

---

# 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

## **36.S54.TST.05.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/).

### **ChatGPT o3-pro: 16 Pages, July 11, 2025**

### **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 54 (Formatted)

### ChatGPT o3-pro

834 words, 10 minutes 00.16 seconds

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

#### Discrepancy

C1 Arm A(Mean, Range, SD)	C2 Arm B	C3 Arm C	C4 Arm D	C5 Arm E	C6 Row Consistency Score
---------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	--------------------------

<b>R1 Patient Count</b>	<b>(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)</b>	(0.00, 0.00,	(0.00, 0.00,	<b>(0.00, 0.00,</b>	(0.00, 0.00,	<b>10.0</b>
<b>Discrepancy</b>		0.00)	0.00)	<b>0.00)</b>	0.00)	

**Example calculations (Table 1)**

- Cell (R1,C1)** – Arm A  
 Values from Trials 1-3 = [0, 0, 0]  
 Mean = 0 ; Range = 0 – 0 = 0 ; SD = 0 → (0.00, 0.00, 0.00)
- Cell (R1,C4)** – Arm D  
 Same three zeros ⇒ identical statistics.
- Row Score (R1,C6)** – Formula A  
 All fifteen values = 0 → Overall SD = 0 ⇒ score = 10.0 (rule: SD = 0 → perfect).

**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 (Table 2)

1. Cell (R1,C1) – Mean Age  
Trials = [0.2, 0.0, 0.1] → Mean = 0.1 ; Range = 0.2 ; SD = 0.1 ⇒ (0.10, 0.20, 0.10)
2. Row Score (R2,C2) – Stage IV (Formula B)  
Values = [0.1, 0.2, 0.1]  
Overall Mean = 0.1333, SD = 0.0577  
Score = 10·[1 – SD / (|Mean|+10)]  
= 10·[1 – 0.0577 / 10.1333] ≈ 9.94 → **9.9** (1 dec.)
3. Row Score (R4,C2) – KRAS (Formula B)  
Values = [86.1, 86.2, 85.8] → Mean = 86.033, SD = 0.208  
Score = 10·[1 – 0.208 / (86.033+10)] ≈ 9.98 → **10.0**.

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

	C1 Arm A	C2 Arm B	C3 Arm C	C4 Arm D	C5 Arm E	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 (Table 3)

1. Cell (R1,C1) – Arm A  
[0.3, 0.1, 0.2] → Mean = 0.2, Range = 0.2, SD = 0.1.

2. **Cell (R1,C5) – Arm E**  
 $[0.1, -0.1, 0.0] \rightarrow \text{Mean} = 0.0, \text{Range} = 0.2, \text{SD} = 0.1.$
3. **Row Score (R1,C6) – Formula A**  
 All 15 values: Overall Mean  $\approx 0.02$ , SD  $\approx 0.1207$   
 Score =  $10 \cdot [1 - 0.1207 / (|0.02| + 1)] \approx \mathbf{8.8}.$

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

	C1 Arm A	C2 Arm B	C3 Arm C	C4 Arm D	C5 Arm E	C6 Row Consistency Score
R1 Median PFS Difference (months)	(0.03, 0.10, 0.06)	<b>(0.07, 0.10, 0.06)</b>	(0.00, 0.00, 0.00)	(-0.03, 0.10, 0.06)	<b>(0.10, 0.20, 0.10)</b>	<b>9.3</b>

**Example calculations (Table 4)**

1. **Cell (R1,C2) – Arm B**  
 $[0.0, 0.1, 0.1] \rightarrow \text{Mean} = 0.07, \text{Range} = 0.1, \text{SD} = 0.0577 \rightarrow 0.06.$
2. **Cell (R1,C5) – Arm E**  
 $[0.1, 0.2, 0.0] \rightarrow \text{Mean} = 0.10, \text{Range} = 0.20, \text{SD} = 0.10.$
3. **Row Score (R1,C6) – Formula A**  
 Overall Mean  $\approx 0.0333$ , SD  $\approx 0.0724$   
 Score =  $10 \cdot [1 - 0.0724 / (|0.0333| + 1)] \approx \mathbf{9.3}.$

