Appendix 1

This Appendix describes a separate Shiny analysis in which the three treatment groups from the trials of Lu *et al.* (4) (treatment group of 223 patients) and Wang *et al.* (5) (two treatment groups of 119 and 120 patients, respectively) are compared with one another to test whether or not they can be pooled into a single patient group of 462 patients. *Figure 4* shows the three Kaplan-Meier curves.

The values of HR were the following:

❖ Wang *et al.* (n=119) *vs.* Lu *et al.* (n=223): HR =1.120 (95% CI: 0.7945–1.578);
❖ Wang *et al.* (n=120) *vs.* Lu *et al.* (n=223): HR =1.214 (95% CI: 0.8698–1.694);
❖ Wang *et al.* (n=120) *vs.* Wang *et al.* (n=119): HR =0.923 (95% CI: 0.572–1.488).

Concordance =0.518 (se =0.021).

Likelihood ratio test =1.34 (on 2 df, P=0.5).

The values of median PFS were the following:

❖ Lu *et al.* (n=223): 9.71 mOS (95% CI: 7.73–11.5);
❖ Wang *et al.* (n=119): 7.71 mOS (95% CI: 5.82–not computable);
❖ Wang *et al.* (n=120): 7.64 mOS (95% CI: 6.62–10.5).

HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; se, standard error; PFS, progression-free survival; mOS, median overall survival.

Appendix 2

This Appendix describes a separate Shiny analysis in which the three treatment groups from the trials of Awad *et al.* (6) (treatment group of 60 patients), Paz-Ares *et al.* (7) (treatment group of 278 patients), and Rodrigues-Abreu *et al.* (8) (treatment group of 410 patients) are compared with one another to test whether or not they can be pooled into a single patient group of 748 patients. *Figure 5* shows the three Kaplan-Meier curves.

The values of median HR were as follows:

❖ Paz-Ares *et al.* (n=278) *vs.* Awad *et al.* (n=60): HR =2.536 (95% CI: 1.738–3.699);
❖ Rodriguez-Abreu *et al.* (n=410) *vs.* Awad *et al.* (n=60): HR =2.348 (95% CI: 1.633–3.376);
❖ Paz-Ares *et al.* (n=278) *vs.* Rodriguez-Abreu *et al.* (n=410): HR =1.08 (95% CI: 0.64–1.824).

Concordance =0.532 (se =0.012).

Likelihood ratio test =30.16 (on 2 df, P<0.001).

The values of median PFS were as follows:

❖ Awad *et al.* (n=60): 24.84 mOS (95% CI: 11.18–41.03);
❖ Paz-Ares *et al.* (n=278): 8.55 mOS (95% CI: 6.51–9.05);
❖ Rodríguez-Abreu *et al.* (n=410): 9.21 mOS (95% CI: 8.38–10.87).

HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; se, standard error; PFS, progression-free survival; mOS, median overall survival.