**Table 1. Criteria for the assessment of fibrosis grade by G. Klöppel & B. Maillet [1, 10]**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fibrosis patterns** | **Degree of fibrosis, scores** | | |
| **Mild** | **Moderate** | **Severe** |
| Perilobular fibrosis: |  |  |  |
| Focal | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Diffuse | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Intralobular fibrosis\*: |  |  |  |
| Focal | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Diffuse | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Integrative index | Mild fibrosis | | ≤ 6 |
| Moderate fibrosis | | 7–9 |
| Severe fibrosis | | 10–12 |

\* The proportion of acinar cells replaced by fibrosis: from 10 to 40%, mild intralobular fibrosis, from 40 to 80%, moderate intralobular fibrosis, from 80 to 100%, severe intralobular fibrosis

**Table 2. Criteria for the assessment of the fibrosis grade by O.V. Paklina et al. [11]**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fibrosis patterns** | **Characteristics, scores** | | | | |
| Perilobular fibrosis | Fibrosis grade: | | | | |
| No | Mild | Moderate | Severe |  |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Intralobular fibrosis | Numbers of acinar lobules replaced by fibrosis, %: | | | | |
| No | < 25 | 25–50 | 50–75 | > 75 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Integrative index | Mild fibrosis | | | | 3 |
| Moderate fibrosis | | | | 4–5 |
| Severe fibrosis | | | | 6–7 |

**Table 3. Comparison of the rating systems for the assessment of fibrosis grade proposed by G. Klöppel & B. Maillet and O.V. Paklina et al. (the mismatched results for the fibrosis grade are shown in red)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Score sum by G. Klöppel & B. Maillet** | | **Score sum by O.V. Paklina et al.** | | | | | | | |  |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Total |
| 0 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 1 |  | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 2 |  | 2 | 4 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  | 26 |
| 3 |  |  |  | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 4 |  |  | 1 |  | 4 |  | 1 |  |  | 6 |
| 5 |  |  | 1 | 10 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 12 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 3 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  | 10 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 5 |
| 8 |  |  |  | 10 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 12 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  | 8 | 5 |  |  | 1 | 14 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1 | 2 |  | 7 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| Total cases | | 7 | 10 | 47 | 21 | 14 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 118 |

**Table 4. The diagnostic efficacy of various methods for the assessment of pancreatic fibrosis (the results of ROC analysis)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Method of the fibrosis assessment** | **Area under the curve** | **Standard error** | **Sensitivity, %** | **Specificity, %** | **P value** |
| QuPath (cell counting) | 0.943 | 0.021 | 89.4 | 86.1 | < 0.001 |
| ASAP (area calculation) | 0.910 | 0.025 | 78.2 | 85.9 | < 0.001 |
| Assessment by G. Klöppel & B. Maillet | 0.879 | 0.031 | 74.1 | 85.0 | < 0.001 |
| Assessment by O.V. Paklina et al. | 0.808 | 0.039 | 67.2 | 83.6 | < 0.001 |