Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Woo Hyun Paik, Seoul National University Hospital, South Korea

REVIEWED BY Hisakazu Hoshi, University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, United States Yousuke Nakai, The University of Tokyo, Japan

*CORRESPONDENCE Nonthalee Pausawasdi Nonthaleep7@gmail.com

SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to Gastrointestinal Cancers: Hepato Pancreatic Biliary Cancers, a section of the journal Frontiers in Oncology

RECEIVED 17 April 2022 ACCEPTED 22 August 2022 PUBLISHED 06 September 2022

CITATION

Termsinsuk P,

Charatcharoenwitthaya P and Pausawasdi N (2022) Development and validation of a 90-day mortality prediction model following endobiliary drainage in patients with unresectable malignant biliary obstruction. *Front. Oncol.* 12:922386. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2022.922386

COPYRIGHT

© 2022 Termsinsuk, Charatcharoenwitthaya and Pausawasdi. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Development and validation of a 90-day mortality prediction model following endobiliary drainage in patients with unresectable malignant biliary obstruction

Panotpol Termsinsuk^{1,2}, Phunchai Charatcharoenwitthaya^{1,3} and Nonthalee Pausawasdi^{1,3}*

¹Siriraj GI Endoscopy Center, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand, ²Gastroenterology Unit, School of Medicine, Institute of Medicine, Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand, ³Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

Background: Palliative endobiliary drainage is the mainstay treatment for unresectable malignant biliary obstruction (MBO). Despite optimal drainage, the survival benefit is arguable. This study aimed to identify factors predicting post-endoscopic drainage mortality and develop and validate a mortality prediction model.

Methods: We retrospectively analyzed data for 451 patients with unresectable pancreatobiliary cancers undergoing first endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP)-guided endobiliary stent placement between 2007 and 2017. We randomly assigned patients in a 3:1 fashion into a derivation cohort (n=339) and validation cohort (n=112). Predictors for 90-day mortality post-stenting were identified from the derivation cohort. A prediction model was subsequently developed and verified with the validation cohort.

Results: The overall 90-day mortality rate of the derivation cohort was 46.9%, and the mean age was 64.2 years. The 2 most common diagnoses were cholangiocarcinoma (53.4%) and pancreatic cancer (35.4%). In all, 34.2% had liver metastasis. The median total bilirubin (TB) level was 19.2 mg/dL, and the mean serum albumin was 3.2 g/dL. A metallic stent was used for 64.6% of the patients, and the median stent patency time was 63 days. A total of 70.8% had TB improvement of more than 50% within 2 weeks after stenting, and 14.5% were eligible for chemotherapy. Intrahepatic obstruction (OR=5.69; P=0.023), stage IV cancer (OR=3.01; P=0.001), pre-endoscopic serum albumin (OR=0.48; P=0.001), TB improvement within 2 weeks after stenting (OR=0.57; P=0.036), and chemotherapy after ERCP (OR=0.11; P<0.001) were associated with 90-day mortality after stenting. The prediction model was developed to identify the risk of death within 90 days post-stent placement.

The AUROC was 0.76 and 0.75 in derivation and validation cohorts. Patients with a score \geq 1.40 had a high likelihood of death, whereas those scoring < -1.50 had a low likelihood of death. Additionally, a score \geq 0.58 provided a 75.2% probability of death, which highlights the usability of the model.

Conclusions: This study proposes a useful validated prediction model to forecast the 90-day mortality of unresectable MBO patients after stenting. The model permits physicians to stratify the death risk and may be helpful to provide a proper palliative strategy.

KEYWORDS

obstructive jaundice, malignant bile duct obstruction, endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography - ERCP, biliary drainage, stent, mortality, prediction model

Introduction

Malignant biliary obstruction (MBO) is a common cause of obstructive jaundice worldwide. Cholangiocarcinoma, pancreatic cancer, gallbladder cancer, and metastatic lymph nodes comprise the majority of MBOs (1). Patients with MBO usually present with an advanced and unresectable stage at diagnosis (2). The symptoms (jaundice, pruritus, malaise, anorexia, and weight loss) are unpleasant and impair patients' quality of life (2–5). Furthermore, due to pre-existing jaundice, initiation of chemotherapy is usually delayed to avoid the risk of hepatotoxicity (6–8). Consequently, the prognosis of unresectable MBO patients is generally poor, and the 5-year survival rate is usually less than 5% (1, 9).

Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP)guided endobiliary drainage with stent placement is a primary treatment for unresectable MBO patients to relieve symptoms and provide the opportunity for chemotherapy (10–12). In addition to the higher technical success rate of 90%–95%, ERCP-guided endobiliary stent placement demonstrates reduced adverse events, hospitalization, and total costs. Additionally, it is associated with more prolonged survival than percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage and surgical drainage (13–18). However, 10% of unresectable MBO patients do not respond to endobiliary stents, and survival after stent placement eventually worsens (19).

Various clinical studies have explored the predictors for mortality after endoscopic endobiliary stent placement. Prat

et al. demonstrated that a tumor size greater than 3 cm was associated with shorter post-stenting survival than a tumor size less than 3 cm (20). The presence of liver metastasis was the major contributor to 24-week mortality and was significantly associated with shorter survival after endobiliary drainage in patients with unresectable MBO (21–23). For pre-endoscopic laboratories, serum levels of total bilirubin (TB) greater than 14 mg/dL and albumin levels lower than 2 mg/dL were associated with 30-day mortality after endobiliary stenting in MBO patients (24, 25). However, pre-endoscopic white blood cell counts lower than 11 000/mm³ and serum gamma-glutamyl transferase (GGT) lower than 165 U/L were associated with better survival outcomes in unresectable pancreatic cancer patients (26).

Nevertheless, clinical studies identifying potential predictors for post-stenting and mortality are limited and generally have small sample sizes. Moreover, other clinical predictors that could influence the mortality outcome, including the site of obstruction and radiographic findings, have not been established by prior studies.

The present study explored the clinical predictors for 90-day mortality after endoscopic endobiliary stent placement. A prediction model for 90-day mortality was also developed and internally validated to identify suitable unresectable MBO patients to proceed with optimal palliation according to their predicted post-stenting mortality.

Materials and methods

Study population

The Institutional Review Board of the Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital approved the study protocol, which met the ethical guidelines of the 1975 Helsinki Declaration (approval

Abbreviations: AUROC, area under the receiver operating characteristic curve; ERCP, endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography; INR, international normalized ratio; LR–, negative likelihood ratio; LR+, positive likelihood ratio; MBO, malignant biliary obstruction; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value; SEMs, self-expandable metallic stent; TB, total bilirubin.

number 097/2019). A retrospective review of the ERCP database of a large tertiary care center was conducted. Eligible patients were those who underwent their first ERCP with endobiliary stent placement for unresectable MBO due to pancreatobiliary cancers between January 2007 and December 2017. The criteria for unresectable MBO were as follows:

- Inoperable locally advanced disease due to major vascular involvement, bilateral or contralateral portal vein, hepatic artery, or secondary biliary radicle involvement
- · Bismuth-Corlette type IV hilar cholangiocarcinoma
- Distant organ or lymph node metastasis
- Unfit for surgery due to significant comorbid conditions and poor functional status.

A total of 1334 patients with unresectable MBO were identified. Of these, 883 patients were excluded. The reasons were incomplete data (n=417), biliary obstruction caused by malignancies other than pancreatobiliary cancers (n=60), concomitant other biliary drainage procedures (n=128), previous endobiliary stent placement (n=73), failed cannulation or no stent placement (n=64), advanced cirrhosis (n=62), death within 2 weeks after endobiliary stent placement (n=30), absence of jaundice (n=25), receiving chemotherapy prior to stenting (n=18), and percutaneous cholecystostomy (n=6). The remaining 451 patients were enrolled and randomly divided in a 3:1 fashion into a "derivation cohort" (n=339) and a "validation cohort" (n=112) using computer generation by simple randomization method.

All relevant clinical and laboratory data before and after ERCP were collected. In addition, cross-sectional images and cholangiographic findings were reviewed. The diagnosis of malignant obstruction was based on either histopathology alone or combined imaging and clinical follow-up in cases where histology could not be obtained.

Statistical analysis

Categorical variables are expressed as numbers and percentages. Continuous variables are expressed as the mean \pm standard deviation for normally distributed data and the median with interquartile range (IQR) for skewed distribution data. Groups were compared using the Chi² test or Fisher's exact test for categorical variables and the independent *t*-test or Mann–Whitney U test for continuous variables. Differences were considered statistically significant if the probability (*P*) values were < 0.05.

Using univariate logistic regression, clinical variables that influenced the study outcomes were identified and compared between surviving and non-surviving patients. The odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were obtained. The significant variables from this step were entered into a multivariate logistic regression model as demonstrated in Model 1. Because of the long recruitment period of the study, the calendar year of endoscopic procedures was considered to control the potential effect on the outcomes in the logistic regression models as shown in Model 2. The coefficients estimated for each factor, which provided the best predictive ability, were relatively weighted to compute the mortality prediction model. The calibration of the mortality prediction model was assessed by comparing the actual observed risk and the average probability of death predicted by the score. The Hosmer–Lemeshow test was used to assess the corresponding goodness-of-fit.

The discriminative power of the developed prediction model was estimated by calculating the area under a receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC). The sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), positive likelihood ratio (LR+), and negative likelihood ratio (LR-) were also determined. Based on a receiver operating curve, cutoffs were selected to categorize patients into a low and high probability (~90%) of death within 90 days after endobiliary stenting. A Cox proportional hazards model was used to estimate the hazard ratio and probability of death according to quartiles of probability score. The overall cumulative survival was estimated using the Kaplan–Meier method. All statistical analyses were performed using PASW Statistics for Windows, version 18 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Results

Baseline characteristics

Of 451 patients with unresectable pancreatobiliary cancers who underwent their first ERCP-guided endobiliary stent placement, 339 and 112 were randomly assigned to the derivation and validation cohorts, respectively. The mean age of the derivation cohort was 64.2 ± 12.4 years, and 173 patients (51.0%) were men. Cholangiocarcinoma was the most common diagnosis, accounting for 53.4% of cases, followed by pancreatic cancer (35.4%), gallbladder cancer (10.0%), and malignant intrapapillary mucinous neoplasm (1.2%). Liver metastasis was noted in 34.2% of patients. The most common clinical presentations were jaundice (89.4%), weight loss (63.7%), abdominal pain (57.2%), and fever (7.1%). Acute cholangitis was diagnosed in 18.0% of cases at the initial presentation. The median pre-endoscopic TB level was 19.2 ± 9.5 mg/dL, and the mean serum albumin was 3.2 ± 0.6 g/dL. Thirty-nine percent of patients had hilar obstruction, whereas 56.6% had an extrahepatic obstruction detected on imaging. Evidence of advanced-stage disease was present: major vascular invasion (47.5%), portal vein invasion (28.3%), distant metastasis (60.5%), peritoneal carcinomatosis (12.1%), and lymph node metastasis (68.0%). Self-expandable metallic and plastic stents were used in 64.6% and 35.4% of patients, respectively (Table 1).

