Electronic Supplement Table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electronic Supplement Table: Study Characteristics | | | | | | | | |
| Author | Country | Type | Total patients | Type of intervention | Overall Mortality | Early vs Late | Mortality Early vs late | Infected necrosis included? |
| Operative Timing | | | | | | | | |
| *72 hours* | | | | | | | | |
| Hartwig 2002 | Germany | Retrospective | 62 | Open necrosectomy | 23/62 (37%) | 30 early: 32 late | 53% vs 22% | Unclear |
| Mier 1997 | Mexico | Prospective randomized | 37 | Open necrosectomy | 17/36 (47%) | 26 early: 11 late | 56% vs 27%) | Yes |
| *12-14 days* | | | | | | | | |
| Besselink 2007 | Netherlands | Retrospective | 53 | Open necrosectomy/Closed Lavage | 19/53 (36%) | 27 early: 26 late | 63% vs 8% | Yes |
| Bhansali 2003 | India | Retrospective | 131 | Open necrosectomy | 45/131 (34%) | 35 early:96 late | 60% vs 25% | Yes, all |
| Gotzinger 2003 | Austria | Retrospective | 250 | Open necrosectomy | 95/250 (38%) | 157 early: 93 late | 46% vs 25% | Yes |
| Ranson 1981 | USA | Retrospective | 133 | Closed lavage/Percutaneous drain | 38/133 (29%) | 31 early: 102 late | 65% vs 18% | Unclear |
| Santvoort 2011 | Netherlands | Prospective | 242 | Open necrosectomy/percutaneous drain | 65/242 (27%) | 45 early: 197 late | 55% vs 20% | Yes |
| Wittau 2010 | Germany | Retrospective | 110 | Closed lavage | 38/110 (35%) | 53 early: 57 Late | 60% vs 11% | Yes |
| *30 days* | | | | | | | | |
| Alderidge 1985 | England | Retrospective | 15 | Open necrosectomy | 5/15 (33%) | 7 early: 8 Late | 57% vs 13% | Yes |
| Besselink 2007 | Netherlands | Retrospective | 53 | Open necrosectomy/Closed Lavage | 19/53 (36%) | 27 early: 26 late | 63% vs 8% | Yes |
| Santvoort 2011 | Netherlands | Prospective | 242 | Open necrosectomy/percutaneous drain | 65/242 (27%) | 143 early:99 late | 35% vs 15% | Yes |
| Wittau 2010 | Germany | Retrospective | 110 | Closed lavage | 38/110 (35%) | 70 early: 40 Late | 43% vs 20% | Yes |
| Primary percutaneous vs Primary surgical intervention | | | | | | | | |
| Ashley 2001 | USA | Retrospective | 34 | 31 surgery/3 percutaneous drainage | 4/34 (12%) |  |  | All 34 infected |
| Aultman 1997 | USA | Retrospective | 23 | 7 surgery/16 percutaneous | 6/23 (26%) |  |  | Yes |
| Bakker 2012 | Netherlands | Prospective | 11 | 9 surgery/2 percutaneous drain | 4/11 (36%) |  |  | Yes, all |
| Baril 2000 | USA | Retrospective | 36 | 11 surgery/25 drain | 3/36 (8%) |  |  | Yes, all |
| Gambiez 1998 | France | Retrospective | 9 | 6 surgery/3 drain | 5/9 (55%) |  |  | Yes |
| Olah 2006 | Hungary | Retrospective | 89 | 74 surgery/15 drain | 16/89 (18%) |  |  | Yes, all |
| Rocha 2009 | USA | Retrospective | 18 | 7 surgery/11 drain | 7/18 (38%) |  |  | Yes |
| Santvoort 2010 | Netherlands | Prospective Randomized | 88 | 73 Surgery/15 drain | 15/88 (17%) |  |  | Yes, Suspected |
| Santvoort 2011 | Netherlands | Prospective | 208 | 78 Surgery/130 drain | 40/208 (19%) |  |  | Yes |
| Sunday 1994 | USA | Retrospective | 16 | 8/surgery/8 drain | 3/16 (18%) |  |  | Yes, all |
| Minimally invasive vs Open surgical intervention | | | | | | | | |
| Baker 2012 | Netherlands | Retrospective | 20 | 10 MIS/10 Surgery | 5/20 (25%) |  |  | Yes, all |
| Conner 2005 | England | Retrospective | 97 | 56 MIS/41 Surgery | 25/97 (26%) |  |  | Yes |
| Raraty 2010 | England | Retrospective | 189 | 137 MIS/52 Surgery | 46/189 (24%) |  |  | Yes |
| Santvoort 2007 | Netherlands | Retrospective | 30 | 15 MIS/15 Surgery (historical control) | 7/30 (23%) |  |  | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |