
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

35.S53.TST.04.P40

Prompt 40

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

Gemini 2.5 Pro: 26 Pages, July 11, 2025

g25p

Prompt 40:

You are tasked with a meta-verification analysis. Using the provided data from "Trial 1," "Trial 2," and "Trial 3," you will generate six new comparison tables. The goal is to re-evaluate the consistency of discrepancies between reported and calculated data across the three trials using a revised methodology that corrects for issues in a previous analysis.

This new methodology introduces a more robust, context-aware scoring system to accurately assess consistency. It distinguishes between standard metrics and percentage-based metrics, applying a unique formula to each to prevent misinterpretation of consistency for high-magnitude percentage values. It also includes explicit rules for data parsing to handle non-numeric characters.

For this task, you will only use the data from the Discrepancy, Deviation, or Difference columns of the provided source tables (Tables 1-6 for each of the three trials).

General Instructions for All Tables

1. Data Pre-processing and Extraction:

- For each required data point, locate the corresponding value in the "Discrepancy," "Deviation," or "Difference" column from the equivalent source table (e.g., Table 2, "Mean Age (years) Deviation") in all three trials.
- Crucially, you must parse **only the numerical value** from each cell. Ignore all non-numeric text, symbols, and formatting.
 - **Examples:**

- +0.3 mo should be parsed as 0.3.
- -0.5% or -0.5% should be parsed as -0.5.
- 0.2 years should be parsed as 0.2.
- 86.1%【11†】 should be parsed as 86.1.
- A value of 0.0 or -0.0 should be parsed as 0.0.

2. Cell Value Calculation:

- For each cell in columns C1 through C5 (where applicable), you will calculate and display three statistics for the set of three parsed numerical values from the trials:
 - **Mean:** The arithmetic average of the three values.
 - **Range:** The difference between the maximum and minimum of the three values.
 - **Standard Deviation (SD):** The sample standard deviation of the three values.
- **Format:** Present these as (Mean, Range, SD) and round each statistic to two decimal places.

3. Row Consistency Score Calculation (Final Column):

The final column of each table is a "Row Consistency Score" on a scale of 1.0 to 10.0. This score measures the stability of the discrepancy for a given metric across the trials.

- **Method:** For a given row (metric), collect all underlying parsed numerical values (e.g., 5 arms x 3 trials = 15 values, or 1 arm x 3 trials = 3 values for Table 2). Calculate the **Overall Mean** and **Overall Standard Deviation (SD)** for this set of values.
- **Select the appropriate formula based on the metric type:**
 - **Formula A (Standard Metrics):** Use for Tables 1, 3, and 4 (Patient Counts, Months).
 Consistency Score = $10.0 * (1 - (\text{Overall SD} / (|\text{Overall Mean}| + 1.0)))$
 - **Rationale:** The addition of 1.0 to the denominator stabilizes the formula, preventing the score from becoming artificially low when the Overall Mean of the discrepancies is close to zero.
 - **Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics):** Use for Tables 2, 5, and 6 (All metrics ending in "%").
 Consistency Score = $10.0 * (1 - (\text{Overall SD} / (|\text{Overall Mean}| + 10.0)))$
 - **Rationale:** For percentage-based data, absolute differences are often small (e.g., +/- 1-2%). The standard formula can incorrectly penalize tight clustering of these small values. The larger + 10.0 scaling factor makes the score robust to this effect by evaluating the standard deviation of the discrepancies relative to a larger denominator. This better reflects high consistency when small discrepancies are tightly grouped around a mean close to zero.
- **Rules for Both Formulas:**
 - If the Overall SD is zero (indicating perfect consistency), the score is **10.0**.
 - Round the final score to **one decimal place**.
 - If the calculated score is less than 1.0, it must be reported as **1.0**. The maximum score is **10.0**.

4. Example Calculations:

- Below each generated table, provide three detailed example calculations as specified in that table's instructions. Each example must clearly show:
 - The source values from the three trials (after parsing).
 - The intermediate steps and final result for the cell statistics (Mean, Range, SD).

- The intermediate steps and final result for the Row Consistency Score, **explicitly stating whether Formula A or Formula B was used.**

Instructions for New Tables

1. Meta-Verification Table 1: Cross-Verification Consistency of Cohort Distribution Discrepancy

- **Title:** Meta-Verification Table 1: Cross-Verification Consistency of Cohort Distribution Discrepancy
- **Dimensions:** 1 Row x 6 Columns
- **Row Name:** R1: Patient Count Discrepancy
- **Column Names:** C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD), C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD), C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD), C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD), C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD), C6: Row Consistency Score
- **Special Instruction for Score Calculation:** The Row Consistency Score must be calculated using **Formula A (Standard Metrics).**
- **Example Calculations:** Show the calculations for Cell (R1, C1), Cell (R1, C4), and the Score for (R1, C6).

2. Meta-Verification Table 2: Cross-Verification Consistency of Baseline Characteristic Deviations (Arm A)

- **Title:** Meta-Verification Table 2: Cross-Verification Consistency of Baseline Characteristic Deviations (Arm A)
- **Dimensions:** 5 Rows x 2 Columns
- **Row Names:** R1: Mean Age (years) Deviation, R2: Stage IV (%) Deviation, R3: ECOG 1 (%) Deviation, R4: KRAS-mutant (%) Deviation, R5: gBRCA-mutant (%) Deviation
- **Column Names:** C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD), C2: Row Consistency Score
- **Special Instructions for Score Calculation:**
 - The Row Consistency Score for each row must be calculated using only the 3 underlying values from Arm A (1 arm x 3 trials).
 - For this table, the Row Consistency Score must be calculated using **Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics)** for all rows, as they are all percentages (even if the unit isn't in the title).
- **Example Calculations:** Show the calculations for Cell (R1, C1), the Score for (R2, C2), and the Score for (R4, C2).

3. Meta-Verification Table 3: Cross-Verification Consistency of Median OS Difference

- **Title:** Meta-Verification Table 3: Cross-Verification Consistency of Median OS Difference
- **Dimensions:** 1 Row x 6 Columns
- **Row Name:** R1: Median OS Difference (months)
- **Column Names:** C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD), C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD), C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD), C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD), C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD), C6: Row Consistency Score
- **Special Instruction for Score Calculation:** The Row Consistency Score must be calculated using **Formula A (Standard Metrics).**
- **Example Calculations:** Show the calculations for Cell (R1, C1), Cell (R1, C5), and the Score for (R1, C6).

4. Meta-Verification Table 4: Cross-Verification Consistency of Median PFS Difference

- **Title:** Meta-Verification Table 4: Cross-Verification Consistency of Median PFS Difference
- **Dimensions:** 1 Row x 6 Columns
- **Row Name:** R1: Median PFS Difference (months)
- **Column Names:** C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD), C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD), C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD), C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD), C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD), C6: Row Consistency Score

- **Special Instruction for Score Calculation:** The Row Consistency Score must be calculated using **Formula A (Standard Metrics)**.
- **Example Calculations:** Show the calculations for Cell (R1, C2), Cell (R1, C5), and the Score for (R1, C6).

5. Meta-Verification Table 5: Cross-Verification Consistency of 12-Month OS Rate Difference

- **Title:** Meta-Verification Table 5: Cross-Verification Consistency of 12-Month OS Rate Difference
- **Dimensions:** 1 Row x 6 Columns
- **Row Name:** R1: 12-Month OS Rate Difference (%)
- **Column Names:** C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD), C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD), C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD), C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD), C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD), C6: Row Consistency Score
- **Special Instruction for Score Calculation:** The Row Consistency Score must be calculated using **Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics)**.
- **Example Calculations:** Show the calculations for Cell (R1, C1), Cell (R1, C3), and the Score for (R1, C6).

6. Meta-Verification Table 6: Cross-Verification Consistency of \geq G3 AE Rate Difference

- **Title:** Meta-Verification Table 6: Cross-Verification Consistency of \geq G3 AE Rate Difference
- **Dimensions:** 1 Row x 6 Columns
- **Row Name:** R1: \geq G3 AE Rate Difference (%)
- **Column Names:** C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD), C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD), C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD), C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD), C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD), C6: Row Consistency Score
- **Special Instruction for Score Calculation:** The Row Consistency Score must be calculated using **Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics)**.
- **Example Calculations:** Show the calculations for Cell (R1, C2), Cell (R1, C4), and the Score for (R1, C6).

[Dataset 03]

Generation 53 (Formatted)

Gemini 2.5 Pro

1710 words, 1 minutes 49.45 seconds

Here is the completed meta-verification analysis, including the six generated tables and the required example calculations.