In the derivation cohort, 159 patients (46.9%) died within 90 days after endobiliary stent placement. The causes of death were acute cholangitis (7.7%), advanced-stage malignancy (5.9%), and bacterial septicemia (2.7%). Weight loss was the significant presenting symptom associated with death. Regarding preendoscopic laboratory findings, the non-surviving group tended to have higher TB and alkaline phosphatase values but lower serum albumin. Large tumor size and the presence of liver, peritoneal, and distant metastases on imaging were significantly associated with death (Table 2). Stage IV cancer based on 8th edition of American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) clinical staging was significantly associated with death (Supplementary Table 1 and 2). The self-expandable metallic stent was used more frequently than plastic stents in the surviving (58.3% vs 41.7%) and non-surviving groups (71.7% vs 28.3%). Metallic stent was used predominately in patients with more advanced metastatic disease compared with plastic stent (Supplementary Table 3). Patients in the surviving group had significantly longer stent patency (75.5 days vs 28 days, P=0.003), a higher rate of TB improvement of more than 50% from baseline within 2 weeks after stenting (77.8% vs 62.9%; P<0.001), and were more eligible for chemotherapy (24.4% vs 3.1%; P<0.001) than those in the non-surviving group. The waiting times for ERCP and post-ERCP complications of the surviving and non-surviving groups were comparable (Table 2). Gemcitabine plus cisplatin-based chemotherapy was used more frequent than other regimens (Supplementary Table 4).

Predictors for 90-day mortality

In the univariate analysis (Table 3), the following were identified as significant variables associated with 90-day mortality after stent placement: intrahepatic biliary obstruction on cross-sectional imaging (P=0.025), peritoneal carcinomatosis (P=0.011), liver metastasis (P=0.004), distant metastasis (P<0.001), pre-endoscopic TB level (P=0.001), pre-endoscopic international normalized ratio level (P=0.032), size of the obstructive tumor (P=0.007), metallic stent (P=0.011), and stage of cancer (P=0.012). However, pre-endoscopic serum albumin (P<0.001), TB improvement of more than 50% from baseline within 2 weeks after stenting (P=0.003), and chemotherapy after ERCP (P<0.001) were inversely associated with 90-day mortality. In the multivariate analysis, the significant predictors of death within 90 days were the following: intrahepatic biliary obstruction (OR 5.69; 95% CI, 1.28-25.4; P=0.023), stage 4 cancer (OR 3.01; 95% CI, 1.81-5.02; P<0.001), pre-endoscopic serum albumin (OR 0.48; 95% CI, 0.32-0.74; P=0.001), TB improvement of more than 50% from baseline within 2 weeks after stenting (OR 0.57; 95% CI, 0.330.97; P=0.036), and chemotherapy after ERCP (OR 0.11; 95% CI, 0.04–0.31; P<0.001). These are shown in Model 1. These variables remained significant after an adjustment was made for the calendar year of endobiliary intervention to recognize the long recruitment period. The variables are shown in Model 2.

Development and validation of the 90day mortality prediction model

The prediction model was developed using the significant factors associated with 90-day mortality after endobiliary stent placement. Intrahepatic biliary obstruction, stage IV cancer, preendoscopic serum albumin, TB improvement of more than 50% from baseline within 2 weeks after stenting, and chemotherapy after ERCP were associated with 90-day mortality. Their coefficients were 1.739, 1.103, -0.729, -0.569, and -2.183, respectively. The equation for 90-day mortality prediction was as follows:

 $2.091 + [1.739 \text{ x} \text{ intrahepatic biliary obstruction on cross-sectional imaging (yes = 1, no = 0)] + [1.103 x stage IV cancer (yes = 1, no = 0)] + (-0.729 x pre-endoscopic serum albumin level) + [-0.569 x bilirubin improvement of more than 50% within 2 weeks after stenting (yes = 1, no = 0)] + [-2.183 x chemotherapy after ERCP (yes = 1, no = 0)], with "1" and "0" used for the presence and absence of each factor. An online score calculator is available at https://personalweb.mahidol.ac.th/ Nonthalee-pau/mortality-prediction-score.$

The calibration of the probability score was performed by comparing the observed and predicted 90-day probability of death according to the quartiles (Figure 1A). The predicted and observed probabilities of death were similar across the quartiles of the probability score in the derivation cohort (Hosmer-Lemeshow $\chi^2 = 8.00$, P=0.434) and the validation cohort (Hosmer-Lemeshow $\chi^2 = 5.12$, P=0.647). These results signified good performance of the probability score throughout the whole score-value range. The scores in the derivation cohort ranged from -4.94 to 4.40. The AUROC was 0.76 (95% CI, 0.71–0.81).

The validation analysis drew upon data for 112 patients with unresectable MBO. The baseline clinical characteristics, laboratory findings, and imaging findings of the validation cohort were comparable to those of the derivation cohort. The AUROC of the prediction model for 90-day mortality in the validation cohort was 0.75 (95% CI, 0.66–0.84), demonstrating the reliability of the prediction model (Figure 1B). The optimal cutoff of 0.03 had a sensitivity of 70.4%, specificity of 65.6%, LR+ of 2.05-2.43, and LR- of 0.43–0.45 for predicting 90-day mortality following endobiliary stent placement (Table 4). The high and low cutoffs were identified to categorize patients with the lowest and highest risks of death. Patients with a risk score over 1.40 were identified as a high-risk group for 90-day mortality. Of these patients, 84.2% were correctly predicted TABLE 1 Patient characteristics and endoscopic interventions in the derivation and validation cohorts.

Characteristics	Derivation cohort (N = 339)	Validation cohort (N = 112)	P value	
le gender, n (%) 173 (51.0%)		64 (57.1%)	0.262	
Age (years)	64.2 ± 12.4	63.4 ± 12.5	0.572	
Body mass index (kg/m ²)	21.6 ± 3.8	22.5 ± 4.7	0.037	
Waiting time for ERCP (days)	19.0 (9.0–31.0)	20.5 (9.5-38.0)	0.119	
Type of malignancy				
Cholangiocarcinoma, n (%)	181 (53.4%)	61 (54.5%)	0.844	
Intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma	31 (17.1%)	12 (19.7%)	0.624	
Hilar cholangiocarcinoma	107 (59.1%)	37 (60.7%)	0.645	
Extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma	43 (23.8%)	12 (19.7%)	0.714	
Pancreatic cancer	120 (35.4%)	39 (34.8%)	0.912	
Gallbladder cancer	34 (10.0%)	11 (9.8%)	0.949	
Malignant IPMN	4 (1.2%)	1 (0.9%)	1.000	
ECOG performance-status score, n (%)				
1	58 (17.1%)	16 (14.3%)	0.484	
2	192 (56.6%)	71 (63.4%)	0.209	
3	89 (26.3%)	25 (22.3%)	0.406	
Clinical presentation, n (%)				
Abdominal pain	194 (57.2%)	62 (55.4%)	0.729	
Jaundice	303 (89.4%)	96 (85.7%)	0.292	
Fever	24 (7.1%)	6 (5.4%)	0.526	
Weight loss	216 (63.7%)	66 (58.9%)		
Ascending cholangitis	61 (18.0%)	21 (18.8%)	0.857	
Pre-endoscopic laboratory				
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	10.6 ± 3.0	10.8 ± 1.5	0.428	
Platelet (10 ⁹ /L)	319 (265–399)	323 (248-412)	0.724	
INR	1.4 ± 0.7	1.4 ± 0.6	0.938	
Total bilirubin (mg/dl)	19.2 ± 9.5	19.1 ± 10.0	0.973	
umin (g/dL) 3.2 ± 0.6		3.2 ± 0.6	0.765	
kaline phosphatase (IU/L) 465 (287–680)		427 (288–698)	0.783	
Creatinine (mg/dl)	0.8 (0.6–1.0)	0.8 (0.6–1.0)	0.546	
Cross-sectional imaging				
Size of obstructive tumor (cm)	3.8 (2.6–5.1)	3.6 (2.6–5.5)	0.896	
Hilar obstruction, n (%)	133 (39.2%)	45 (40.2%)	0.859	
Non-hilar obstruction, n (%)	206 (60.8%)	67 (59.8%)	0.859	
Intrahepatic obstruction	14 (4.1%)	7 (6.3%)	0.356	
Extrahepatic obstruction	192 (56.6%)	60 (53.6%)	0.571	
Combined obstruction, n (%)	14 (4.1%)	6 (5.4%)	0.599	
Vascular involvement, n (%)	161 (47.5%)	59 (52.7%)	0.341	
Portal vein invasion, n (%)	96 (28.3%)	45 (40.2%)	0.019	
Duodenal invasion, n (%)	31 (9.1%)	11 (9.8%)	0.831	
Liver metastasis, n (%)	116 (34.2%)	34 (30.4%)	0.452	
stant metastasis, n (%) 205 (60.5%)		67 (59.8%)	0.903	
Peritoneal carcinomatosis, n (%) 41 (12.1%)		12 (10.7%)	0.694	
Lymph node metastasis, n (%)	231 (68.0%)	80 (71.4%)	0.514	
Endoscopic intervention, n (%)				
Presence of metallic/plastic stent	219 (64.6%)/120 (35.4%)	76 (67.9%)/36 (32.1%)	0.530	
One stent placement	317 (93.5%)	106 (94.6%)	0.667	
One plastic stent placement	112 (33.0%)	34 (30.4%)	0.599	

(Continued)

Characteristics	Derivation cohort (N = 339)	Validation cohort (N = 112)	P value	
One metallic stent placement	205 (60.5%)	72 (64.3%)	0.472	
- Uncovered SEMs	199 (58.7%)	67 (59.8%)	0.835	
- Fully covered SEMs	4 (1.2%)	4 (3.6%)	0.110	
- Partially covered SEMs	2 (0.6%)	1 (0.9%)	0.576	
Two-stent placements	22 (6.5%)	6 (5.4%)	0.667	
Two metallic stents	12 (3.5%)	4 (3.6%)	1.000	
Two plastic stents	7 (2.1%)	2 (1.8%)	1.000	
One metallic and one plastic stent	3 (13.6%)	0	1.000	
Post-endoscopic outcomes				
Post-ERCP complications, n (%)	34 (10.0%)	13 (11.6%)	0.636	
Stent dysfunction, n (%)	92 (27.1%)	26 (23.2%)	0.413	
Stent patency time (days)	63 (28.0-105.0)	81 (40.0-159.0)	1.000	
Bilirubin improvement after stenting † , n (%)	240 (70.8%)	81 (72.3)	0.757	
Chemotherapy after ERCP, n (%)	49 (14.5%)	16 (14.3%)	0.965	

TABLE 1 Continued

Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation, median (interquartile range), or number (proportion) of patients with a condition.