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

	C1 Arm A	C2 Arm B	C3 Arm C	C4 Arm D	C5 Arm E	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 (Table 5)

- Cell (R1,C1) – Arm A  
[0.3, 0.9, 1.0] → Mean = 0.73, Range = 0.7, SD = 0.38.
- Cell (R1,C3) – Arm C  
[-0.5, -1.3, -0.2] → Mean = -0.67, Range = 1.1, SD = 0.57.
- Row Score (R1,C6) – Formula B  
Overall Mean ≈ -0.08, SD ≈ 0.605  
Score = 10·[1 – 0.605 / (|-0.08|+10)] ≈ 9.4.

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

	C1 Arm A	C2 Arm B	C3 Arm C	C4 Arm D	C5 Arm E	C6 Row Consistency Score
R1 ≥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 (Table 6)



1. **Cell (R1,C2)** – Arm B  
[-0.3, -0.7, -0.8] → Mean = -0.60, Range = 0.5, SD = 0.26.
2. **Cell (R1,C4)** – Arm D  
[0.5, 0.7, -0.5] → Mean = 0.23, Range = 1.2, SD = 0.64.
3. **Row Score (R1,C6)** – Formula B  
Overall Mean  $\approx$  -0.04, SD  $\approx$  0.503  
Score =  $10 \cdot [1 - 0.503 / (|-0.04| + 10)] \approx$  **9.5**.

---

## Notes on Methodology

- **Data parsing** strictly removed all non-numeric characters (units, symbols, footnote markers) before computation.
- **Statistical rounding**: all cell statistics are shown to **two decimals**; consistency scores to **one decimal**.
- **Formula selection** adhered to the instructions: Formula A for patient counts and time-in-months metrics; Formula B for all percentage metrics.
- **Boundary conditions** (SD = 0 or score < 1) were enforced exactly as specified.

## Generation 54 (Plain Text)

### ChatGPT o3-pro

**858 words, 10 minutes 00.16 seconds**

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

	C1 Arm A (Mean, Range, SD)	C2 Arm B	C3 Arm C	C4 Arm D	C5 Arm E
**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 (Table 1)\*\*

1. \*\*Cell (R1,C1)\*\* – Arm A

Values from Trials 1-3 = [0, 0, 0]

Mean = 0 ; Range = 0 – 0 = 0 ; SD = 0 → (0.00, 0.00, 0.00)

2. \*\*Cell (R1,C4)\*\* – Arm D

Same three zeros ⇒ identical statistics.

3. \*\*Row Score (R1,C6)\*\* – Formula A

All fifteen values = 0 → Overall SD = 0 ⇒ score = 10.0 (rule: SD = 0 → perfect).

---

### 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



-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----			

**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 (Table 3)\*\*

1. \*\*Cell (R1,C1)\*\* – Arm A

$\backslash[0.3, 0.1, 0.2] \rightarrow \text{Mean} = 0.2, \text{Range} = 0.2, \text{SD} = 0.1.$

2. \*\*Cell (R1,C5)\*\* – Arm E

$\backslash[0.1, -0.1, 0.0] \rightarrow \text{Mean} = 0.0, \text{Range} = 0.2, \text{SD} = 0.1.$

3. \*\*Row Score (R1,C6)\*\* – Formula A

All 15 values: Overall Mean  $\approx 0.02$ , SD  $\approx 0.1207$

Score =  $10 \cdot \backslash[1 - 0.1207 / (|0.02|+1)] \approx$  **8.8**.

---

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

	C1 Arm A	C2 Arm B	C3 Arm C	C4 Arm D	C5 Arm E	
**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 (Table 4)\*\***

1. **\*\*Cell (R1,C2)\*\*** – Arm B

$\sqrt{[0.0, 0.1, 0.1]} \rightarrow \text{Mean} = 0.07, \text{Range} = 0.1, \text{SD} = 0.0577 \rightarrow 0.06.$

2. **\*\*Cell (R1,C5)\*\*** – Arm E

$\sqrt{[0.1, 0.2, 0.0]} \rightarrow \text{Mean} = 0.10, \text{Range} = 0.20, \text{SD} = 0.10.$

3. **\*\*Row Score (R1,C6)\*\*** – Formula A

$\text{Overall Mean} \approx 0.0333, \text{SD} \approx 0.0724$

$\text{Score} = 10 \cdot \sqrt{[1 - 0.0724 / (|0.0333| + 1)]} \approx \textbf{9.3}.$

---

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

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

**\*\*Example calculations (Table 5)\*\***

1. **\*\*Cell (R1,C1)\*\*** – Arm A

$\sqrt{[0.3, 0.9, 1.0]} \rightarrow \text{Mean} = 0.73, \text{Range} = 0.7, \text{SD} = 0.38.$

2. **Cell (R1,C3)** – Arm C

$\sqrt{[-0.5, -1.3, -0.2]} \rightarrow \text{Mean} = -0.67, \text{Range} = 1.1, \text{SD} = 0.57.$

3. **Row Score (R1,C6)** – Formula B

Overall Mean  $\approx -0.08$ , SD  $\approx 0.605$

Score =  $10 \cdot \sqrt{[1 - 0.605 / (|-0.08| + 10)]} \approx \mathbf{9.4}$ .

---

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

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

**Example calculations (Table 6)**

1. **Cell (R1,C2)** – Arm B

$\sqrt{[-0.3, -0.7, -0.8]} \rightarrow \text{Mean} = -0.60, \text{Range} = 0.5, \text{SD} = 0.26.$

2. **Cell (R1,C4)** – Arm D

$\sqrt{[0.5, 0.7, -0.5]} \rightarrow \text{Mean} = 0.23, \text{Range} = 1.2, \text{SD} = 0.64.$

3. **Row Score (R1,C6)** – Formula B

Overall Mean  $\approx -0.04$ , SD  $\approx 0.503$

Score =  $10 \cdot [1 - 0.503 / (|-0.04| + 10)] \approx 9.5$ .

---

#### #### Notes on Methodology

\* \*\*Data parsing\*\* strictly removed all non-numeric characters (units, symbols, footnote markers) before computation.

\* \*\*Statistical rounding\*\*: all cell statistics are shown to **two decimals**; consistency scores to **one decimal**.

\* \*\*Formula selection\*\* adhered to the instructions: Formula A for patient counts and time-in-months metrics; Formula B for all percentage metrics.

\* \*\*Boundary conditions\*\* (SD = 0 or score < 1) were enforced exactly as specified.

## **Research Summary Generation 54: 282 Words**

### Computing stats

I'm calculating stats like Mean, Range, and SD for each discrepancy column across trials, adjusting formulas for row consistency scores.

### Coding calculations

I'm preparing to code Python to compute numbers to two decimal places. This will include gathering data and calculating stats and row consistency scores.

### Organizing data

I'm preparing tables with statistical data. Rounding stats to two decimals, using markdown for presentation. Detailed calculations and example breakdowns for clarity.

### Calculating the standard deviation

I'm calculating the standard deviation for R2 C2 in Stage IV using the values 0.1, 0.2, and 0.1. The mean is 0.133333.

### Mapping the score

First, I calculate the weight ratio as 0.057735, adjusting it to 0.06. Then, using Formula B, the score is about 1.383, approximately 1.4.

### Calculating the mean

I'm figuring out the standard deviation of 9.9. Score R4 C2 for KRAS mutant values of 86.1, 86.2, and 85.8. The mean comes to 86.033333.

### Understanding the designation

I'm decoding "SD 0.208." It likely represents a standard, code, or designation in a specific context, possibly an education program or a standard metric.

### Gathering data

I'm compiling statistical data for Arm A and E, including mean, range, and standard deviation. Progressing towards calculating the overall mean of 15 values.

### Verifying parameters

I'm checking the standard deviation to see if it was included or measured.

### Calculating the score

Working through the equation step-by-step to find the score by simplifying and applying the formula.

### Noticing data trends

I'm pulling together info on specific arms from Tables 4 to 6, thinking through mean, range, and standard deviation. Considering examples and edge cases for final calculations.