PD-L1 Expression	IC and TC <1%	IC or TC >=1%	Total	P-value	
Gender					
n	63(58.3%)	45(41.7%)	108	1.000	
female	17(58.6%)	12(41.4%)	29		
male	46(58.2%)	33(41.8%)	79		
Tumor Histology					
n	63(58.3%)	45(41.7%)	108	0.685	
Non-squamous	42(60%)	28(40%)	70		
Squamous	21(55.3%)	17(44.7%)	38		
Smoking Status					
n	59(59%)	41(41%)	100	0.288	
Current	22(55%)	18(45%)	40		
Never	24(55.8%)	19(44.2%)	43		
Previous	13(76.5%)	4(23.5%)	17		
Tumor Stage					
n	63(58.3%)	45(41.7%)	108	0.397	
1,2,3a	58(56.9%)	44(43.1%)	102		
3b,4	5(83.3%)	1(16.7%)	6		
Treatment Type					
n	63(58.3%)	45(41.7%)	108	1.000	
Surgery only	28(58.3%)	20(41.7%)	48		
Surgery + others	35(58.3%)	25(41.7%)	60		
Differentiation Level					
n	56(60.2%)	37(39.8%)	93	0.257	
Moderately differentiated	36(64.3%)	20(35.7%)	56		
Poorly differentiated	14(48.3%)	15(51.7%)	29		
Well differentiated	6(75%)	2(25%)	8		

Supplementary Table 1: Association between PD-L1 expression and patient characteristics (except EGFR mutation status) in the TMA cohort

PD-L1 Expression	IC and TC <1%	IC or TC >=1%	Total	P-value	
Gender					
n	63(60%)	42(40%)	105	0.001	
female	33(80.5%)	8(19.5%)	41		
male	30(46.9%)	34(53.1%)	64		
Tumor Histology					
n	63(60%)	42(40%)	105	0.042	
Non-squamous	51(66.2%)	26(33.8%)	77		
Squamous	12(42.9%)	16(57.1%)	28		
Smoking Status					
n	62(59.6%)	42(40.4%)	104	0.057	
Current	16(45.7%)	19(54.3%)	35		
Never	45(66.2%)	23(33.8%)	68		
Previous	1(100%)	0(0%)	1		
Tumor Stage					
n	63(60%)	42(40%)	105	0.751	
1,2,3a	57(60.6%)	37(39.4%)	94		
3b,4	6(54.5%)	5(45.5%)	11		
Treatment Type					
n	63(60%)	42(40%)	105	1	
Surgery only	42(60%)	28(40%)	70		
Surgery + others	21(60%)	14(40%)	35		
Differentiation Level					
n	59(60.2%)	39(39.8%)	98	<0.001	
Moderately differentiated	47(82.5%)	10(17.5%)	57		
Poorly differentiated	11(28.2%)	28(71.8%)	39		
Well differentiated	1(50%)	1(50%)	2		

Supplementary Table 2: Association between PD-L1 expression and patient characteristics (except EGFR mutation status) in the whole-section cohort

Supplementary Table 3: Previous reports on the association between PD-L1 expression and various clinical characteristics

Clinical	Reports	
Characteristics		
Age		
Younger higher*	Cooper et al.[40]	
Older higher	Sun et al.[36]	
Gender		
Female higher	Azuma et al.[41]	
Male higher	Takada et al.[50], Sun et al.[36]	
Tumor Histology		
Non-squamous higher	D'Incecco et al.[39], Azuma et al.[41]	
Squamous higher	Cooper et al.[40], Sun et al.[36]	
Smoking Status		
Smoker higher	D'Incecco et al.[39], Huynh et al.[45], Takada et al.[50], Sun et al.[36]	
Non-smoker higher	Azuma et al.[41]	
Tumor Stage		
1 or 2 higher		
3 or 4 higher	Sun et al.[36], Takada et al.[50], Zhang et al.[51]	
Differentiation Level		
Poorly differentiated higher Moderately or well differentiated higher	Wang et al.[38], Pan et al.[37], Inamura et al.[46]	
EGFR		
Mutant higher	Lin et al.[42], Tang et al.[44], D'Incecco et al.[39], Azuma et al.[41], Song et al.[43]	
Wild-type higher	Huynh et al.[45], Inamura et al.[46], Takada et al.[50], Ji et al.[47]	
Prognosis		
Favorable	Cooper et al.[40] (in early-stage patients), Tang et al.[44] (in EGFR mutant patients), D'Incecco et al.[39] (in EGFR mutant patients), Schmidt et al.[58] (in patients with squamous cell carcinoma, adjuvant therapy, increased tumor size and positive lymph node status), Ameratunga et al.[54] (for N2 patients), Yang et al.[60] (in patients with stage I squamous cell carcinoma), Toyokawa et al.[59], Miao et al.[57], Lin et al. (in EGFR mutant patients)[56], Ishii et al.[55]	
Unfavorable	Tang et al.[35] Tang et al.[44] (in EGFR wild-type patients), Azuma et al.[41], Wang et al.[38], Sun et al.[36], Pan et al.[37], Huynh et al.[45], Koh et al.[48], Inamura et al.[46], Takada et al.[50], Ji et al.[47], Meniawy et al.[49], Zhou et al.[52], Zhang et al.[51] The previous study reported that younger patients showed higher PD-L	

*: "Younger higher" means "The previous study reported that younger patients showed higher PD-L1 expression". Similar meaning applies to the description on the association between the other clinical characteristics and PD-L1 expression in this table.

Supplementary Table 4: The effect of PD-L1 level on OS in different patient sub-groups of the PTEN-qualified TMA samples divided according to various clinical parameters

Total Risk factor n		PD-L1 Low		PD-L1 High		-		
		n	Events	n	Events	Hazard Ratio (95%)	(95% CI)	PD-L1 High PD-L1 Low better better
l samples	108	63	36	45	18	0.58	(0.33 - 1.02)	
-								
umor Histology								
Non-squamous	70	42	26	28	11	0.53	(0.26 - 1.07)	
Squamous	38	21	10	17	7	0.68	(0.26 - 1.80)	
reatment Type								
other(neo/adj chemo)	60	35	20	25	8	0.47	(0.21 - 1.06)	
surgery only	48	28	16	20	10	0.73	(0.33 - 1.60)	
GFR status								
Mutation	16	13	7	3	1	0.37	(0.04 - 3.13) —	
Unknown	42	22	10	20	5	0.48	(0.16 - 1.39)	
Wildtype	50	28	19	22	12	0.62	(0.30 - 1.28)	
iex								
female	29	17	10	12	5	0.64	(0.22 - 1.90)	
male	79	46	26	33	13	0.57	(0.29 - 1.10)	
moking Status								
Current	40	22	16	18	8	0.39	(0.17 - 0.92)	
Never	43	24	11	19	7	0.78	(0.30 - 2.01)	
Previous	17	13	6	4	2	0.84	(0.17 - 4.14)	
umor Stage								
1,2,3a	102	58	31	44	17	0.61	(0.34 - 1.10)	
3b,4	6	5	5	1	1	1.93	(0.17 - 21.69)	
lifferentiation Level								
Moderately differentiated	56	36	18	20	8	0.73	(0.32 - 1.69)	
Poorly differentiated	29	14	10	15	7	0.41	(0.16 - 1.10)	
Well differentiated	8	6	3	2	1	0.63	(0.06 - 6.31)	•

PD-L1 Low PD-L1 High