

**Table S3.** Comparisons of dose parameters according to bowel circumference

Bowel circumference (%)		EQD <sub>2</sub> (Gy)						
		GTV D <sub>98%</sub>	HR-CTV D <sub>98%</sub>	IR-CTV D <sub>98%</sub>	Rectum D <sub>2mL</sub>	Sigmoid D <sub>2mL</sub>	Bladder D <sub>2mL</sub>	Bowel D <sub>2mL</sub>
0 (n = 21)	2D	137.9 ± 48.6	<b>78.0 ± 11.7</b>	<b>63.8 ± 6.8</b>	64.0 ± 8.7	68.8 ± 8.1	<b>91.9 ± 12.7</b>	49.1 ± 4.9
	3D	129.0 ± 28.8	<b>81.5 ± 6.3</b>	<b>65.8 ± 3.7</b>	63.9 ± 8.7	67.8 ± 7.0	<b>85.4 ± 4.6</b>	49.2 ± 5.2
0–15 (n = 21)	2D	<b>118.6 ± 51.5</b>	83.6 ± 10.2	65.4 ± 7.2	59.1 ± 6.8	66.8 ± 12.0	<b>87.8 ± 19.4</b>	<b>62.2 ± 9.2</b>
	3D	<b>103.2 ± 41.0</b>	80.3 ± 8.9	63.9 ± 5.6	60.3 ± 6.9	65.0 ± 8.6	<b>80.0 ± 8.4</b>	<b>58.1 ± 4.7</b>
>15 (n = 8)	2D	<b>175.4 ± 51.2</b>	<b>90.7 ± 15.1</b>	<b>71.1 ± 10.1</b>	62.9 ± 6.3	<b>62.7 ± 10.4</b>	79.4 ± 12.9	<b>79.4 ± 12.3</b>
	3D	<b>129.3 ± 29.9</b>	<b>73.0 ± 7.1</b>	<b>61.4 ± 4.0</b>	59.5 ± 4.8	<b>58.0 ± 9.2</b>	74.0 ± 8.6	<b>62.4 ± 3.4</b>

Values are presented as mean ± standard deviation.

Bold type was statistically significant factor.

EQD<sub>2</sub>, 2 Gy equivalent dose; GTV, gross tumor volume; HR-CTV, high-risk clinical target volume; IR-CTV, intermediate-risk clinical target volume; 2D, two-dimensional; 3D, three-dimensional.