Meta-Verification Table 1: Cross-Verification Consistency of Cohort Distribution Discrepancy

	C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)	C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD)	C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD)	C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD)	C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD)	C6: Row Consistency Score
R1: Patient Count Discrepancy	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	10.0

Example Calculations for Table 1

- Cell (R1, C1) - Arm A:**
 - Source Values:** Trial 1: 0, Trial 2: 0, Trial 3: 0.
 - Parsed Values:** [0.0, 0.0, 0.0]
 - Mean:** $(0.0 + 0.0 + 0.0) / 3 = 0.00$
 - Range:** $0.0 - 0.0 = 0.00$
 - SD:** The standard deviation of identical values is 0.00.
 - Result:** (0.00, 0.00, 0.00)
-
- Cell (R1, C4) - Arm D:**
 - Source Values:** Trial 1: 0, Trial 2: 0, Trial 3: 0.
 - Parsed Values:** [0.0, 0.0, 0.0]
 - Mean:** $(0.0 + 0.0 + 0.0) / 3 = 0.00$
 - Range:** $0.0 - 0.0 = 0.00$
 - SD:** The standard deviation of identical values is 0.00.
 - Result:** (0.00, 0.00, 0.00)
-
- Row Consistency Score (R1, C6):**
 - Formula:** Formula A (Standard Metrics) is used.
 - Underlying Values:** All 15 parsed values from the row (5 arms x 3 trials): [0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0].
 - Overall Mean:** 0.00
 - Overall SD:** 0.00
 - Score:** As the Overall SD is 0, the score is **10.0**.
-

Meta-Verification Table 2: Cross-Verification Consistency of Baseline Characteristic Deviations (Arm A)

	C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)	C2: Row Consistency Score
R1: Mean Age (years) Deviation	(0.10, 0.20, 0.10)	9.9
R2: Stage IV (%) Deviation	(0.13, 0.10, 0.06)	9.9
R3: ECOG 1 (%) Deviation	(0.33, 0.40, 0.21)	9.8
R4: KRAS-mutant (%) Deviation	(86.03, 0.40, 0.21)	10.0
R5: gBRCA-mutant (%) Deviation	(0.03, 0.10, 0.06)	9.9

Example Calculations for Table 2

1. Cell (R1, C1) - Mean Age (years) Deviation:
 - Source Values: Trial 1: 0.2 years, Trial 2: 0.0, Trial 3: 0.1.
 - Parsed Values: [0.2, 0.0, 0.1]
 - Mean: $(0.2 + 0.0 + 0.1) / 3 = 0.10$
 - Range: $0.2 - 0.0 = 0.20$
 - SD: 0.10
 - Result: (0.10, 0.20, 0.10)
2.
3. Row Consistency Score (R2, C2) - Stage IV (%) Deviation:
 - Formula: Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics) is used.
 - Underlying Values: Trial 1: 0.1%, Trial 2: 0.2%, Trial 3: 0.1%. Parsed as [0.1, 0.2, 0.1].
 - Overall Mean: $(0.1 + 0.2 + 0.1) / 3 = 0.13$
 - Overall SD: 0.06
 - Score: $10.0 * (1 - (0.06 / (|0.13| + 10.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.06 / 10.13) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.0059) = 9.941 \approx 9.9$
4.
5. Row Consistency Score (R4, C2) - KRAS-mutant (%) Deviation:

- **Formula:** Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics) is used.
- **Underlying Values:** Trial 1: 86.1%【11†】，Trial 2: 86.2%，Trial 3: 85.8%. Parsed as [86.1, 86.2, 85.8].
- **Overall Mean:** $(86.1 + 86.2 + 85.8) / 3 = 86.03$
- **Overall SD:** 0.21
- **Score:** $10.0 * (1 - (0.21 / (|86.03| + 10.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.21 / 96.03) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.0022) = 9.978 \approx 10.0$

6.

Meta-Verification Table 3: Cross-Verification Consistency of Median OS Difference

	C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)	C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD)	C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD)	C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD)	C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD)	C6: Row Consistency Score
R1: Median OS Difference (months)	(0.20, 0.20, 0.10)	(-0.07, 0.10, 0.06)	(-0.03, 0.10, 0.06)	(0.00, 0.20, 0.10)	(0.00, 0.20, 0.10)	8.8

Example Calculations for Table 3

- Cell (R1, C1) - Arm A:
 - **Source Values:** Trial 1: +0.3, Trial 2: +0.1, Trial 3: +0.2.
 - **Parsed Values:** [0.3, 0.1, 0.2]
 - **Mean:** $(0.3 + 0.1 + 0.2) / 3 = 0.20$
 - **Range:** $0.3 - 0.1 = 0.20$
 - **SD:** 0.10
 - **Result:** (0.20, 0.20, 0.10)
-
- Cell (R1, C5) - Arm E:
 - **Source Values:** Trial 1: +0.1, Trial 2: -0.1, Trial 3: 0.0.
 - **Parsed Values:** [0.1, -0.1, 0.0]
 - **Mean:** $(0.1 + (-0.1) + 0.0) / 3 = 0.00$
 - **Range:** $0.1 - (-0.1) = 0.20$
 - **SD:** 0.10
 - **Result:** (0.00, 0.20, 0.10)

4.

