

RAF plus EGFR Inhibition for BRAF-Mutant Metastatic Colorectal Cancer—Letter

Steven Sorscher

I read with interest the recently published article by Yaeger and colleagues (1). The primary endpoint was overall response, and the secondary efficacy endpoints were progression-free survival and overall survival.

Yet, in the abstract, the authors note "tumor regressions were seen in 10 of 12 evaluable patients" (a number that included 4 patients not meeting RECIST criteria for "response" and 2 patients

with stable disease by RECIST criteria). Should not these patients be referred to as having "stable disease," by current accepted criteria? The authors have somehow conflated the terms "response," "stable disease" (less than 20% response), and what has traditionally been called stable disease to derive the term "regression" without defining it in the statistical methods. If "regression" is an acceptable term, it should be defined in the statistical methods section.

University of California, San Diego, California.

Corresponding Author: Steven Sorscher, University of California, 3855 Health Sciences Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093. Phone: 858-822-2372; Fax: 858-822-6186; E-mail: ssorscher@ucsd.edu

doi: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-15-0333

©2015 American Association for Cancer Research.

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed.

Received February 10, 2015; accepted February 11, 2015; published online May 1, 2015.

Reference

1. Yaeger R, Cercek A, O'Reilly EM, Reidy DL, Kemeny NE, Wolinsky T, et al. Pilot trial of combined BRAF and EGFR inhibition in BRAF-

mutant metastatic colorectal cancer patients. *Clin Cancer Res* 2015; 21:1313–20.