

Errata

Volume 41, No. 4, page 2061, Results, 18th line should read:

(median=36.2 months, 95% CI=21.2- not achieved) and

Vol 41, No. 4, page 2101, Patients and Methods section, 1st line should read:

We retrospectively analyzed the recorded rectal toxicity data of prostate

Vol 41, No. 4, page 2102, left column, 5th line should read:

from January 2013 to November 2016 received RT using the same

Vol 41, No. 4, page 2102, left column, penultimate line should read:

<15% for conventional fractionation, V32 ≤50%, V50 ≤25.8% and V60

Vol 41, No. 4, page 2103, Tables II and III should be replaced with the following ones:


Table II. Acute rectal toxicity frequencies among 146 patients treated at the level of prostate bed.

	Acute rectal toxicity in prostate bed patients					p<0.001
	G0		G1-G2		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	
IGRT	27	81.8%	6 (4+2)	18.2%	33	
Medications	45	39.8%	68 (62+6)	60.2%	113	
Total	72		74		146	

Table III. Late rectal toxicity frequencies among 146 patients treated at the level of prostate bed.

	Late rectal toxicity in prostate bed patients					p=0.44
	G0		G1-G2		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	
IGRT	29	87.9%	4 (4+0)	12.1%	33	
Medications	91	80.5%	22 (15+7)	19.5%	113	
Total	120		26		146	

Vol 41, No. 4, page 2104, Figure 4 should be replaced with the following one:



Vol 41, No. 4, page 2105, Legend of Figure 5 should read:

Figure 5. *Considering only clinically relevant acute rectal toxicity in the whole sample, we observed 3/91 G2 cases in the image-guided radiation therapy (IGRT) group and 18/268 G2 cases in the Medications group, $p=0.30$.*

Vol 41, No. 4, page 2105, Legend of Figure 6 should read:

Figure 6. *Considering only clinically relevant late rectal toxicity in the whole sample, we observed 2/91 G2 cases in the image-guided radiation therapy (IGRT) group and 10/268 G2 cases in the Medications group, $p=0.74$.*

Vol 41, No. 4, page 2106, Legend of Figure 7 should read:

Figure 7. *Discriminating the clinically relevant acute rectal toxicity in the whole sample on the basis of fractionation scheme, we observed 17/270 G2 cases in the conventional group and 4/89 G2 cases in the hypofractionated group, $p=0.79$.*

Vol 41, No. 4, page 2106, Legend of Figure 8 should read:

Figure 8. *Discriminating the clinically relevant late rectal toxicity in the whole sample on the basis of fractionation scheme, we observed 10/270 G2 cases in the conventional group and 2/89 G2 cases in the hypofractionated group, $p=0.74$.*

Vol 41, No. 4, page 2107, Legend of Figure 9 should read:

Figure 9. *Discriminating the clinically relevant acute rectal toxicity in the whole sample on the basis of radiotherapy target (prostate vs. prostate bed), we observed 13/213 G2 cases in the prostate group and 8/146 G2 cases in the prostate bed group, $p=1$.*

Vol 41, No. 4, page 2107, Legend of Figure 10 should read:

Figure 10. *Discriminating the clinically relevant late rectal toxicity in the whole sample on the basis of radiotherapy target (prostate vs. prostate bed), we observed 5/213 G2 cases in the prostate group and 7/146 G2 cases in the prostate bed group, $p=0.24$.*

Volume 41, No. 8, page 3848, Acknowledgements, 3rd line should read:

Thailand (NRCT), Thailand (N41A640075). The Authors thank Dr. Sucharat