5. **Row Consistency Score (R1, C6):**
- **Formula:** Formula A (Standard Metrics) is used.
 - **Underlying Values:** All 15 parsed values: [0.3, 0.1, 0.2, 0.0, -0.1, -0.1, -0.1, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.1, -0.1, 0.1, -0.1, 0.0].
 - **Overall Mean:** $0.3 / 15 = 0.02$
 - **Overall SD:** 0.12
 - **Score:** $10.0 * (1 - (0.12 / (|0.02| + 1.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.12 / 1.02) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.1176) = 8.824 \approx \mathbf{8.8}$
6.

Meta-Verification Table 4: Cross-Verification Consistency of Median PFS Difference

	C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)	C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD)	C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD)	C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD)	C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD)	C6: Row Consistency Score
R1: Median PFS Difference (months)	(0.03, 0.10, 0.06)	(0.07, 0.10, 0.06)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(-0.03, 0.10, 0.06)	(0.10, 0.20, 0.10)	9.3

Example Calculations for Table 4

1. **Cell (R1, C2) - Arm B:**
- **Source Values:** Trial 1: +0.0, Trial 2: +0.1, Trial 3: +0.1.
 - **Parsed Values:** [0.0, 0.1, 0.1]
 - **Mean:** $(0.0 + 0.1 + 0.1) / 3 = 0.07$
 - **Range:** $0.1 - 0.0 = 0.10$
 - **SD:** 0.06
 - **Result:** (0.07, 0.10, 0.06)
2.
3. **Cell (R1, C5) - Arm E:**
- **Source Values:** Trial 1: +0.1, Trial 2: +0.2, Trial 3: 0.0.
 - **Parsed Values:** [0.1, 0.2, 0.0]
 - **Mean:** $(0.1 + 0.2 + 0.0) / 3 = 0.10$
 - **Range:** $0.2 - 0.0 = 0.20$
 - **SD:** 0.10

- **Result:** (0.10, 0.20, 0.10)
- 4.
5. **Row Consistency Score (R1, C6):**
- **Formula:** Formula A (Standard Metrics) is used.
 - **Underlying Values:** All 15 parsed values: [0.1, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.1, 0.1, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, -0.1, 0.1, 0.2, 0.0].
 - **Overall Mean:** $0.5 / 15 = 0.03$
 - **Overall SD:** 0.07
 - **Score:** $10.0 * (1 - (0.07 / (|0.03| + 1.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.07 / 1.03) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.0680) = 9.32 \approx \mathbf{9.3}$
- 6.

Meta-Verification Table 5: Cross-Verification Consistency of 12-Month OS Rate Difference

	C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)	C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD)	C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD)	C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD)	C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD)	C6: Row Consistency Score
R1: 12-Month OS Rate Difference (%)	(0.73, 0.70, 0.38)	(-0.47, 0.70, 0.38)	(-0.67, 1.10, 0.57)	(-0.07, 0.50, 0.29)	(0.07, 0.60, 0.32)	9.4

Example Calculations for Table 5

1. **Cell (R1, C1) - Arm A:**
- **Source Values:** Trial 1: +0.3%, Trial 2: +0.9, Trial 3: +1.0.
 - **Parsed Values:** [0.3, 0.9, 1.0]
 - **Mean:** $(0.3 + 0.9 + 1.0) / 3 = 0.73$
 - **Range:** $1.0 - 0.3 = 0.70$
 - **SD:** 0.38
 - **Result:** (0.73, 0.70, 0.38)
- 2.
3. **Cell (R1, C3) - Arm C:**
- **Source Values:** Trial 1: -0.5%, Trial 2: -1.3, Trial 3: -0.2.
 - **Parsed Values:** [-0.5, -1.3, -0.2]

- **Mean:** $(-0.5 + (-1.3) + (-0.2)) / 3 = -0.67$
- **Range:** $-0.2 - (-1.3) = 1.10$
- **SD:** 0.57
- **Result:** (-0.67, 1.10, 0.57)

4.

5. **Row Consistency Score (R1, C6):**

- **Formula:** Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics) is used.
- **Underlying Values:** All 15 parsed values: [0.3, 0.9, 1.0, -0.3, -0.9, -0.2, -0.5, -1.3, -0.2, -0.4, 0.1, 0.1, 0.2, -0.3, 0.3].
- **Overall Mean:** $-1.2 / 15 = -0.08$
- **Overall SD:** 0.59
- **Score:** $10.0 * (1 - (0.59 / (|-0.08| + 10.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.59 / 10.08) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.0585) = 9.415 \approx \mathbf{9.4}$

6.