IPMN, intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm; ECOG, Eastern cooperative oncology group; ERCP, endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography; INR, international normalized ratio; SEMs, self-expandable metallic stent.

[†]Defined by total bilirubin improvement of more than 50% from baseline within 2 weeks after ERCP-guided endobiliary stent placement.

(PPVs of 84%–85%). Patients with a risk score under -1.50 were identified as a low-risk group for 90-day mortality. Eighty-nine percent of these patients were correctly predicted (NPVs of 89%–93%).

The cutoffs were further explored by stratifying the prediction score into 4 intervals according to the quartiles for predicting the 90-day probability of death. In the derivation cohort, the cutoffs were as follows: scores < -0.83, scores of -0.83 to <0.07 (probability of death, 41.9%), scores of 0.07 to <0.58 (probability of death, 54.9%), and scores of \geq 0.58 (probability of death, 75.2%). The prediction model was then applied to the validation cohort. The cutoffs were as follows: scores < -0.83, scores of -0.83 to <0.07 (probability of death, 34.3%), scores of 0.07 to <0.58 (probability of death, 55.6%), and scores of \geq 0.58 (probability of death, 76.0%; Table 5).

Survival analysis at 90 days

During follow-up, 159 patients in the derivation cohort died. The median follow-up was 99 days (IQR, 47–239). The cumulative survival at 90 days after endobiliary stent placement was 52.8%. In the validation cohort, 49 patients died. The median follow-up was 114 days (IQR, 61–265). At 90 days after endobiliary stent placement, the cumulative survival was 56.3%. The cumulative survival was stratified according to the quartiles of the prediction score in the derivation and validation cohorts (Figure 2).

Discussion

Biliary obstruction caused by pancreaticobiliary tumors may lead to poor outcomes, including cholangitis, delay in treatment including chemotherapy, a decreased quality of life, and higher mortality. Understanding the factors associated with mortality due to this condition will inform how to effectively allocate resources. Our study showed that pre-endoscopic serum albumin level, intrahepatic biliary obstruction, stage IV cancer, improvement of hyperbilirubinemia within 2 weeks after stenting, and receiving chemotherapy were independent risk factors for 90day mortality in patients with pancreaticobiliary cancers.

Lower pre-endoscopic serum albumin levels were significantly associated with 90-day mortality. Albumin is a liver-synthesized plasmaprotein essential in immunomodulation, endothelium stability, and antioxidant activity (27). Hypoalbuminemia in unresectable MBO patients indicates a deterioration in liver function from long-standing biliary obstruction and has been associated with overall survival in previous studies (24, 27, 28). Hypoalbuminemia also reflects poor nutritional status due to systemic inflammation, precluding most advanced-stage MBO patients from receiving chemotherapy and contributing to a higher fatality rate. In patients with advanced liver disease, albumin levels are often low. Cirrhotic individuals were thus omitted from this investigation to minimize the potential confounding effect of pre-endoscopic albumin levels.

Intrahepatic biliary obstruction was significantly associated with 90-day mortality. Endoscopic-guided biliary decompression TABLE 2 Baseline characteristics and endoscopic intervention among the surviving and non-surviving groups in the derivation cohort.

