

TABLES

Table 1. The demographic and surgical data of all the patients.

		N (%)	Mean \pm SD (min-max)
Age (years)		3309 (100)	58.04 \pm 12.26 (18-99)
Tumor size (cm)		3309 (100)	5.89 \pm 3.60 (1-37)
Sex	Male	2176 (65.8)	
	Female	1133 (34.2)	
Surgical procedure	Radical nephrectomy	2099 (63.4)	
	Partial nephrectomy	1210 (36.6)	
Surgic al approach	Open	2611(78.9)	
	Laparoscopic	698 (21.1)	
Radiological technique	CT	2510 (75.8)	
	MRI	799 (24.2)	

CT: Computer Tomography, MRI: Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Table 2. Concordance of the stages between radiological and pathological staging.

		Pathological Staging				
		<i>Stage I</i> (n=1904)	<i>Stage II</i> (n=401)	<i>Stage III</i> (n=669)	<i>Stage IV</i> (n=335)	
Radiological staging	<i>Stage I</i> (n=2157)	1726 (80%)	81 (3.7%)	306 (14.2%)	44 (2.1%)	
	<i>Stage II</i> (n=501)	46 (9.2%)	270 (53.9%)	158 (31.5%)	27 (5.4%)	
	<i>Stage III</i> (n=383)	110 (28.7%)	39 (10.2%)	185 (48.3%)	49 (12.8%)	
	<i>Stage IV</i> (n=268)	22 (8.2%)	11 (4.1%)	20 (7.5%)	215 (80.2%)	

$\kappa=0.52$
 $p<0.001$

Table 3. Sensitivity, specificity, negative and positive predictive values and accuracy rates of radiologic staging

		<i>Sensitivity %</i>	<i>Specificity %</i>	<i>Negative predictive value %</i>	<i>Positive predictive value %</i>	<i>Accuracy %</i>
Pathological staging	<i>Stage I</i>	90.7	69.3	84.5	80.0	81.6
	<i>Stage II</i>	67.3	92.1	95.3	53.9	89.1
	<i>Stage III</i>	27.7	92.5	83.5	48.3	79.4
	<i>Stage IV</i>	64.2	98.2	96.1	80.2	94.8