Meta-Verification Table 6: Cross-Verification Consistency of \geq G3 AE Rate Difference

	C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)	C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD)	C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD)	C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD)	C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD)	C6: Row Consistency Score
R1: \geqG3 AE Rate Difference (%)	(0.03, 0.30, 0.15)	(-0.60, 0.50, 0.26)	(0.17, 1.30, 0.75)	(0.23, 1.20, 0.64)	(-0.03, 0.40, 0.21)	9.5

Example Calculations for Table 6

1. **Cell (R1, C2) - Arm B:**

- **Source Values:** Trial 1: -0.3%, Trial 2: -0.7, Trial 3: -0.8.
- **Parsed Values:** [-0.3, -0.7, -0.8]
- **Mean:** $(-0.3 + (-0.7) + (-0.8)) / 3 = -0.60$
- **Range:** $-0.3 - (-0.8) = 0.50$
- **SD:** 0.26
- **Result:** (-0.60, 0.50, 0.26)

2.

3. **Cell (R1, C4) - Arm D:**

- **Source Values:** Trial 1: +0.5%, Trial 2: +0.7, Trial 3: -0.5.
- **Parsed Values:** [0.5, 0.7, -0.5]
- **Mean:** $(0.5 + 0.7 + (-0.5)) / 3 = 0.23$
- **Range:** $0.7 - (-0.5) = 1.20$
- **SD:** 0.64
- **Result:** (0.23, 1.20, 0.64)

4.

5. **Row Consistency Score (R1, C6):**

- **Formula:** Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics) is used.
- **Underlying Values:** All 15 parsed values: [0.2, -0.1, 0.0, -0.3, -0.7, -0.8, 0.6, 0.6, -0.7, 0.5, 0.7, -0.5, 0.2, -0.1, -0.2].
- **Overall Mean:** $-0.6 / 15 = -0.04$
- **Overall SD:** 0.51
- **Score:** $10.0 * (1 - (0.51 / (|-0.04| + 10.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.51 / 10.04) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.0508) = 9.492 \approx \mathbf{9.5}$

6.

Generation 53 (Plain Text)

Gemini 2.5 Pro

1710 words, 1 minutes 49.45 seconds

Here is the completed meta-verification analysis, including the six generated tables and the required example calculations.

Meta-Verification Table 1: Cross-Verification Consistency of Cohort Distribution Discrepancy

C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)		C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD)		C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD)		C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD)		C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD)		C6: Row Consistency Score
R1: Patient Count Discrepancy	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	10.0	

Example Calculations for Table 1

Cell (R1, C1) - Arm A:

Source Values: Trial 1: 0, Trial 2: 0, Trial 3: 0.

Parsed Values: [0.0, 0.0, 0.0]

Mean: $(0.0 + 0.0 + 0.0) / 3 = 0.00$

Range: $0.0 - 0.0 = 0.00$

SD: The standard deviation of identical values is 0.00.

Result: (0.00, 0.00, 0.00)

Cell (R1, C4) - Arm D:

Source Values: Trial 1: 0, Trial 2: 0, Trial 3: 0.

Parsed Values: [0.0, 0.0, 0.0]

Mean: $(0.0 + 0.0 + 0.0) / 3 = 0.00$

Range: 0.0 - 0.0 = 0.00

SD: The standard deviation of identical values is 0.00.

Result: (0.00, 0.00, 0.00)

Row Consistency Score (R1, C6):

Formula: Formula A (Standard Metrics) is used.

Underlying Values: All 15 parsed values from the row (5 arms x 3 trials): [0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0].

Overall Mean: 0.00

Overall SD: 0.00

Score: As the Overall SD is 0, the score is 10.0.

Meta-Verification Table 2: Cross-Verification Consistency of Baseline Characteristic Deviations (Arm A)

C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)		C2: Row Consistency Score
R1: Mean Age (years) Deviation	(0.10, 0.20, 0.10)	9.9
R2: Stage IV (%) Deviation	(0.13, 0.10, 0.06)	9.9
R3: ECOG 1 (%) Deviation	(0.33, 0.40, 0.21)	9.8

R4: KRAS-mutant (%) Deviation (86.03, 0.40, 0.21) 10.0

R5: gBRCA-mutant (%) Deviation (0.03, 0.10, 0.06) 9.9

Example Calculations for Table 2

Cell (R1, C1) - Mean Age (years) Deviation:

Source Values: Trial 1: 0.2 years, Trial 2: 0.0, Trial 3: 0.1.