Make gender, n (%) Sf (48.3%) Sf (45.1%) 0.230 Age (yam) 64.0 ± 12.7 64.4 ± 12.2 0.744 Marking me for ERCP (dap) 19.0 (30-30.0) 20.0 (30-32.0) 0.444 Vanisation for ERCP (dap) 19.0 (30-30.0) 20.0 (30-32.0) 0.444 Collargicarcinoma, n (%) 89 (49.4%) 9.2 (57.9%) 6.121 Intrahegiscic choing/accritoma 14 (15.7%) 17 (15.9%) 0.353 Flar choing/accritoma 21 (17.5%) 15 (35.3%) 0.452 Parcentic cancer 21 (17.5%) 15 (35.3%) 0.452 Colladies cancer 21 (17.5%) 16 (36.3%) 0.503 S and cancer 21 (17.5%) 35 (35.3%) 0.212 Malgica cancer 31 (15.9%) 42 (15.1%) 0.503 S and cancer 12 (15.3%) 35 (35.3%) 0.512	Characteristics	Survived (N = 180)	Deceased (N = 159)	P value	
App (pars)64.0 + 12.764.4 + 12.20.70Boly max sinde (bgn')10.7 × 3.421.4 × 4.10.640Variag unic for RLP (days)10.9 (00-30.0)20.9 (00-30.0)0.00Collagizactioners10.9 (00-30.0)10.0 (00-30.0)0.0 (00-30.0)Collagizactioners44 (15.7%)17 (16.5%)0.0 (00-30.0)Intrabeptic cholingicactioners44 (15.7%)17 (16.5%)0.0 (00-30.0)Thrabeptic cholingicactioners21 (21.6%)22.0 (20.9%)0.0 (20.9%)Parcetact cause:67 (57.2%)35 (35.3%)0.0 (20.9%)Callbadder cause:67 (57.2%)1.0 (20.9%)0.0 (20.9%)Callbadder cause:67 (57.2%)1.0 (20.9%)0.0 (20.9%)Callbadder cause:10.0 (56.3%)87 (54.7%)0.0 (20.9%)Callbadder cause:10.0 (56.3%)0.0 (20.9%)0.0 (20.9%)Callbadder cause:10.0 (56.3%)0.0 (20.9%)0.0 (20.9%)Callbadder cause:10.0 (20.9%)0.0 (20.9%)0.0 (20.9%)Callbad	Male gender, n (%)	87 (48.3%)	86 (54.1%)	0.290	
Body maked (dgm)21.7 : 1.421.4 (1.4 (1.4)0.408Waiting time for ERCP (day)21.0 (9.0-3.00)0.0 (9.0-3.00)0.040Pare of aniguamy21.0 (9.0-3.00)0.010Cholago carcinoma. 1 (%)84 (9.4%)22.(57.9%)0.033Hiller cholangboarcinoma14 (10.5%)22.(10.5%)0.030Extrahopatic cholangboarcinoma12 (12.6%)13.03.3%)0.050Extrahopatic cholangboarcinoma21 (12.7%)13.03.2%)0.063Gulfbadder cancer21 (11.7%)13.03.2%)0.063Boarcastic Cancer21 (11.7%)14.0 (10.9%)0.062EXTOP (Daring Cancer)10.0 (0.05.3%)44.0 (10.9%)0.062EXTOP (Daring Cancer)10.0 (0.05.3%)44.0 (0.05%)0.02020.10 (0.05.3%)44.0 (0.02%)0.020314.0 (12.9%)44.0 (0.05%)0.020Cancer16.0 (9.4%)14.0 (0.9%)0.004Abendra pin97.0 (1.9%)0.0100.004Second probability10.1 (2.6%)10.0 (1.9%)0.004Cancer16.0 (9.4%)14.0 (1.9%)0.004Needing cholangits31.0 (2.6%)10.0 (1.9%)0.004Needing cholangits31.2 (2.5%)10.1 (2.9%)0.004Needing cholangits31.2 (2.5%)10.1 (2.9%)0.004Needing cholangits31.2 (2.5%)10.0 (2.9%)0.004Needing cholangits31.2 (2.5%)10.0 (2.9%)0.004Needing cholangits10.2 (2.6%)10.0 (2.9%)0.004<	Age (years)	64.0 ± 12.7	64.4 ± 12.2	0.794	
Waiting for EACP (day)10.0 (90-300)20.0 (0-320)0.464Type of adjamacy992.07.5%)0.101Colongicacritoman. (%)94.04.5%)17.08.5%)0.533Harr donging carcinoma14.15.7%)17.08.5%)0.533Parceta carcer0.7 (17.2%)22.03.9%)0.533Colladiacy carcinoma21.02.6%)13.03.5%)0.636Colladiacy carcer0.7 (17.2%)10.05%)0.636Colladiacy carcer0.1 (1.0%)0.6360.636Colladiacy carcer10.1 (0.6%)0.6360.636Colladiacy carcer14.1 (8.5%)0.6160.636Colladiacy carcer14.1 (8.5%)0.6160.636214.0 (2.6%)0.6120.6160.616214.0 (2.6%)0.6120.6160.616214.0 (2.6%)10.0 (2.6%)0.6160.616214.0 (2.6%)14.0 (2.6%)0.6160.616210.0 (2.6%)10.0 (2.6%)0.6160.616210.0 (2.6%)10.0 (2.6%)0.6160.616210.0 (2.6%)10.0 (2.6%)0.6160.616210.0 (2.6%)10.0 (2.6%)0.6160.616210.0 (2.6%)10.0 (2.6%)0.6160.616210.0 (2.6%)10.0 (2.6%)0.6160.616210.0 (2.6%)10.0 (2.6%)0.6160.616210.0 (2.6%)10.0 (2.6%)0.6160.616210.0 (2.6%)10.0 (2.6%)0.616 </td <td>Body mass index (kg/m²)</td> <td>21.7 ± 3.4</td> <td>21.4 ± 4.1</td> <td>0.463</td>	Body mass index (kg/m ²)	21.7 ± 3.4	21.4 ± 4.1	0.463	
TypeJumba in the second se	Waiting time for ERCP (days)	19.0 (9.0-30.0)	20.0 (9.0-32.0)	0.468	
Chalangescanoma n(%)89 (04%)22 (07%)0.121Intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma14 (15.7%)17 (18.5%)0.533Intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma21 (23.6%)22 (23.5%)0.632Darcoarle cancer21 (11.7%)13 (8.2%)0.826Galbadder cancer21 (11.7%)13 (8.2%)0.826COCO performance-status score, n(%)21 (11.7%)13 (8.2%)0.826COCO performance-status score, n(%)34 (15.1%)0.5350.123134 (18.9%)34 (15.1%)0.5350.123241 (22.8%)46 (0.0.5%)0.124Consolidities' (13.3.9%)20 (14.2%)0.8040.126214 (12.8%)46 (0.0.5%)0.126214 (22.8%)46 (0.0.5%)0.126214 (12.8%)46 (0.0.5%)0.126214 (12.8%)10.12 (8.9%)0.106214 (12.8%)10.12 (8.9%)0.106210.12 (25.6%)114 (17.1%)0.004210.25 (25.6%)114 (17.1%)0.004210.25 (25.6%)114 (17.1%)0.004210.25 (25.6%)114 (17.1%)0.004210.25 (25.6%)114 (17.1%)0.004210.25 (25.6%)114 (17.1%)0.004210.25 (25.6%)114 (17.1%)0.004210.25 (25.6%)15.16.80.021210.25 (25.6%)15.16.80.021210.25 (25.6%)15.16.80.021210.26 (25.6%	Type of malignancy				
Intrabusic debangescritorian14 (18.7%)17 (18.5%)0.53Hiar dolungioscritorian24 (30.0%)23 (62.0%)0.53Detrabeysic dolungioscritorian67 (52.9%)53 (03.3%)0.455Galibladier cancer67 (52.9%)13 (62.3%)0.626Malguant INN3 (17.0%)13 (62.3%)0.626Borger concers at (%)24 (15.1%)0.626COC performance-state score, n (%)48 (02.3%)0.621Multip concorbidities'(10.5(3.9%)67 (54.7%)0.623Multip concorbidities'(10.3(3.9%)0.6240.623Multip concorbidities'61 (03.9%)26 (02.9%)0.626Sector at (20.9%)16 (03.9%)0.6260.626Multip concorbidities'10 (16.9%)0.6280.626Concert at (20.9%)10 (16.9%)0.6280.626Nearding (301)10 (12.5%)114 (71.7%)0.628Nearding (301)10 (12.5%)114 (71.7%)0.620Patier (10 ² 1,1)13 (12.5%)12.5 (28.490)0.621Namigubin (gdl)13 4 1.513 (15.6%)0.621Namigubin (gdl)13 4 1.513 (15.6%)0.621Namigubin (gdl)13 (15.6%)14 (12.8%)0.621Namigubin (gdl)13 (15.6%)14 (12.8%)0.621Namigubin (gdl)13 (15.6%)12.5 (12.9%)0.621Namigubin (gdl)13 (15.6%)14 (12.8%)0.621Namigubin (gdl)13 (15.6%)14 (12.8%)0.621 <trr>Namigubin (gdl)13 (15.6%)<!--</td--><td>Cholangiocarcinoma, n (%)</td><td>89 (49.4%)</td><td>92 (57.9%)</td><td>0.121</td></trr>	Cholangiocarcinoma, n (%)	89 (49.4%)	92 (57.9%)	0.121	
Hilr chalangioarcinoma54 (300%)53 (329)0.319Extraheptic chalangioarcinoma21 (23.6%)22 (23.9%)0.323Galbiader cancer21 (11.7%)13 (8.2%)0.326Maignant IPMN23 (17.9%)13 (8.2%)0.326COG performance-status score, n (%)113 (8.2%)0.353241 (12.8%)44 (10.2%)0.053341 (12.8%)44 (10.2%)0.010Mained personation75 (53.9%)75 (61.0%)0.016Conception16 (10.94.4%)14 (10.3%)0.064Janadic16 (10.94.4%)14 (10.3%)0.064Perer16 (89.9%)85 (50.9%)0.016Veight Jos10.12 (55.7%)10.14 (71.7%)0.016Veight Jos10.12 (55.7%)10.14 (71.7%)0.016Perendoscipt Indontry10.2 (56.7%)10.4 ± 4.00.017Pandig chalingtis13.1 2.5 (28-39)32.2 (28-40.1)0.016Na13.1 5.0 515.1 6.00.021Ablin phosphase (UUL)35.2 (28-53)22.0 (19.0-71.60)0.016Ablin phosphase (UUL)34.4 0.631.4 0.6<0.001	Intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma	14 (15.7%)	17 (18.5%)	0.353	
Extrahegetic cholongiocarcinoma21 (23.6%)22 (23.9%)0.052Pancentic cancer67 (57.2%)53 (3.3%)0.645Callbalder cancer11 (17%)10.6%)0.626Maignant IPMN51 (17%)10.6%)0.626ECOF performance-states score, n (%)41 (18.9%)42 (15.1%)0.6302105 (58.3%)87 (54.7%)0.630341 (23.8%)63 (3.33)0.012Multiple consolutility'61 (3.9%)35 (3.33)0.016Consolutility'61 (3.9%)70 (6.0%)0.016Ianadac70 (5.9%)70 (6.0%)0.016Consolutility'10 (5.6%)10 (2.6%)0.016Neeming binin10 (2.6%)10 (1.7%)0.014Accending obingitis31 2.15 (28.8-3%)0.0120.016Neeming bining in10 7.2 1.810.4 2.40.027Palacit (0 ¹ / ₁)13 ± 0.531 ± 0.60.012Nacending obingitis13 ± 0.531 ± 0.60.001Nacending obingitis13 ± 0.531 ± 0.60.001Naling hopphatase (U/L)47.5 (27.0-647.5)22.0 (30971.60)0.056Naling hopphatase (U/L)47.5 (27.0-647.5)22.0 (30971.60)0.056Naling hopphatase (U/L)10 (7.9%)9.0 (23.3)0.056Naling hopphatase (U/L)10 (7.9%)0.0570.056Naling hopphatase (U/L)10 (10 (59.4%)10 (10 (59.4%)0.056Naling hopphatase (U/L)10 (10 (59.4%)10 (10 (59.4%)0.056Na	Hilar cholangiocarcinoma	54 (30.0%)	53 (62.9%)	0.510	
Pancala cancer6 (37.2%)5 (33.3%)0.458Galiblader ancer1 (10.7%)1 (0.6%)0.868Malignari IRVN3 (10.7%)1 (10.6%)0.8585 COG performance status score, n (W)14 (10.3%)0.91314 (10.5%)3 (5 (5 4 7 %)0.91234 (10.2%)4 & (0.02%)0.912Mathie Comorb diffies'4 (10.2%)4 & (0.02%)0.912Colical personal difficience1 (10.8%)4 & (0.02%)0.916Colical personal difficience9 (5 1.5%)9 (5 0.6%)0.916Pancer difficience1 (10.8%)0.9160.916Colical personal difficience1 (10.5%)0.9160.916Partee difficience1 (10.5%)0.9160.916Veradosci difficience1 0 2 (5 0.5%)1 1 4 (7 1.5%)0.916Paredosci difficience1 0 2 (5 0.5%)1 1 4 (7 1.5%)0.916Veradosci difficience1 0 2 (5 0.5%)2 2 (0.960 - 716.0)0.916Paredosci difficience1 0 2 5 2 5 - 3932 2 0 (90.0 - 716.0)0.916Na Cont difficience1 0 2 5 1 2 5 - 52 1 1 2 9 00.916Na Cont difficience1 0 2 1 2 0 - 60.752 1 1 2 9 00.916Data bind bind bind bind (Diff)1 0 5 (0 - 20.15)0.9160.916Na Cont difficience1 0 0 (5 0.5%)0 0 0 0 - 0.910.916Data bind bind bind bind bind bind bind bind	Extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma	21 (23.6%)	22 (23.9%)	0.352	
Gallbadder cancer21 (11.%)13 (8.3%)0.826Malgant PMN21 (11.%)10 (0.5%)0.826CGC performance-status score, n (%)24 (15.1%)0.535234 (16.9%)24 (15.1%)0.501210 (5.3.%)27 (3.3.%)0.921341 (2.2.%)44 (8.0.2%)0.921Mulpic consorbiditis ¹ 61 (3.3.%)27 (3.3.%)0.921China pesentation97 (51.9%)97 (0.1%)0.968Gandaer10 (56.7%)97 (0.1%)0.968Fever16 (8.9.%)8 (5.0%)0.676Veight loss10 (2.56.7%)10 (1.7.%)0.964Neacongic balongtis10 (2.56.7%)10 4 ± 4.00.976Veight loss10 (2.56.7%)10 4 ± 4.00.921Pateler (07)110.7 ± 1.810 4 ± 4.00.921Naccongic balongtis10 2 1.5 (2.8893)10 4 ± 4.00.921Nak1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.921Otago (10,1)1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.921Nak1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.921Nak1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.921Otago (10,1)1.3 ± 0.51.0 ± 0.00.921Nak1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.921Nak1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.921Nak1.4 ± 0.51.6 ± 0.51.6 ± 0.5Nak1.4 ± 0.51.6 ± 0.51.6 ± 0.5Nak1.4 ± 0.51.6 ± 0.51.6 ± 0.5Nak1.4 ± 0.51.6 ± 0.51.6 ± 0.5 <td>Pancreatic cancer</td> <td>67 (37.2%)</td> <td>53 (33.3%)</td> <td>0.455</td>	Pancreatic cancer	67 (37.2%)	53 (33.3%)	0.455	
