Table.s1 Quality assessment using Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Quality assessment using Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale | | | | | | | | |  |
| Reference | Selection  (1) | Selection  (2) | Selection  (3) | Selection  (4) | Comparability | Outcome  (1) | Outcome  (2) | Outcome  (3) | Totalstars |
| Wang[1](#_ENREF_1) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | No-state | 7 |
| Li[2](#_ENREF_2) | \* | \* | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | No-state | 6 |
| Hochwald[3](#_ENREF_3) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \*\* | \* | \* | No-state | 8 |
| Nikfarjam[4](#_ENREF_4) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \*\* | \* | \* | No-state | 8 |
| Cordesmeyer[5](#_ENREF_5) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | No-state | 7 |
| Liu[6](#_ENREF_6) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | No-state | 7 |
| Wang[7](#_ENREF_7) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \*\* | \* | \* | \* | 9 |
| Watanabe[8](#_ENREF_8) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \*\* | \* | \* | No-state | 8 |
| Xu[9](#_ENREF_9) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | No-state | 7 |
| Zhang[10](#_ENREF_10) | \* | \* | \* | \* | \*\* | \* | \* | No-state | 8 |

A study can be awarded a maximum of one star (\*) for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.

Selection

(1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

(a) Truly representative of the average patients accepted PD in the community\*

(b) Somewhat representative of the average patients accepted PD in the community\*

(c) Selected group of users (e.g., nurses, volunteers)

(d) No description of the derivation of the cohort

(2) Selection of the non exposed cohort

(a) Drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort\*

(b) Drawn from a different source

(c) No description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort

(3) Ascertainment of exposure

(a) Secure record (e.g., surgical records)\*

(b) Structured interview \*

(c) Written self report

(d) No description

(4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study

(a) Yes\*

(b) No

Comparability

(1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis

(a) Study controls for Nature of pancreas or pathological diagnosis\*

(b) Study controls for any additional factor (Age, gender, BMI, ASA, Jaundice, Abdominal pain, Weight loss etc.)\*

Outcome

(1) Assessment of outcome

(a) Independent blind assessment\*(

(b) Record linkage\*

(c) Self report

(d) No description

(2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur?

(a) Yes\*

(b) No

(3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts

(a) Complete follow up – all subjects accounted for\*

(b) Subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias – small number lost – (25%) follow up, or description provided of those lost)\*

(c) Follow up rate (<75%) and no description of those lost

(d) No statement

A study can be awarded a maximum of one star (\*) for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability. Underlined and quoted phrases are provided in the scale to allow for adjustment to particular studies. Italicised phrases indicate our interpretation of the question relevant to this study.
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