Parsed Values: [0.2, 0.0, 0.1]

Mean: $(0.2 + 0.0 + 0.1) / 3 = 0.10$

Range: $0.2 - 0.0 = 0.20$

SD: 0.10

Result: (0.10, 0.20, 0.10)

Row Consistency Score (R2, C2) - Stage IV (%) Deviation:

Formula: Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics) is used.

Underlying Values: Trial 1: 0.1%, Trial 2: 0.2%, Trial 3: 0.1%. Parsed as [0.1, 0.2, 0.1].

Overall Mean: $(0.1 + 0.2 + 0.1) / 3 = 0.13$

Overall SD: 0.06

Score: $10.0 * (1 - (0.06 / (|0.13| + 10.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.06 / 10.13) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.0059) = 9.941 \approx 9.9$

Row Consistency Score (R4, C2) - KRAS-mutant (%) Deviation:

Formula: Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics) is used.

Underlying Values: Trial 1: 86.1%【11†】, Trial 2: 86.2%, Trial 3: 85.8%. Parsed as [86.1, 86.2, 85.8].

Overall Mean: $(86.1 + 86.2 + 85.8) / 3 = 86.03$

Overall SD: 0.21

Score: $10.0 * (1 - (0.21 / (|86.03| + 10.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.21 / 96.03) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.0022) = 9.978 \approx 10.0$

Meta-Verification Table 3: Cross-Verification Consistency of Median OS Difference

C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)		C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD)		C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD)		C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD)		C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD)		C6: Row Consistency Score	
R1: Median OS Difference (months)		(0.20, 0.20, 0.10)		(-0.07, 0.10, 0.06)		(-0.03, 0.10, 0.06)		(0.00, 0.20, 0.10)		8.8	

Example Calculations for Table 3

Cell (R1, C1) - Arm A:

Source Values: Trial 1: +0.3, Trial 2: +0.1, Trial 3: +0.2.

Parsed Values: [0.3, 0.1, 0.2]

Mean: $(0.3 + 0.1 + 0.2) / 3 = 0.20$

Range: $0.3 - 0.1 = 0.20$

SD: 0.10

Result: (0.20, 0.20, 0.10)

Cell (R1, C5) - Arm E:

Source Values: Trial 1: +0.1, Trial 2: -0.1, Trial 3: 0.0.

Parsed Values: [0.1, -0.1, 0.0]

Mean: $(0.1 + (-0.1) + 0.0) / 3 = 0.00$

Range: $0.1 - (-0.1) = 0.20$

SD: 0.10

Result: (0.00, 0.20, 0.10)

Row Consistency Score (R1, C6):

Formula: Formula A (Standard Metrics) is used.

Underlying Values: All 15 parsed values: [0.3, 0.1, 0.2, 0.0, -0.1, -0.1, -0.1, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.1, -0.1, 0.1, -0.1, 0.0].

Overall Mean: $0.3 / 15 = 0.02$

Overall SD: 0.12

Score: $10.0 * (1 - (0.12 / (|0.02| + 1.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.12 / 1.02) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.1176) = 8.824 \approx 8.8$

Meta-Verification Table 4: Cross-Verification Consistency of Median PFS Difference

C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD) C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD) C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD) C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD) C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD) C6: Row Consistency Score				
R1: Median PFS Difference (months)	(0.03, 0.10, 0.06)	(0.07, 0.10, 0.06)	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(-0.03, 0.10, 0.06)
	(0.10, 0.20, 0.10)	9.3		

Example Calculations for Table 4

Cell (R1, C2) - Arm B:

Source Values: Trial 1: +0.0, Trial 2: +0.1, Trial 3: +0.1.

Parsed Values: [0.0, 0.1, 0.1]

Mean: $(0.0 + 0.1 + 0.1) / 3 = 0.07$

Range: $0.1 - 0.0 = 0.10$

SD: 0.06

Result: (0.07, 0.10, 0.06)

Cell (R1, C5) - Arm E:

Source Values: Trial 1: +0.1, Trial 2: +0.2, Trial 3: 0.0.

Parsed Values: [0.1, 0.2, 0.0]

Mean: $(0.1 + 0.2 + 0.0) / 3 = 0.10$

Range: $0.2 - 0.0 = 0.20$

SD: 0.10

Result: (0.10, 0.20, 0.10)

Row Consistency Score (R1, C6):

Formula: Formula A (Standard Metrics) is used.

Underlying Values: All 15 parsed values: [0.1, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.1, 0.1, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, -0.1, 0.1, 0.2, 0.0].