Malganat IPMN3 (1.7%)1 (0.6%)0.602324 (15.1%)0.5132105 (58.3%)87 (54.7%)0.603341 (22.8%)48 (0.2%)0.021Mulpic comorbiditis'0.61233 (33.3%)0.916Clincal presention97 (55.9%)97 (61.0%)0.868Jandiac161 (89.4%)48 (50.9%)0.606Fever16 (89.4%)0.8160.016Conspansion0.02 (56.7%)114 (71.7%)0.004Accading chalongitis0.02 (56.7%)114 (71.7%)0.004Accading chalongitis10.2 (56.7%)114 (71.7%)0.001Accading chalongitis10.2 (56.7%)11.4 (71.7%)0.001Accading chalongitis10.2 (56.7%)10.4 ±4.010.071Chalong chalongitis10.2 (56.7%)10.4 ±0.010.001Accading chalongitis10.2 (56.7%)10.4 ±4.010.011Chalong chalongitis10.2 (56.7%)10.4 ±0.010.011Chalong chalongitis10.2 (56.7%)10.4 ±0.010.011Chalong chalongitis10.2 (56.7%)10.4 ±0.010.011Chalong chalongitis10.2 (56.7%)20.0 ±0.010.011Chalongitis <td< td=""><td>Gallbladder cancer</td><td>21 (11.7%)</td><td>13 (8.2%)</td><td>0.286</td></td<>	Gallbladder cancer	21 (11.7%)	13 (8.2%)	0.286	
BOC Genomenaes subset with the set of	Malignant IPMN	3 (1.7%)	1 (0.6%)	0.626	
134 (18.9%)24 (15.1%)0.0352105 (53.%)37 (54.7%)0.035314 (22.8%)48 (30.2%)0.012Mulpic comorbidites*61 (33.9%)0.031Charlesentation77 (35.9%)77 (31.9%)0.068Janadice16 (89.4%)142 (89.3%)0.068Fever16 (89.4%)142 (89.3%)0.068Secondic balanciation102 (55.7%)114 (71.7%)0.061Ascanding chalengitis31 (12.2%)30 (18.9%)0.067Perotocic balanciation10.7 ± 1.810.4 ± 4.00.77Pladet (10 ⁷ /1)31.2 5 (28.9-393)32.08.8-104)0.021Total bilinshin (mg/dl)10.7 ± 1.810.4 ± 4.00.021NR13.2 5 (28.9-393)32.08.8-104)0.021Catatine (mg/dl)10.7 ± 9.721.1 ± 9.00.021Catatine (mg/dl)34.4 0.631.1 0.60.022Catatine (mg/dl)34.0 0.631.2 0.60.022Catatine (mg/dl)34.0 0.631.2 0.60.022Catatine (mg/dl)31.0 (23.5)0.0210.021Data bilinshin (mg/dl)31.0 (23.5)0.0210.021Catatine (mg/dl)34.0 (23.5)0.0210.021Catatine (mg/dl)31.0 (23.5)0.0210.021Data bilinshin (mg/dl)31.0 (23.5)0.0210.021Catatine (mg/dl)31.0 (23.5)0.0210.021Catatine (mg/dl)31.0 (23.5)0.0210.021Data bilinshin (mg/dl)31.0 (23.5) </td <td>ECOG performance-status score, n (%)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	ECOG performance-status score, n (%)				
2105 (98.%)87 (54.%)0.030341 (22.%)45 (0.2%)0.12Multip conorbiditis ¹ 61 (0.3%)0.12Clinical presention97 (51.%)97 (61.%)0.18Jandac161 (9.4%)142 (9.3%)0.06Fever16 (9.4%)142 (9.3%)0.064Veight DS102 (56.7%)114 (71.5%)0.004Ascending cholargitis31 (1.2%)30 (18.9%)0.064Ascending cholargitis31 (1.2%)30 (18.9%)0.064Preser102 (56.7%)114 (71.5%)0.004Pachet Diff (JL)10.7 ± 1.810.4 ± 4.00.77Placted U0 ⁷ /131.2 5 (28.8-393)322 (28.4-04)0.013Placted U0 ⁷ /131.2 5 (28.8-393)322 (28.4-04)0.021Dabming (JL)13.2 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.021Abuling (JL)13.2 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.021Abuling (JL)42.75 (27.0.0.647.5)52.20 (09.0.71.60)0.021Abuling (JL)42.75 (27.0.0.647.5)52.20 (09.0.71.60)0.021Abuling (JL)42.75 (27.0.0.647.5)52.20 (09.0.71.60)0.021Abuling (JL)42.75 (27.0.0.647.5)52.20 (09.0.71.60)0.021Abuling (JL)42.75 (27.0.0.647.5)52.20 (09.0.71.60)0.021Bie of structure (LTM)9.10 (27.5%)4.1 (28.5%)0.021Abuling (JL)10.75 (16.5%)4.1 (28.5%)0.021Abuling (JL)10.75 (16.5%)4.1 (28.5%)0.021Abuling (JL)10.75 (16.5%)	1	34 (18.9%)	24 (15.1%)	0.355	
341 (22%)48 (30.2%)0.121Mulge conorbidities'(3.03%)0.912Clinical presentation77 (53.9%)97 (61.0%)0.168Jandarie161 (89.4%)142 (89.3%)0.868Perer16 (89.4%)142 (89.3%)0.868Rever16 (89.4%)142 (89.3%)0.808Weight loos10 (25.6%)11 (71.7%)0.001Accuting changitis3.1 (72.9%)3.0 (18.9%)0.801Perecord10 (25.6%)10 (14.4.0)0.372Patalet (07.1)1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.023NR1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.023Constraint (11.1)3.4 ± 0.63.1 ± 0.50.222Albaine polytates (11.1)3.4 ± 0.63.1 ± 0.50.021Creatine (ng/d)0.8 (0.7-0.9)0.8 (0.6-1.0)0.51Description (11.1)3.9 (225.5)4.1 (18-5.8)0.021Creatine (ng/d)3.9 (225.5)4.1 (18-5.8)0.021Creatine (ng/d)0.8 (0.7-0.9)0.8 (0.6-1.0)0.51Disc of obstruction, n(%)3.9 (225.5)4.1 (18-5.8)0.021Intraheguit obstruction, n(%)3.9 (225.5)4.1 (18-5.8)0.021Construction, n(%)3.9 (225.7)4.1 (18-5.8)0.021Intraheguit obstruction, n(%)3.9 (225.7)4.1 (18-5.8)0.021Intraheguit obstruction, n(%)3.9 (225.7)4.1 (18-5.8)0.021Construction, n(%)3.9 (225.7)4.1 (18-5.8)0.021Intraheguit obstruction, n(%)<	2	105 (58.3%)	87 (54.7%)	0.503	
Multiple conorbidities61 (339%)53 (33.%)0.918Chinal presentationAbdominal pain97 (51.9%)9.76 (1.9%)0.818Jandice161 (89.4%)14 (28.3%)0.016Fever16 (89.9%)8 (5.0%)0.016Weight loos10 (25.5%)114 (71.7%)0.004Ascending chalangitis10 (25.5%)114 (71.7%)0.004Areadoscilatorior312.5 (258-393)322 (268-404)0.037Piatel (0 ⁷ /1)312.5 (258-393)322 (268-404)0.031Otal bilmsin (ng/d1)17.5 ± 9.71.1 ± 9.00.010Albamin (gdL)3.4 ± 0.63.1 ± 0.6<0.001	3	41 (22.8%)	48 (30.2%)	0.122	
Clincial presentationAbdomin pain $?$ 7 (53.9%) $?$ 7 (61.0%) 0.16 Jundice $?$ 7 (61.0%) $?$ 7 (61.0%) 0.16 Jundice $16 (89.4\%)$ $14 (2 (89.3\%)$ 0.010 Perer $16 (89.4\%)$ $10 (2 (6.7\%)$ $114 (17.\%)$ 0.001 Algebita to $10 (2 (6.7\%)$ $114 (17.\%)$ 0.001 0.0101 Areador pholangitis $10 (2 (5.7\%)$ $114 (17.\%)$ 0.001 Pre-ndoscip claotator $10 (2 (5.7\%)$ $0.10 (4 ± 0.01)$ 0.012 Pre-ndoscip claotator $13 (2 (5.2 (5.8 - 3.3))$ $32 (2 (6.8 - 4.01)$ 0.021 Pre-ndoscip claotator $13 (2 (5.5 - 5.9 - 3.01)$ 0.021 0.021 Pre-ndoscip claotator $13 (2 (5.5 - 5.9 - 3.01)$ 0.012 0.021 Pre-ndoscip claotator $13 (2 (5.5 - 5.9 - 3.01)$ 0.012 0.012 Pre-ndoscip claotator $31 (2 (5.5 - 3.01)$ 0.021 0.021 Pre-ndoscip claotator $31 (2 (5.7 - 3.01 + 2.01)$ 0.021 Pre-ndoscip claotator $39 (2 (2.3 - 5.01 + 2.01)$ 0.012 Pre-ndoscip claotator $31 (2 (5.7 + 3.01 + 2.01)$ 0.021 Pre-ndoscip claotator $31 (2 (5.7 + 3.01 + 2.01)$ 0.012 Pre-ndoscip claotator $39 (2 (2.3 + 5.01 + 2.01)$ 0.012 Pre-ndoscip claotator $31 (2 (5.7 + 3.01 + 2.01)$ 0.021 Pre-ndoscip claotator $31 (2 (5.7 + 3.01 + 2.01)$ 0.021 Pre-ndoscip claotator $31 (2 (5.7 + 3.01 + 2.01)$ 0.021 Pre-ndoscip claotator $31 (2 (5.7 + 3.01 + 2.01)$ <td< td=""><td>Multiple comorbidities[†]</td><td>61 (33.9%)</td><td>53 (33.3%)</td><td>0.914</td></td<>	Multiple comorbidities [†]	61 (33.9%)	53 (33.3%)	0.914	
Abdominal pain97 (53.9%)97 (61.0%)0.161Jandre16 (89.4%)14 (89.3%)0.068Fever16 (89.4%)8 (50.%)0.167Weight los10 (2 (5.7%)14 (17.7%)0.069Ascending cholangitis31 (17.2%)30 (18.9%)0.694Fever endoscopic laboratory10 (2 (5.7%)10.4 ± 4.00.371Pladed (10 ⁹ /L)10.7 ± 1.810.4 ± 4.00.371Pladed (10 ⁹ /L)13.2 (258-393)322 (268-404)0.001Nactory17.5 ± 9.72.1 ± 9.00.001Ablumin (gdL)3.4 ± 0.63.1 ± 0.6<0.012	Clinical presentation				
Jandice161 (89.4%)142 (89.3%)0.968Fever16 (8.9%)8 (5.0%)0.167Weigh los102 (56.7%)114 (71.7%)0.064Ascendra golangits102 (56.7%)114 (71.7%)0.064Ascendra golangits10.7 ± 1.810.4 ± 4.00.377Pateol (0 ⁹ /L)10.7 ± 1.810.4 ± 4.00.371Pateol (10 ⁹ /L)12.5 (258-393)322 (288-404)0.403NR1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.001Alburin (gdl)17.5 ± 9.721.1 ± 9.00.001Alburin (gdl)34 ± 0.63.1 ± 0.6<0.001	Abdominal pain	97 (53.9%)	97 (61.0%)	0.186	
Fver16 (8.9%)8 (5.0%)0.107Weight los102 (5.6%)114 (7.7%)0.004Acendos changtito10.7 (2.6%)30.1050.005Pre-ndoscopic laboator10.7 ± 1.810.4 ± 4.00.071Placlet (10 ⁰ /L)312.5 (258-393)32.2 (268-404)0.021INR1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.021Total binshin (ngdl)1.7 ± 9.721.1 ± 9.00.021Albumin (çdL)42.5 (270647.5)52.2 (03071.60)0.021Albumin (çdL)42.5 (270647.5)52.2 (03071.60)0.021Creatinie (ng/d)0.8 (0.7-0.9)0.8 (0.6-1.0)0.515Creatinie (ng/d)0.8 (0.7-0.9)0.8 (0.6-1.0)0.516Alba obstructiva tumor (m)3.9 (2.2-3.5)4.1 (2.8-5.8)0.021Mar obstruction, n (%)7.3 (40.6%)60 (37.7%)0.506Non-hilar obstruction, n (%)3.0 (2.7%)1.0 (6.9%)0.516Markopatic obstruction, n (%)3.0 (1.7%)1.1 (6.9%)0.051Combined obstruction, n (%)8.4 (4.%)6.3 (8.%)0.222Oral vein invasion, n (%)4.5 (2.5.%)5.1 (3.2.%)0.612Distant entastasis, n (%)4.9 (2.7%)4.0 (2.0%)0.012Distant entastasis, n (%)4.0 (2.7%)0.0100.012Distant entastasis, n (%)4.0 (2.7%)0.0100.012Distant entastasis, n (%)4.5 (5.0%)5.1 (3.2.%)0.021Distant entastasis, n (%)4.0 (2.7%)0.0100.012Distant entastasis, n (%	Jaundice	161 (89.4%)	142 (89.3%)	0.968	
Weight loss102 (56.%)114 (71.%)0.004Ascending cholangitis31 (17.%)30 (18.%)0.644Henoscopic laborator0.015.%)0.016.%)Henoscopic laborator10.7 ± 1.810.4 ± 4.00.377Plachet (10 ⁹ /L)312.5 (258-393)22.2 (268-404)0.001INR1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.021Albumin (g/dL)3.4 ± 0.63.1 ± 0.6<0.001	Fever	16 (8.9%)	8 (5.0%)	0.167	
Acroding cholongitis 31 (17.2%) 30 (18.9%) 0.049 Pre-endoscopic laboratory 10.7 ± 1.8 10.4 ± 4.0 0.377 Platel (10 ⁰ /L) 312.5 (258–393) 322 (268–404) 0.401 NR 1.3 ± 0.5 3.1 ± 9.0 0.001 Albumin (g/dl) 1.4 ± 0.6 3.1 ± 0.6 <0.001	Weight loss	102 (56.7%)	114 (71.7%)	0.004	
Pre-endory laboratory Instance Instance Henoglobin (g/dL) 10.7 ± 1.8 10.4 ± 4.0 0.37 Placlet (10 ⁹ /L) 312.5 (258-393) 322 (268-404) 0.403 INR 1.3 ± 0.5 1.5 ± 0.8 0.023 Total bilrubin (ng/dl) 17.5 ± 9.7 21.1 ± 9.0 0.001 Albamin (g/dL) 42.75 (270.0-647.5) 522.0 (309.0-716.0) 0.027 Creatinine (ng/dl) 0.8 (0.7-0.9) 0.8 (0.6-1.0) 0.016 Alkaline phosphatase (IU/L) 2.52.5 (270.0-647.5) 522.0 (309.0-716.0) 0.027 Creatinine (ng/dl) 0.8 (0.7-0.9) 0.8 (0.6-1.0) 0.016 Milar obstructive tumor (cm) 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Milar obstructive tumor (cm) 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Non-hilar obstructive tumor (cm) 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Non-hilar obstructive tumor (cm) 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Non-hilar obstructive tumor (cm) 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Non-hilar obstructive (ng/d)	Ascending cholangitis	31 (17.2%)	30 (18.9%)	0.694	
Henoglobin (g/d1) 10.7 ± 1.8 10.4 ± 4.0 0.377 Placlet (10 ⁹ /l.) 312.5 (258-393) 322 (268-404) 0.430 INR 1.3 ± 0.5 1.5 ± 0.8 0.023 Total bilrubin (mg/d1) 17.5 ± 9.7 21.1 ± 9.0 0.001 Albaine phosphatas (U/L) 3.4 ± 0.6 3.1 ± 0.6 <0.001	Pre-endoscopic laboratory				
Platelt (10 ⁹ /L)312.5 (258-393)322 (268-404)0.430INR1.3 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.001Albumin (g/d)7.5 ± 9.72.1.1 ± 9.00.001Albumin (g/d)3.4 ± 0.63.1 ± 0.6<0.001	Hemoglobin (g/dL)	10.7 ± 1.8	10.4 ± 4.0	0.377	
NR1.5 ± 0.51.5 ± 0.80.023Total bilrubin (ng/dl)17.5 ± 9.721.1 ± 9.00.001Albumin (g/dl)3.4 ± 0.63.1 ± 0.6<0.001	Platelet (10 ⁹ /L)	312.5 (258-393)	322 (268–404)	0.430	
Total bilirubin (mg/dl)17.5 ± 9.721.1 ± 9.00.001Albumin (g/dl)3.4 ± 0.63.1 ± 0.6< 0.001	INR	1.3 ± 0.5	1.5 ± 0.8	0.023	
