

## Supplementary File

**Table S1.** Treatment plans localisations

Region	Localization	Number of arcs
Abdomen and Pelvic	Bladder	12
	Gynaecology	59
	Prostate	228
	Rectum	64
	Stomach	2
	Adrenal	2
	Metastasis to bones	26
	Metastasis to soft tissues	26
	<i>TOTAL</i>	419
Thorax	Lung	136
	Oesophagus	29
	Metastasis to bones	26
	<i>TOTAL</i>	191
Head and Neck	Laryngopharynx	135
	Oropharynx	45
	Nasopharynx	2
	Metastasis to bones	4
	Brain	6
	<i>TOTAL</i>	192

**Table S2.** Spearman correlation coefficients between plan and complexity metrics. Results in bold are statistically significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$

Variables	PTV (L)	D(fr,arc)	MU/Gy	BA	BI	BM	aMU/CP	sdMU/CP	aDR	sdDR	aGS	sdGS	9
PTV (L)	<b>1</b>												
D(fr,arc)	<b>-0.226</b>	<b>1</b>											
MU/Gy	<b>-0.216</b>	<b>-0.195</b>	<b>1</b>										
BA	<b>0.897</b>	<b>-0.195</b>	<b>-0.438</b>	<b>1</b>									
BI	<b>0.628</b>	<b>-0.337</b>	<b>0.146</b>	<b>0.552</b>	<b>1</b>								
BM	<b>0.164</b>	<b>-0.258</b>	<b>0.441</b>	<b>0.012</b>	<b>0.714</b>	<b>1</b>							
aMU/CP	<b>-0.439</b>	<b>0.690</b>	<b>0.292</b>	<b>-0.533</b>	<b>-0.457</b>	<b>-0.184</b>	<b>1</b>						
sdMU/CP	<b>-0.375</b>	<b>0.410</b>	<b>0.231</b>	<b>-0.442</b>	<b>-0.259</b>	<b>-0.010</b>	<b>0.563</b>	<b>1</b>					
aDR	<b>-0.364</b>	<b>0.737</b>	<b>0.199</b>	<b>-0.472</b>	<b>-0.400</b>	<b>-0.144</b>	<b>0.890</b>	<b>0.416</b>	<b>1</b>				
sdDR	<b>0.135</b>	<b>-0.206</b>	<b>-0.002</b>	<b>0.098</b>	<b>0.227</b>	<b>0.325</b>	<b>-0.285</b>	<b>0.332</b>	<b>-0.273</b>	<b>1</b>			
aGS	<b>0.452</b>	<b>-0.496</b>	<b>-0.325</b>	<b>0.572</b>	<b>0.283</b>	<b>-0.035</b>	<b>-0.705</b>	<b>-0.692</b>	<b>-0.731</b>	<b>0.049</b>	<b>1</b>		
sdGS	<b>-0.426</b>	<b>0.452</b>	<b>0.355</b>	<b>-0.554</b>	<b>-0.242</b>	<b>0.092</b>	<b>0.678</b>	<b>0.694</b>	<b>0.698</b>	<b>0.012</b>	<b>-0.983</b>	<b>1</b>	
9	<b>-0.370</b>	<b>0.737</b>	<b>0.208</b>	<b>-0.481</b>	<b>-0.398</b>	<b>-0.135</b>	<b>0.893</b>	<b>0.438</b>	<b>0.999</b>	<b>-0.263</b>	<b>-0.749</b>	<b>0.719</b>	<b>1</b>

Legend: no correlation small fair moderate substantial almost perfect

**Table S3.** Confusion matrices for the training sample for the DA model

from \ to	Green	Yellow	Red	Total	% correct
Green	160	273	1	434	36.87%
Yellow	7	175	5	187	93.58%
Red	0	0	21	21	100.00%
Total	167	448	27	642	55.45%

**Table S4.** Confusion matrices for the training sample for the RDF model

From\to	Green	Yellow	Red	Total	% correct
Green	412	21	1	434	94.9
Yellow	38	142	7	187	75.9
Red	4	8	9	21	42.9
Total	454	171	17	642	87.7

**Table S5.** Confusion matrices for the validation sample for the DA model

From\to	Green	Yellow	Red	Total	% correct
Green	38	70	0	108	35.19%
Yellow	1	45	1	47	95.74%
Red	0	0	5	5	100.00%
Total	39	115	6	160	55.00%

**Table S6.** Confusion matrices for the validation sample for the RDF model

from \ to	Green	Yellow	Red	Total	% correct
Green	102	6	0	108	94.4
Yellow	9	36	2	47	76.6
Red	1	2	2	5	40.0
Total	112	44	4	160	87.5

**Table S7.** Confusion matrices for the validation sample for the hybrid model.

From\to	Green	Yellow	Red	Total	% correct
Green	102	6	0	108	94.4
Yellow	10	36	1	47	76.6
Red	0	0	5	5	100.0
Total	112	42	6	160	89.4