Overall Mean: $0.5 / 15 = 0.03$

Overall SD: 0.07

Score: $10.0 * (1 - (0.07 / (|0.03| + 1.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.07 / 1.03) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.0680) = 9.32 \approx 9.3$

Meta-Verification Table 5: Cross-Verification Consistency of 12-Month OS Rate Difference

C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)		C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD)		C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD)		C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD)		C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD)		C6: Row Consistency Score	
R1: 12-Month OS Rate Difference (%)		(0.73, 0.70, 0.38)		(-0.47, 0.70, 0.38)		(-0.67, 1.10, 0.57)		(-0.07, 0.50, 0.29)		(0.07, 0.60, 0.32)	
		9.4									

Example Calculations for Table 5

Cell (R1, C1) - Arm A:

Source Values: Trial 1: +0.3%, Trial 2: +0.9, Trial 3: +1.0.

Parsed Values: [0.3, 0.9, 1.0]

Mean: $(0.3 + 0.9 + 1.0) / 3 = 0.73$

Range: $1.0 - 0.3 = 0.70$

SD: 0.38

Result: (0.73, 0.70, 0.38)

Cell (R1, C3) - Arm C:

Source Values: Trial 1: -0.5%, Trial 2: -1.3, Trial 3: -0.2.

Parsed Values: [-0.5, -1.3, -0.2]

Mean: $(-0.5 + (-1.3) + (-0.2)) / 3 = -0.67$

Range: $-0.2 - (-1.3) = 1.10$

SD: 0.57

Result: (-0.67, 1.10, 0.57)

Row Consistency Score (R1, C6):

Formula: Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics) is used.

Underlying Values: All 15 parsed values: [0.3, 0.9, 1.0, -0.3, -0.9, -0.2, -0.5, -1.3, -0.2, -0.4, 0.1, 0.1, 0.2, -0.3, 0.3].

Overall Mean: $-1.2 / 15 = -0.08$

Overall SD: 0.59

Score: $10.0 * (1 - (0.59 / (|-0.08| + 10.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.59 / 10.08) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.0585) = 9.415 \approx 9.4$

Meta-Verification Table 6: Cross-Verification Consistency of $\geq G3$ AE Rate Difference

C1: Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)		C2: Arm B (Mean, Range, SD)		C3: Arm C (Mean, Range, SD)		C4: Arm D (Mean, Range, SD)		C5: Arm E (Mean, Range, SD)		C6: Row Consistency Score	
R1: $\geq G3$ AE Rate Difference (%)		(0.03, 0.30, 0.15)		(-0.60, 0.50, 0.26)		(0.17, 1.30, 0.75)		(0.23, 1.20, 0.64)		(-0.03, 0.40, 0.21)	
										9.5	

Example Calculations for Table 6

Cell (R1, C2) - Arm B:

Source Values: Trial 1: -0.3%, Trial 2: -0.7, Trial 3: -0.8.

Parsed Values: [-0.3, -0.7, -0.8]

Mean: $(-0.3 + (-0.7) + (-0.8)) / 3 = -0.60$

Range: $-0.3 - (-0.8) = 0.50$

SD: 0.26

Result: (-0.60, 0.50, 0.26)

Cell (R1, C4) - Arm D:

Source Values: Trial 1: +0.5%, Trial 2: +0.7, Trial 3: -0.5.

Parsed Values: [0.5, 0.7, -0.5]

Mean: $(0.5 + 0.7 + (-0.5)) / 3 = 0.23$

Range: $0.7 - (-0.5) = 1.20$

SD: 0.64

Result: (0.23, 1.20, 0.64)

Row Consistency Score (R1, C6):

Formula: Formula B (Percentage-Based Metrics) is used.

Underlying Values: All 15 parsed values: [0.2, -0.1, 0.0, -0.3, -0.7, -0.8, 0.6, 0.6, -0.7, 0.5, 0.7, -0.5, 0.2, -0.1, -0.2].

Overall Mean: $-0.6 / 15 = -0.04$

Overall SD: 0.51

Score: $10.0 * (1 - (0.51 / (|-0.04| + 10.0))) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.51 / 10.04) = 10.0 * (1 - 0.0508) = 9.492 \approx 9.5$

Research Summary Generation 53: 951 Words

Commencing Meta-Analysis

I've initiated a meta-verification analysis using data from three trials. The primary goal is to produce six new comparison tables, labeled Meta-Verification Tables 1 through 6. This process involves deconstructing the request into manageable steps to effectively generate these tables.

Examining the Metrics

I'm now fully immersed in the metric extraction phase. My focus is on parsing and isolating the numerical values within the discrepancy data. I've successfully implemented the data parsing and have initiated statistical calculations for each cell, focusing on the Mean, Range, and Standard Deviation (sample SD). These preliminary calculations will underpin the row consistency scoring methodology. My next step will be calculating the overall mean and overall SD for each row.