Abumin (g/d.) 3.4 ± 0.6 3.1 ± 0.6 < 0.001 Atkaline phosphatase (U/L) 427.5 (270.0-647.5) 522.0 (309.0-71.60) 0.027 Creatinine (mg/d) 0.8 (0.7-0.9) 0.8 (0.6-1.0) 0.515 Creas-sectional imagin 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Hilar obstruction, n (%) 73 (40.6%) 60 (37.7%) 0.596 Non-hilar obstruction, n (%) 107 (59.4%) 99 (62.3%) 0.596 Intrahepatic obstruction 3 (1.7%) 11 (6.9%) 0.605 Combined obstruction, n (%) 104 (57.8%) 88 (55.3%) 0.652 Combined obstruction, n (%) 80 (44.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.232 Vacuar involvement, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.862 Divert invasion, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.862 Liver metastasis, n (%) 39 (51.7%) 11 (6.9%) 0.015 Distant metastasis, n (%) 39 (51.7%) 12 (70.4%) 0.802 Liver metastasis, n (%) 39 (51.7%) 11 (6.9%) 0.015 Distant metastasis, n (%) 12	Total bilirubin (mg/dl)	17.5 ± 9.7	21.1 ± 9.0	0.001	
Akaline phosphatase (IU/L) 427.5 (27.0.0-647.5) 522.0 (309.0-716.0) 0.027 Creatinine (mg/d) 0.8 (0.7-0.9) 0.8 (0.6-1.0) 0.515 Cross-sectional imaging 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Hilar obstructive tumor (cm) 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Hilar obstruction, n (%) 73 (40.6%) 60 (37.7%) 0.596 Non-hilar obstruction, n (%) 107 (59.4%) 9.9 (62.3%) 0.596 Intrahepatic obstruction 3 (1.7%) 11 (6.9%) 0.015 Extrahepatic obstruction, n (%) 8 (4.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.652 Combined obstruction, n (%) 8 (4.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.232 Portal vein invasion, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.149 Dudenal invasion, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.804 Iver metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) 0.001 Ivertan etastasis, n (%) 30 (17.6%) 10.10 0.011 Ivertan etastasis, n (%) 14 (7.8%) 27 (17.0%) 0.010 Ivertan etastasis, n (%) </td <td>Albumin (g/dL)</td> <td>3.4 ± 0.6</td> <td>3.1 ± 0.6</td> <td>< 0.001</td>	Albumin (g/dL)	3.4 ± 0.6	3.1 ± 0.6	< 0.001	
Creatinine (mg/dl) 0.8 (0.7-0.9) 0.8 (0.6-1.0) 0.515 Cross-sectional imaging 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Hilar obstructive tumor (cm) 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Hilar obstruction, n (%) 73 (40.6%) 60 (37.7%) 0.596 Non-hilar obstruction, n (%) 107 (59.4%) 9.9 (62.3%) 0.501 Extrahepatic obstruction 3.1 (7.%) 11 (6.9%) 0.505 Combined obstruction, n (%) 84 (4.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.523 Oxacular involvement, n (%) 80 (44.4%) 81 (50.9%) 0.232 Ortal vein invasion, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.404 Dudenal invasion, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.604 Otistant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.001 Umph node metastasis, n (%) 120 (66.7%) 111 (69.8%) 0.535 Endocopic intervention, n(%) 20.0 (13.0-30.0) 20.0 (15.0-30.0) 0.413 Diameter of intrahepatic biliary dilatation (mm) 16.0 ± 6.5 16.3 ± 6.5 0.225	Alkaline phosphatase (IU/L)	427.5 (270.0-647.5)	522.0 (309.0-716.0)	0.027	
Cross-sectional imaging Star of obstructive tumor (cm) 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Hilar obstruction, n(%) 73 (40.6%) 60 (37.7%) 0.596 Non-hilar obstruction, n(%) 107 (59.4%) 99 (62.3%) 0.596 Intrahepatic obstruction 3 (1.7%) 11 (6.9%) 0.015 Extrahepatic obstruction 104 (57.8%) 88 (55.3%) 0.652 Combined obstruction, n(%) 8 (4.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.757 Vacular involvement, n(%) 80 (44.4%) 81 (50.9%) 0.232 Portal vein invasion, n(%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.149 Duodenal invasion, n(%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.004 Distant metastais, n(%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.001	Creatinine (mg/dl)	0.8 (0.7–0.9)	0.8 (0.6–1.0)	0.515	
Size of obstructive tumor (cm) 3.9 (2.2-3.5) 4.1 (2.8-5.8) 0.004 Hilar obstruction, n (%) 73 (40.6%) 60 (37.7%) 0.596 Non-hilar obstruction, n (%) 107 (59.4%) 99 (62.3%) 0.596 Intrahepatic obstruction 3 (1.7%) 11 (6.9%) 0.015 Extrahepatic obstruction 104 (57.8%) 88 (55.3%) 0.652 Combined obstruction, n (%) 8 (4.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.757 Vascular involvement, n (%) 80 (44.4%) 81 (50.9%) 0.232 Portal vein invasion, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.004 Duodenal invasion, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.862 Liver metastasis, n (%) 12 (70.4%) <0.010	Cross-sectional imaging				
Hilar obstruction, n (%) 73 (40.6%) 60 (37.7%) 0.596 Non-hilar obstruction, n (%) 107 (59.4%) 99 (62.3%) 0.596 Intrahepatic obstruction 3 (1.7%) 11 (6.9%) 0.015 Extrahepatic obstruction 104 (57.8%) 88 (55.3%) 0.652 Combined obstruction, n (%) 8 (4.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.757 Vascular involvement, n (%) 80 (44.4%) 81 (50.9%) 0.232 Portal vein invasion, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.862 Liver metastasis, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.804 Distant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.010	Size of obstructive tumor (cm)	3.9 (2.2–3.5)	4.1 (2.8–5.8)	0.004	
Non-hilar obstruction, n (%) 107 (59.4%) 99 (62.3%) 0.596 Intrahepatic obstruction 3 (1.7%) 11 (6.9%) 0.015 Extrahepatic obstruction 104 (57.8%) 88 (55.3%) 0.652 Combined obstruction, n (%) 8 (4.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.757 Vascular involvement, n (%) 80 (44.4%) 81 (50.9%) 0.232 Portal vein invasion, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.149 Duodenal invasion, n (%) 16 (8.9%) 15 (9.4%) 0.862 Liver metastasis, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.004 Distant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.001	Hilar obstruction, n (%)	73 (40.6%)	60 (37.7%)	0.596	
Intrahepatic obstruction 3 (1.7%) 11 (6.9%) 0.015 Extrahepatic obstruction 104 (57.8%) 88 (55.3%) 0.652 Combined obstruction, n (%) 8 (4.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.757 Vascular involvement, n (%) 80 (44.4%) 81 (50.9%) 0.232 Portal vein invasion, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.449 Duodenal invasion, n (%) 16 (8.9%) 15 (9.4%) 0.862 Liver metastasis, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.004 Distant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.001	Non-hilar obstruction, n (%)	107 (59.4%)	99 (62.3%)	0.596	
Extrahepatic obstruction 104 (57.8%) 88 (55.3%) 0.652 Combined obstruction, n (%) 8 (4.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.757 Vascular involvement, n (%) 80 (44.4%) 81 (50.9%) 0.232 Portal vein invasion, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.149 Duodenal invasion, n (%) 16 (8.9%) 15 (9.4%) 0.862 Liver metastasis, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.004 Distant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.001	Intrahepatic obstruction	3 (1.7%)	11 (6.9%)	0.015	
Combined obstruction, n (%) 8 (4.4%) 6 (3.8%) 0.757 Vascular involvement, n (%) 80 (44.4%) 81 (50.9%) 0.232 Portal vein invasion, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.149 Duodenal invasion, n (%) 16 (8.9%) 15 (9.4%) 0.862 Liver metastasis, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.004 Distant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.001	Extrahepatic obstruction	104 (57.8%)	88 (55.3%)	0.652	
Vascular involvement, n (%) 80 (44.4%) 81 (50.9%) 0.232 Portal vein invasion, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.149 Duodenal invasion, n (%) 16 (8.9%) 15 (9.4%) 0.862 Liver metastasis, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.004 Distant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.001	Combined obstruction, n (%)	8 (4.4%)	6 (3.8%)	0.757	
Portal vein invasion, n (%) 45 (25.0%) 51 (32.1%) 0.149 Duodenal invasion, n (%) 16 (8.9%) 15 (9.4%) 0.862 Liver metastasis, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.004 Distant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.001	Vascular involvement, n (%)	80 (44.4%)	81 (50.9%)	0.232	
Duodenal invasion, n (%) 16 (8.9%) 15 (9.4%) 0.862 Liver metastasis, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.004 Distant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.001	Portal vein invasion, n (%)	45 (25.0%)	51 (32.1%)	0.149	
Liver metastasis, n (%) 49 (27.2%) 67 (42.1%) 0.004 Distant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) <0.001	Duodenal invasion, n (%)	16 (8.9%)	15 (9.4%)	0.862	
Distant metastasis, n (%) 93 (51.7%) 112 (70.4%) < 0.001 Peritoneal carcinomatosis, n (%) 14 (7.8%) 27 (17.0%) 0.010 Lymph node metastasis, n (%) 120 (66.7%) 111 (69.8%) 0.535 Endoscopic intervention, n (%) 20.0 (13.0–30.0) 20.0 (15.0–30.0) 0.143 Diameter of intrahepatic biliary dilatation (mm) 16.0 ± 6.5 16.3 ± 6.5 0.225	Liver metastasis, n (%)	49 (27.2%)	67 (42.1%)	0.004	
Peritoneal carcinomatosis, n (%) 14 (7.8%) 27 (17.0%) 0.010 Lymph node metastasis, n (%) 120 (66.7%) 111 (69.8%) 0.535 Endoscopic intervention, n (%) 20.0 (13.0–30.0) 20.0 (15.0–30.0) 0.143 Length of biliary stricture (mm) 20.0 (13.0–30.0) 20.0 (15.0–30.0) 0.143 Diameter of intrahepatic biliary dilatation (mm) 16.0 ± 6.5 16.3 ± 6.5 0.225	Distant metastasis, n (%)	93 (51.7%)	112 (70.4%)	< 0.001	
Lymph node metastasis, n (%) 120 (66.7%) 111 (69.8%) 0.535 Endoscopic intervention, n (%) 20.0 (13.0–30.0) 20.0 (15.0–30.0) 0.143 Diameter of intrahepatic biliary dilatation (mm) 16.0 ± 6.5 16.3 ± 6.5 0.225	Peritoneal carcinomatosis, n (%)	14 (7.8%)	27 (17.0%)	0.010	
Endoscopic intervention, n (%) 20.0 (13.0–30.0) 20.0 (15.0–30.0) 0.143 Length of biliary stricture (mm) 16.0 ± 6.5 16.3 ± 6.5 0.225	Lymph node metastasis, n (%)	120 (66.7%)	111 (69.8%)	0.535	
Length of biliary stricture (mm) 20.0 (13.0-30.0) 20.0 (15.0-30.0) 0.143 Diameter of intrahepatic biliary dilatation (mm) 16.0 ± 6.5 16.3 ± 6.5 0.225	Endoscopic intervention, n (%)				
Diameter of intrahepatic biliary dilatation (mm) 16.0 ± 6.5 16.3 ± 6.5 0.225	Length of biliary stricture (mm)	20.0 (13.0-30.0)	20.0 (15.0-30.0)	0.143	
	Diameter of intrahepatic biliary dilatation (mm)	16.0 ± 6.5	16.3 ± 6.5	0.225	

