



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Significant individual variation between pathologists in the evaluation of colon cancer specimens after complete mesocolic excision*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/101977/>

Version: Supplemental Material

---

**Article:**

Munkedal, DLE, Laurberg, S, Hagemann-Madsen, R et al. (4 more authors) (2016)  
Significant individual variation between pathologists in the evaluation of colon cancer specimens after complete mesocolic excision. *Diseases of the Colon and Rectum*, 59 (10). pp. 953-961. ISSN 0012-3706

<https://doi.org/10.1097/DCR.0000000000000671>

---

© The American Society of Colon & Rectal Surgeons, Inc. Unauthorized reproduction of this article is prohibited. This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Diseases of the Colon and Rectum*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy. The final publication is available at Springer via [10.1097/DCR.0000000000000671](https://doi.org/10.1097/DCR.0000000000000671)

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>




Figure 3: Inter-observer variability for each person compared to the reference person (50 specimens, four rounds, five comparisons). 990 evaluations as one specimen was excluded in Round 1.