Advancing Data Extraction

I am now focused on executing the detailed table generation plan. For Meta-Verification Table 1, I've successfully extracted the numerical values, resulting in identical values across all arms. Calculations for the cell statistics are completed, resulting in the expected (0.00, 0.00, 0.00) values across all five arms. My next step is to calculate the final column, Row Consistency Score.

Developing the Generation Strategy

I'm currently formalizing the strategy for table generation. I've broken down the main goal – creating six new meta-verification tables – into more manageable steps. I will be extracting, parsing, and calculating statistics from the "Discrepancy," "Deviation," or "Difference" data. This includes determining the mean, range, and standard deviation for each cell and calculating a row consistency score using specific formulas. I've also begun drafting the example calculations.

Analyzing Data Structure

My process now involves a thorough examination of the data structure. I'm focusing on the "Discrepancy," "Deviation," and "Difference" data, meticulously extracting numerical values. This includes handling text, symbols, and formatting, with the immediate goal of building the foundation for statistical calculations. I've started extracting and parsing the "Deviation" data, which is now in an intermediary state.

Developing Detailed Calculations

I've progressed to calculating the individual cell statistics and the row consistency scores for Meta-Verification Table 2. This involves applying Formula B to percentage metrics. The extraction and parsing from 'Deviation' data are nearing completion for the initial table. My current focus is on accurate rounding and applying the special score rules.

Developing Table Generation

I've outlined detailed plans for generating each table, starting with "Cohort Distribution Discrepancy." I've specified data sources, extraction procedures, cell calculations (mean, range, SD), and the row consistency score methodology using Formula A. I've also completed the generation plan for the second table, including the special percentage rules. My next step will be generating the examples to go with the next tables.

Developing Methodology Refinements

My focus has shifted to the refinement of the discrepancy consistency scoring methodology, specifically addressing nuances in data types and potential edge cases. For percentage data, I'm now applying Formula B, and I've incorporated the special rules for handling zero standard deviations to ensure robust results. Additionally, I'm working to produce detailed examples for the remaining tables.

Developing Extraction and Scoring

I'm now fully immersed in developing the detailed plan for table generation and data extraction. I'm focusing on the intricacies of parsing and extracting numerical data from the "Discrepancy", "Deviation", and "Difference" columns for accurate statistical calculations. The methodologies for both score formulas are now solidified and implemented. I'm also ensuring the correct formulas are applied, including the specific rules for a zero standard deviation and percentage metric data types.

Implementing Score Refinement

I'm currently engaged in refining the scoring methodology for percentage-based metrics. I'm meticulously applying Formula B where relevant and ensuring the zero SD rule is correctly implemented. I have completed the detailed plan for all tables and will be generating the examples to illustrate my methodology.

Initiating Calculation Refinement

I've progressed to calculating the score for the table examples and have finished generating examples for each table. All examples showcase the application of Formulas A and B, including when the SD is zero. My next step will be to thoroughly review the examples to ensure accuracy and completeness.

Developing Example Tables

I've finalized the detailed plans and generated examples for each table, showcasing the application of both scoring formulas and the handling of zero standard deviations. I'm now conducting a thorough review of the generated examples to ensure accuracy and consistency.

Implementing Verification Strategy

I've finalized the detailed plans and generated examples for each table, showcasing the application of both scoring formulas and the handling of zero standard deviations. I'm now conducting a thorough review of the generated examples to ensure accuracy and consistency.

Developing Score Calculation Refinements

I've completed the initial extraction, calculation, and example generation steps, and am now engaged in a meticulous review process. The aim is to ensure the utmost accuracy and adherence to specifications, particularly in applying the correct formulas and rounding consistently across all tables.

Finalizing Example Calculations

I've completed the extraction and calculations for all examples, ensuring adherence to the specified methodology, formulas, and rounding rules. I'm now in the process of a comprehensive review to verify the accuracy and consistency of the generated examples.

Revising Example Accuracy

I've completed my initial calculations and generation plans. I am now in a comprehensive review and refinement phase. While developing examples, I noted a minor inconsistency in one Standard Deviation (SD) calculation from the manual calculation, which needs to be adjusted. The plan remains consistent with generating the six meta-verification tables.

Analyzing Current Calculations

I've completed detailed plan generation and initiated the meticulous calculation phase for the tables. I'm focusing on ensuring accuracy in data extraction, formula application, and consistent rounding. My objective is to generate the comparison tables and their detailed examples, meeting all the requirements. I'm carefully reviewing the extraction plan, to meet all specifications.