

Table 1. Response Categories according to Therasse et al vs Abrey et al								
Method	Therasse et al				Abrey et al			
	CR (%)	PR (%)	SD (%)	PD (%)	CR (%)	PR (%)	SD (%)	PD (%)
Axial 1D / RECIST	100 ↓	30 ↓	30 ↓ to 20 ↑	20 ↑	100 ↓	50 ↓	50 ↓ to 25 ↑	25 ↑
Longest 1D	100 ↓	30 ↓	30 ↓ to 20 ↑	20 ↑	100 ↓	50 ↓	50 ↓ to 25 ↑	25 ↑
2D	100 ↓	50 ↓	50 ↓ to 25 ↑	25 ↑	100 ↓	50 ↓	50 ↓ to 25 ↑	25 ↑
3D	100 ↓	65 ↓	65 ↓ to 40 ↑	40 ↑	100 ↓	65 ↓	65 ↓ to 40 ↑	40 ↑

Abbreviations: RECIST, Axial 1D and Longest 1D based on RECIST 1.1 criteria; 2D based on McDonald modified; 3D based on volume; ↑, increase in size; ↓, decrease in size.^{5,12,13,16}

Table 6. Response categories and agreement for each measurement method using 20-30%, 25-50% and 40-65% cut-offs for 1D, 2D and 3D respectively

Measurement Method	Response counts in absolute (%)				Frequency of Agreement in %			
	CR	PR	SD	PD	Axial 1D	Longest 1D	RECIST	2D
Axial 1D	22 (55)	7 (17.5)	4 (10)	7 (17.5)	-	-	-	-
Longest 1D	22 (55)	6 (15)	4 (10)	8 (20)	95	-	-	-
RECIST	22 (55)	8 (20)	5 (12.5)	5 (12.5)	90	92.5	-	-
2D	22 (55)	6 (15)	3 (7.5)	9 (22.5)	92.5	97.5	90	-
3D	22 (55)	7 (17.5)	4 (10)	7 (17.5)	87.5	92.5	90	95

Table 7. Response categories and agreement for each measurement method using 25-50% for 1D and 2D and 40-65% for 3D respectively

Measurement Method	Response counts in absolute (%)				Frequency of Agreement in %			
	CR	PR	SD	PD	Axial 1D	Longest 1D	RECIST	2D
Axial 1D	22 (55)	7 (17.5)	5 (12.5)	6 (15)	-	-	-	-
Longest 1D	22 (55)	5 (12.5)	5 (12.5)	8 (20)	92.5	-	-	-
RECIST	22 (55)	6 (15)	7 (17.5)	5 (12.5)	90	90	-	-
2D	22 (55)	6 (15)	3 (7.5)	9 (22.5)	87.5	95	85	-
3D	22 (55)	7 (17.5)	4 (10)	7 (17.5)	82.5	90	85	95