BJC

British Journal of Cancer (2014) 111, 2382 | doi:10.1038/bjc.2014.562

# Differences in cancer awareness and beliefs between Australia, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and the UK (the International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership): do they contribute to differences in cancer survival?

L J L Forbes, A E Simon, F Warburton, D Boniface, K E Brain, A Dessaix, C Donnelly, K Haynes, L Hvidberg, M Lagerlund, G Lockwood, C Tishelman, P Vedsted, M N Vigmostad, A J Ramirez, J Wardle and the International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership Module 2 Working Group

**Correction to:** *British Journal of Cancer* (2013) **108**, 292–300. doi:10.1038/bjc.2012.542

Upon publication of this paper in Volume 108, the authors recognised a calculation error in the row 'estimated response rate' of Table 1. The corrected Table 1 is now presented below.

**Table 1. Response rates**

| | Australia | Canada | Denmark | Norway | Sweden | UK |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total number of households with connected telephone numbers approached | 35 730 | 46 672 | 5369 | 8921 | 7411 | 80 210 |
| Number of households of unknown eligibility[a] | 20 719 | 34 828 | 899 | 1922 | 1901 | 55 979 |
| Number of households of known eligibility | 15 011 | 11 844 | 4470 | 6999 | 5510 | 24 231 |
| Number of households in which the individual declined to take part either during or after assessment of eligibility | 433 | 1195 | 2337 | 4726 | 3345 | 3468 |
| Number of ineligible households[a] | 10 119 | 8571 | 12 | 24 | 19 | 13 234 |
| Number of eligible households[a] | 4892 | 3273 | 4458 | 6975 | 5491 | 10 997 |
| Proportion of households eligible among those assessed for eligibility (%) | 32.6 | 27.6 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 45.4 |
| Completed interviews | 4002 | 2064 | 2000 | 2009 | 2039 | 6965 |
| Minimum response rate (%)[b] | 15.9 | 5.4 | 31.5 | 23.2 | 28.0 | 10.5 |
| Estimated response rate (%)[c] | 35.8 | 16.0 | 38.2 | 23.2 | 28.0 | 19.4 |

[a]A household was eligible if one or more people aged 50+ lived in the household.
[b]The minimum response rate represents the response rate assuming all households that we could not assess for eligibility were eligible, in other words the lowest possible response rate. It is calculated as the number of complete interviews divided by the number of interviews plus the number of incomplete interviews among eligible people (refusals and break-offs plus non-contacts) plus the number of all households of unknown eligibility (equivalent to the American Association for Public Opinion Research response rate formula 1).
[c]The estimated response rate represents the response rate after adjusting the size of the denominator for the likely proportion of households that were eligible. It is calculated by assuming that the proportion eligible among households of unknown eligibility is the same as the proportion of those tested for eligibility who were eligible (equivalent to American Association for Public Opinion Research response rate formula 3).

BJC

British Journal of Cancer (2014) 111, 2382 | doi:10.1038/bjc.2014.550

# Randomised phase II study of S-1/cisplatin plus TSU-68 *vs* S-1/cisplatin in patients with advanced gastric cancer

W Koizumi, K Yamaguchi, H Hosaka, Y Takinishi, N Nakayama, T Hara, K Muro, H Baba, Y Sasaki, T Nishina, N Fuse, T Esaki, M Takagi, M Gotoh and T Sasaki

**Correction to**: *British Journal of Cancer* (2013) **109,** 2079–2086. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2013.555

Upon publication of this paper in Volume 109, the authors recognised some errors relating to the units in Table 3. The corrected Table 3 is now presented below.

**Table 3. Pharmacokinetic (PK) parameters**

| | | | PKparameters | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Group** | **No. of patients** | **$t_{max}$ (h)** | **$C_{max}$ ($\mu$g ml$^{-1}$)** | **$AUC_{0\text{-last}}$ ($\mu$g h$^{-1}$ ml$^{-1}$)** | **$t_{1/2}$ (h)** |
| TSU-68 | A | 6 | 3.5 ± 1.5 | 4.46 ± 0.95 | 23.2 ± 7.0 | 2.2 ± 0.7 |
| | **Group** | **No. of patients** | **$t_{max}$ (h)** | **$C_{max}$ (ng ml$^{-1}$)** | **$AUC_{0\text{-last}}$ (ng h$^{-1}$ ml$^{-1}$)** | **$t_{1/2}$ (h)** |
| **S-1** | | | | | | |
| FT | A | 12 | 2.3 ± 0.8 | 2168 ± 378** | 13 368 ± 2581** | 6.9 ± 1.1** |
| | B | 12 | 2.4 ± 1.2 | 3693 ± 1309 | 29 219 ± 10 288 | 13.3 ± 4.4 |
| 5-FU | A | 12 | 3.1 ± 0.7 | 202 ± 65 | 891 ± 315 | 1.6 ± 0.3** |
| | B | 12 | 3.8 ± 1.2 | 160 ± 37 | 976 ± 221 | 2.4 ± 0.6 |
| CDHP | A | 12 | 2.6 ± 0.8 | 228 ± 55 | 993 ± 229** | 2.9 ± 0.6* |
| | B | 12 | 2.7 ± 1.1 | 263 ± 94 | 1442 ± 337 | 3.8 ± 0.8 |
| Oxo | A | 12 | 3.3 ± 1.8 | 44 ± 22* | 258 ± 133* | 3.2 ± 0.9 |
| | B | 12 | 3.0 ± 1.7 | 90 ± 59 | 498 ± 285 | 4.6 ± 2.3 |
| **CDDP** | | | | | | |
| Free platinum | A | 6 | 1.7 ± 0.5 | 1277 ± 169* | 2813 ± 360* | 0.783 ± 0.071 |
| | B | 7 | 2.0 ± 0.0 | 1585 ± 284 | 3441 ± 437 | 0.819 ± 0.070 |

Abbreviations: CDHP = 5-chloro-2,4-dihydroxypyridine; FT = 5-fluoro-1-(tetrahydrofuran-2-yl)pyrimidine-2,4(1H,3H)-dione (tegafur); 5-FU = 5-fluorouracil; Oxo = monopotassium 1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-2,4-dioxo-1,3,5-triazine-6-carboxylate (oxonic acid). Mean ± s.d. *$P$-value < 0.05; **$P$-value < 0.001.