

Tumour Size and T-Stage in Pancreatic Cancer Resection Specimens Depend on the Pathology Examination Approach

Table S1. Change in T-stage assignment when comparing the simple approach (2D-macro) with the three more elaborate approaches to tumour size measurement.

	2D-Macro vs. 2D Micro		2D-Macro vs. 3D-Macro		2D-Macro vs. 2D-3D-Micro	
	Head	Body/Tail	Head	Body/Tail	Head	Body/Tail
T1	(n = 26) *	(n = 12) *				
No changes	8 (31)	11 (92)	12 (46)	4 (33)	1 (4)	4 (33)
T1 → T2	18 (69)	1 (8)	13 (50)	7 (58)	19 (73)	8 (67)
T1 → T3	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4)	1 (9)	6 (23)	0 (0)
T2	(n = 176) *	(n = 55) *				
No changes	162 (92)	48 (87)	137 (78)	22 (40)	119 (68)	25 (45)
T1 → T2	12 (7)	12 (7)	22 (12)	30 (55)	55 (31)	29 (53)
T1 → T3	2 (1)	5 (9)	1 (4)	3 (5)	2 (1)	1 (2)
T3	(n = 29) *	(n = 17) *				
No changes	16 (55)	13 (76)	12 (41)	14 (82)	9 (31)	15 (88)
T1 → T2	13 (45)	3 (18)	15 (52)	3 (18)	18 (62)	2 (12)
T1 → T3	0 (0)	1 (6)	2 (7)	0 (0)	2 (7)	0 (0)

* Number of tumours assigned to the T-category based on 2D-macro assessment.

Table S2. T-stage distribution in pancreatic cancer series.

Study	% T1	% T2	% T3
Current			
• 2D-macro	12	73	15
• 2D-3D-micro	3	61	36
Saka 2016 [22]			
• Institutional series	13	64	23
• SEER series	17	55	28
• “Ordinary cases”	20	56	24
Shin 2019 [18]	13.1	66.5	20.5
Kwon 2018 [20]	19.6	63.8	16.6
Park 2019 [17]	14.5	65.5	20.0
Schlitter 2017 [23]			
• Berlin series	12.0	69.3	18.7
• Munich series	13.5	65.3	21.2
Kamarajah 2017 [19]	17	58	25

Table S3. *n*-stage distribution for T-stages according to different approaches to tumour size measurement.

	N0 <i>n</i> (%)	N1 <i>n</i> (%)	N2 <i>n</i> (%)	<i>p</i>-Value
T1				0.03
• 2D-macro	9 (24)	19 (52)	9 (24)	
• 2D-3D-micro	5 (56)	4 (44)	0 (0)	
T2				0.03
• 2D-macro	21 (9)	78 (34)	132 (57)	
• 2D-3D-micro	22 (12)	81 (42)	88 (46)	
T3				0.20
• 2D-macro	1 (2)	18 (39)	27 (59)	
• 2D-3D-micro	4 (4)	30 (26)	80 (70)	