A,ARCH-01,49.8,1,0,0,0,3008.6,5.78,14.58,37.59 000048,C,ARCH-01,63.8,1,1,0,0,2777.6,6.42,2.94,10.64
file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd
S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv
000016,C,ARCH-01,39.9,1,1,0,0,10631.7,5.96,55.58,29.32 000017,D,ARCH-01,66.8,1,0,0,0,4144.0,0.08,7.32,7.79
000018,E,ARCH-01,58.4,1,1,0,0,0.0,3.15,10.07,6.03 000019,E,ARCH-01,71.0,1,1,0,0,0.0,5.47,13.69,76.7
file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd
S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv
000026,C,ARCH-01,74.8,1,0,0,0,6234.7,1.5,3.46,5.21 000027,A,ARCH-01,49.3,1,1,0,0,8892.8,17.84,5.78,7.15
000028,E,ARCH-01,66.5,1,0,0,0,0.0,2.3,0.34,71.72 000029,A,ARCH-01,59.7,1,1,0,0,1852.1,4.87,26.35,19.27
file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd
S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv
000009,C,ARCH-01,64.4,1,1,0,0,559.0,6.97,49.12,13.9 000010,B,ARCH-01,53.7,1,0,0,0,11380.3,5.44,9.77,11.52
000011,B,ARCH-01,40.3,1,1,0,0,5522.9,6.31,1.25,4.08 000012,D,ARCH-01,57.2,1,0,0,0,0.0,4.14,0.18,20.85
file-duxcpjcts6cdbcyitdknvd
S33.TRL.13.P30.LOG.csv
000031,D,ARCH-01,47.0,1,0,0,0,7087.3,2.49,16.62,11.36 000032,B,ARCH-01,84.2,1,0,0,0,8902.3,5.42,23.59,0.72
000033,B,ARCH-01,68.0,1,1,0,0,3692.8,6.82,4.88,40.71 000034,A,ARCH-01,66.5,1,1,0,0,5939.5,5.55,3.3,1.79

All Sources

[S33.TRL....0.LOG.csv](#)