

Study ID	Aim	Phase	Funding	Multicentre	International	Country	Sufficiently powered	Follow-up, median (months)
Jeremic 2001 ⁶³	To investigate whether or not the addition of weekend CTX consisting of CARB + ETOP to HFXRT and concurrent daily CARB + ETOP offers an advantage over the same HFXRT/daily CARB + ETOP	III	Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture	No	No	Yugoslavia	Yes	60
Komaki 2002 ⁵⁰	To evaluate the toxicity and efficacy of induction CTX followed by once-daily RT and concurrent CTX and HFXRT	II	National Cancer Institute	Yes	No	USA	Unclear	NS
Schild 2002 ⁶²	To compare CTX + RT twice daily or four times daily	III	Public Health Service Grants	Yes	No	USA	Yes	43
Vokes 2002 ⁴⁷	To evaluate new drugs in combination with CIS in unresectable NSCLC stage III	II	National Cancer Institute	Yes	No	USA	Yes	43
Zatloukal 2004 ⁵¹	To compare the safety and efficacy of concurrent and sequential CTX-RT with CTX consisting of a CIS and VNB regimen, in patients with locally advanced NSCLC	NS	Ministry of Health of the Czech Republic	Yes	No	Czech Republic	No	39
Belani 2005 ⁵²	To determine the optimal sequencing and integration of PAX + CARB with standard daily thoracic RT in patients with locally advanced unresected stage III NSCLC	II	Bristol-Myers Squibb	Yes	No	USA	Unclear	39.6
Fournel 2005 ⁴⁹	To compare the survival impact of concurrent vs sequential treatment with RT and CTX in unresectable stage III NSCLC	III	Pierre Fabre Institute of Oncology, France	Yes	No	France	No	57.6
Reinfuss 2005 ⁴⁶	To compare the results of sequential and concurrent CTX-RT	NS	NS	No	No	Poland	Unclear	29 (mean)
Dasgupta 2006 ⁵⁶	To evaluate different combination regimens of RT and CTX in unresectable NSCLC	III	NS	No	No	India	Unclear	24 (mean)

Study ID	Aim	Phase	Funding	Multicentre	International	Country	Sufficiently powered	Follow-up, median (months)
Gouda 2006 ⁵⁹	To evaluate the results of combination CARB + PAX concomitantly with RT and also the benefit of two cycles of induction CTX	NS	NS	Yes	No	Egypt	Unclear	24
Belderbos 2007 ⁵⁴	To compare concurrent CTX-RT and sequential CTX-RT for inoperable NSCLC patients stages I-III	II	National Cancer Institute	Yes	Yes	Germany, Netherlands, France, Belgium	No	16.5
Vokes 2007 ⁴⁸	To evaluate whether or not induction CTX before concurrent CTX-RT would result in improved survival	III	National Cancer Institute	Yes	No	USA	Yes	38
Liu 2008 ⁵³	To evaluate the efficacy and toxicity of concurrent CTX-RT with low-dose weekly DOC followed by consolidation CTX with DOC + CIS in stage III NSCLC	NS	NS	No	No	China	Unclear	20
Socinski 2008 ⁵⁵	To evaluate 74-Gy thoracic RT with induction and concurrent CTX in stage IIIA/B NSCLC	II	National Cancer Institute	Yes	No	USA	Unclear	42/49
Berghmans 2009 ⁴⁵	To determine the best sequence and safety of CTX and CTX-RT, using a regimen CIS + GEM + VNB	III	NS	Yes	Yes	Belgium, France, Spain, Greece	No	NS
Crvenkova 2009 ⁵⁷	To compare the survival impact of concurrent vs sequential treatment with RT and CTX in inoperable stage III NSCLC	NS	NS	No	No	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Unclear	NS
Nyman 2009 ⁵⁸	To improve locoregional control by testing accelerated RT or concurrent daily or weekly CTX with conventional RT	II	Bristol-Myers Squibb Scandinavia	Yes	No	Sweden	Yes	52
Zhu 2009 ⁶⁰	To compare sequential vs concurrent CTX-RT for stage III NSCLC	NS	NS	No	No	China	Unclear	24
Movsas 2010 ⁶¹	To assess consolidation with either GEM alone or with DOC after CTX-RT	II	Lilly, USA	Yes	Yes	USA, China, Argentina, Republic of Korea	No	36

HFXRT, hyperfractionated RT; NS, not stated.