(Continued)

TABLE 2 Continued

Characteristics	Survived $(N = 180)$	Deceased $(N = 159)$	P value	
Diameter of extrahepatic biliary dilatation (mm)	17.5 ± 6.3	17.2 ± 6.9	0.765	
Presence of either metallic or plastic stent	105 (58.3%)/75 (41.7%)	114 (71.7%)/45 (28.3%)	0.010	
One stent placement	168 (93.3%)	149 (93.7%)	0.888	
One plastic stent placement	69 (38.3%)	43 (27.0%)	0.027	
One metallic stent placement	99 (55.0%)	106 (66.7%)	0.028	
- Uncovered SEMs	97 (53.9%)	102 (64.2%)	0.055	
- Fully covered SEMs	1 (0.6%)	3 (1.9%)	0.345	
- Partially covered SEMs	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)	1.000	
Two-stent placements	12 (6.7%)	10 (6.3%)	0.888	
Two metallic stents	5 (2.8%)	7 (4.4%)	0.419	
Two plastic stents	6 (3.3%)	1 (0.6%)	0.126	
One metallic and one plastic stent	1 (8.3%)	2 (20.0%)	0.571	
Post-endoscopic outcomes				
Post-ERCP complications, n (%)	15 (8.3%)	19 (11.9%)	0.269	
Post-ERCP cholangitis	6 (3.3%)	10 (6.3%)	0.200	
Post-ERCP pancreatitis	8 (4.4%)	9 (5.7%)	0.609	
Duodenal perforation	0	0	-	
Post-sphincterotomy bleeding	0	1 (0.6%)	0.452	
Stent dysfunction, n (%)	71 (39.4%)	21 (13.2%)	< 0.001	
Stent patency time (days)	75.5 (35.0–118.0)	28.0 (18.0-52.0)	0.003	
Bilirubin improvement after stenting [‡] , n (%)	140 (77.8%)	100 (62.9%)	0.003	
Chemotherapy after ERCP, n (%)	44 (24.4%)	5 (3.1%)	< 0.001	

Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation, median (interquartile range), or number (proportion) of patients with a condition.

IPMN, intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm; ECOG, Eastern cooperative oncology group; ERCP, endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography; INR, international normalized ratio; SEMs, self-expandable metallic stent.

[†]Defined by more than two illnesses or diseases occurring in the same person at the same time.

*Defined by total bilirubin improvement of more than 50% from baseline within 2 weeks after ERCP-guided endobiliary stent placement.

in obstruction at intrahepatic biliary tract portion can be challenging, especially for peripheral duct obstruction. Furthermore, patients with intrahepatic biliary obstruction frequently have a concurrent hepatic vascular invasion. This condition results in liver decompensation, liver atrophy, and small liver remnants, with endobiliary stenting failing to provide adequate biliary drainage of more than 50% of the liver volume (29). Hence, our patients with intrahepatic biliary obstruction had a greater overall mortality rate, even after performing endobiliary stenting, than those with hilar or extrahepatic biliary obstruction.

The majority of our patients with pancreaticobiliary cancers were at clinical AJCC stage IV. Using the multivariate regression analysis of clinical factors for 90-day mortality in patients with pancreaticobiliary cancers, stage IV cancer was determined as an independent risk factor for 90-day mortality after stenting. This finding is compatible with those of previous studies, which showed that liver metastases and peritoneal carcinomatosis were independent risk factors for short-term mortality in patients with pancreaticobiliary cancers (21–23, 30). Hernandez et al. (25) found that pre-stenting TB levels of more than 14 mg/dL were substantially associated with 30-day mortality. A high pre-endoscopic TB level indicated severe, longstanding biliary obstruction and cirrhosis, contributing to poor bilirubin normalization following stenting. As a result, these individuals were ineligible for chemotherapy and had higher mortality than those with lower pre-endoscopic TB levels (31). Our study showed that a 50% improvement of hyperbilirubinemia within 2 weeks after stenting was inversely associated with 90-day mortality.

In both the surviving and non-surviving groups, metallic biliary stents were used more frequently than plastic stents. Despite the fact that metallic stent was effective for endobiliary decompression (32-36), 45.2% of our patients died within 90 days of the procedure. Notably, in our practice, metallic stents were preferred in patients with advanced disease and were anticipated to require less stent revision due to their shorter life expectancy. The findings might suggest that the use of a metallic stent in our study was indeed a mediated factor of

TABLE 3 Univariate and multivariate analyses of baseline variables for predicting 90-day mortality following endobiliary stent placement in the derivation cohort.

