

**Table 1. The Correlation of FAP Expression with clinicopathological features clinicopathological features**

Factors	FAP Score			r	p value
	Negative	Low	High		
Age (years)				0.011	0.915
< 65	7	12	18		
≥ 65	14	11	32		
Sex				0.013	0.899
Male	18	19	42		
Female	3	4	8		
Location				0.027	0.796
Ce	1	1	5		
Ut	8	3	5		
Mt	6	16	29		
Lt	4	3	9		
Ac	2	0	2		
Histological factor				-0.013	0.904
well	5	5	12		
moderate	9	13	28		
poor	5	3	10		
T factor				0.571	<0.001**
T1, T2	21	21	19		
T3, T4	0	2	31		
N factor				0.521	<0.001**
Negative	20	17	17		
Positive	1	6	33		
lymphatic invasion				0.649	<0.001**
Negative	17	10	5		
Positive	2	13	44		
Venous invasion				0.500	<0.001**
Negative	18	13	15		
Positive	1	10	34		

Note: FAP score were classified as high (≥4), low (3-1) and negative (0). Spearman's

Rank-Correlation test (n = 94). Statistical significance: P-value \*<0.05, \*\*<0.005.

*Table 2. Risk factors related to lymph node metastases in patients with esophageal cancer after surgical resection*

	Univariate <sup>a</sup>			Multivariate <sup>b</sup>		
	Odds ratio	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	Odds ratio	95% CI	<i>p</i> value
<b>Factors</b>						
Age (<65 vs ≥65)	2.45	1.02-5.88	0.045*	2.65	0.88-7.93	0.082
sex (male vs female)	1.22	0.40-3.70	0.725			
location (Ce, Ut, Mt, Lt, Ae)	1.21	0.76-1.93	0.410			
Histological factor (wel vs mod vs por)	0.58	0.303-1.11	0.100			
T factor (T1,2 vs T3,4)	9.58	3.57-25.7	<0.001**	1.52	0.33-7.01	0.592
lymphatic invasion		N/A				
venous invasion	9.10	3.47-23.9	<0.001**	3.69	0.93-14.6	0.063
FAP score (0 vs 2,3 vs 4-8)	5.89	2.66-13.1	<0.001**	3.84	1.50-9.86	0.005*

*Note:* <sup>a</sup>Univariate analysis is carried out without any adjustment. <sup>b</sup>In addition to clinically relevant variables, multivariate analysis is carried out on statistically significant parameters obtained from the univariate model. Statistical significance: *P*-value \*<0.05, \*\*<0.005.