Univariate analysis						
Characteristics	Regression coefficient	Standard error	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	P value		
Intrahepatic biliary obstruction	1.478	0.661	4.39 (1.20-16.0)	0.025		
Peritoneal carcinomatosis	0.886	0.349	2.43 (1.22-4.81)	0.011		
Liver metastasis	0.666	0.232	1.95 (1.24–3.07)	0.004		
Distant metastasis	0.802	0.229	2.23 (1.42-3.49)	< 0.001		
Pre-endoscopic serum albumin level	-0.964	0.198	0.38 (0.26-0.57)	< 0.001		
Pre-endoscopic total bilirubin level	0.041	0.012	1.04 (1.02–1.07)	0.001		
Pre-endoscopic INR level	0.441	0.206	1.55 (1.04–2.33)	0.032		
Pre-endoscopic ALP (times above ULN)	0.046	0.035	1.05 (0.98–1.12)	0.183		
Endobiliary drainage with metallic stent	0.593	0.232	1.81 (1.15–2.85)	0.011		
Size of obstructive tumor	0.127	0.047	1.14 (1.04–1.24)	0.007		
Stage of pancreatobiliary cancer	1.102	0.440	3.01 (1.27-7.13)	0.012		
Bilirubin improvement after stenting*	-0.725	0.243	0.48 (0.30-0.78)	0.003		
Received chemotherapy after ERCP	-2.299	0.486	0.10 (0.04-0.26)	< 0.001		
	Multivar	iate analysis				
Characteristics	Regression coefficient	Standard error	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	P value		
Model 1 [†]						
Intrahepatic biliary obstruction	1.739	0.762	5.69 (1.28-25.4)	0.023		
Pre-endoscopic serum albumin level	-0.729	0.217	0.48 (0.32-0.74)	0.001		
Stage IV pancreatobiliary cancer	1.103	0.261	3.01 (1.81-5.02)	< 0.001		
Bilirubin improvement after stenting*	-0.569	0.272	0.57 (0.33-0.97)	0.036		
Received chemotherapy after ERCP	-2.183	0.517	0.11 (0.04-0.31)	< 0.001		
Model 2 [‡]						
Intrahepatic biliary obstruction	1.567	0.771	4.79 (1.06–21.74)	0.042		
Pre-endoscopic serum albumin level	-0.702	0.225	0.50 (0.32-0.77)	0.002		
Stage IV pancreatobiliary cancer	1.004	0.265	2.73 (1.62-4.59)	< 0.001		
Bilirubin improvement after stenting*	-0.580	0.274	0.56 (0.34-0.96)	0.034		
Received chemotherapy after ERCP	-2.218	0.529	0.11 (0.04–0.31)	< 0.001		

95% CI, 95% confidence interval; INR, international normalized ratio; ALP, alkaline phosphatase; OR, odds ratio; ERCP, endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography. [†]Model 1 included baseline factors that were significant in the univariate analysis; [‡]Model 2 included the factors from Model 1 plus the calendar year of the endobiliary intervention. ^{*}Defined by total bilirubin improvement of more than 50% from baseline within 2 weeks after ERCP-guided endobiliary stent placement.



FIGURE 1

The probability of death within 90 days after endobiliary stent placement and diagnostic accuracy of the risk score in the derivation and validation cohorts. (A) The observed and predicted mortality rates according to the approximate quartiles of the risk score. (B) Area under the receiver operating characteristic curve of the risk score.

09

The derivation cohort						
Prediction score	Sensitivity (%) (95% CI)	Specificity (%) (95% CI)	PPV (%) (95% CI)	NPV (%) (95% CI)	LR+(95% CI)	LR-(95% CI)
Low scoreof -1.50	96.9 (92.8–99.0)	23.3 (17.4–30.2)	52.7 (50.6-54.9)	89.4 (77.3-95.4)	1.26(1.16-1.38)	0.13 (0.05-0.33)
Optimal scoreof 0.03	70.4 (62.7-77.4)	65.6 (58.1–72.5)	64.4 (59.1–69.4)	71.5 (65.9–76.6)	2.05(1.63-2.56)	0.45 (0.35-0.59)
High score of 1.40	10.1 (5.9–15.8)	96.3 (95.2–99.7)	84.2 (61.3-94.7)	55.3 (53.9-56.7)	6.04(1.79-20.34)	0.91 (0.87-0.97)
		The v	alidation cohort			
Prediction score	Sensitivity (%) (95% CI)	Specificity (%) (95% CI)	PPV (%) (95% CI)	NPV (%) (95% CI)	LR+(95% CI)	LR-(95% CI)
Low scoreof -1.50	98.0 (89.2–99.9)	22.2 (12.7-34.5)	49.5 (46.0-52.9)	93.3 (65.6–99.0)	1.26(1.10-1.45)	0.09 (0.01-0.67)
Optimal scoreof 0.03	69.4 (54.6-81.8)	71.4 (58.7-82.1)	65.4 (55.1–74.4)	75.0 (65.7-82.5)	2.43(1.58-3.74)	0.43 (0.27-0.67)
High score of 1.40	12.2 (4.63–24.08)	98.4 (91.5–99.9)	85.7 (42.6-98.0)	59.1 (56.4–61.7)	7.71(0.96-61.99)	0.89 (0.80-0.99)

TABLE 4 The diagnostic performance of the 90-day mortality prediction model following endobiliary stent placement in the derivation and validation cohorts.

95% CI, 95% confidence interval; LR-, negative likelihood ratio; LR+, positive likelihood ratio; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value.

advanced malignancy rather than a risk factor for 90-day mortality after stenting. The selection of metallic stents might be biased by endoscopists' decisions based on their preferences, patients' conditions, and cancer clinical staging. Therefore, the type of endobiliary stent was not included in the prediction model.

This study developed a 90-day mortality prediction model that incorporates 5 clinical predictors. The "90-day mortality prediction model" was subsequently evaluated in the validation cohort. The model displayed consistent diagnostic performance with the derivation cohort, confirming its reliability. The AUROC of the proposed 90-day mortality prediction model was 0.76, similar to the prediction model for 24-week mortality in a prior study (21). The cutoffs were determined by assessing the predictive abilities of death to provide clinical application depending on the situation. To enhance the clinical utility of the prediction model, we proposed "scores for the probability of death" that ranged from 14.6% to 75.2%, according to quartiles. Probability scores greater than 0.58 indicated a high probability (75.2%) of dying within 90 days after stenting. Combining the "90-day mortality prediction model" and the "scores for the probability of death" might guide physicians' decisions to provide optimal palliation for patients with unresectable MBO.

For example, patients with a "90-day mortality prediction score" exceeding 1.40 are highly likely to die within 90 days following stenting. In contrast, patients with a score below -1.50 have a low chance of death. As to patients in the intermediate group (a risk score between -1.50 and 1.40), the treatment approach should be based on the patients' performance statuses and physician discretion. Endobiliary drainage with a plastic stent is suitable for unresectable MBO patients with a high death risk (90-day mortality prediction score exceeding 1.40 and probability score over 0.58). Nonetheless, performance status, nutritional status, and comorbidities should be considered when deciding on a treatment plan. Counseling with patients and their families is needed. Prompt biliary decompression should be considered in situations of superimposed infection, such as acute cholangitis or cholangitic liver abscesses.

TABLE 5 The probability of death within 90 days after endobiliary stent placement in the derivation and validation cohorts.

Score interval	HR (95% CI)	Derivation cohort P value	Probability of death	V HR (95% CI)	alidation cohort <i>P</i> value	Probability of death
< -0.83		< 0.001 [†]	14.6%		< 0.001 [†]	12.0%
-0.83 to <0.07	3.49 (1.81-6.70)	< 0.001*	41.9%	3.25 (0.92-11.52)	0.068^{\pm}	34.3%
0.07 to <0.58	5.09 (2.69-9.63)	< 0.001 [±]	54.9%	6.12 (1.77-21.19)	0.004^{\ddagger}	55.6%
≥ 0.58	8.26 (4.46–15.31)	<0.001 [‡]	75.2%	12.10(3.57-41.08)	< 0.001 [‡]	76.0%

95% CI, 95% confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio.

[†]P value of total score (reference); [‡]P value of each interval score compared with the reference.



The strengths of this study were that it had a large cohort of unresectable MBO patients and a long data-collection duration. Furthermore, this is the first study to develop a 90-day mortality prediction model and create a validation cohort to verify the model internally. Combining the 90-day mortality prediction model and the score for probability of death enhanced the model's performance.

Nonetheless, the current investigation has some limitations. First, it was conducted retrospectively. Consequently, some data, such as patients' nutritional statuses, could not be evaluated, which might be associated with post-stenting mortality. Second, our analysis excluded cirrhotic patients and those with other cholestatic diseases to minimize the potential confounding effects of pre-endoscopic laboratories. Thus, this prediction model does not apply to these patients. Third, morbidity during hospitalization was not explored. This factor might affect post-stenting outcomes, such as the severity of acute cholangitis and organ failure due to sepsis or septic shock. Finally, because the unmeasured bias could occur in our study, the prediction model must be externally evaluated in larger prospective cohorts to confirm the model's accuracy for predicting post-stenting 90 days mortality.

Conclusions

The pre-endoscopic laboratory reflected liver performance, intrahepatic obstruction, evidence of advanced disease represented by clinical staging, improvement of hyperbilirubinemia, and eligibility for chemotherapy and were significant predictors for 90-day mortality following endobiliary stent placement. Combining a mortality prediction model and a score for probability of death can help develop an optimal drainage strategy for patients with unresectable MBO.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Ethics statement

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital. Written informed consent for participation was not required for this study in accordance with the national legislation and the institutional requirements.

Author contributions

NP contributed to the conceptualization, design, and supervision of the study. PT collected the data and organized the database. NP, PT, and PC performed the formal analyses. PT wrote the first draft of the manuscript. NP and PC reviewed and edited the manuscript. All authors contributed to the manuscript revision and read and approved the submitted version.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge Ms Khemajira Karaketklang, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University for assistance with the statistical analyses. We are also indebted to Mr David Park for the English-language editing of this paper.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated

organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/ fonc.2022.922386/full#supplementary-material

References

1. Banales JM, Cardinale V, Carpino G, Marzioni M, Andersen JB, Invernizzi P, et al. Cholangiocarcinoma: Current knowledge and future perspectives consensus statement from the European network for the study of cholangiocarcinoma (ENS-CCA). *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* (2016) 13(5):261–80. doi: 10.1038/nrgastro.2016.51

2. Abraham NS, Barkun JS, Barkun AN. Palliation of malignant biliary obstruction: A prospective trial examining impact on quality of life. *Gastrointest Endosc* (2002) 56(6):835–41. doi: 10.1016/S0016-5107(02)70356-8

3. Pereira-Lima JC, Jakobs R, Maier M, Kohler B, Benz C, Martin WR, et al. Endoscopic stenting in obstructive jaundice due to liver metastases: Does it have a benefit for the patient? *Hepatogastroenterology* (1996) 43(10):944–8.

4. Arguedas MR, Heudebert GH, Stinnett AA, Wilcox CM. Biliary stents in malignant obstructive jaundice due to pancreatic carcinoma: A cost-effectiveness analysis. *Am J Gastroenterol* (2002) 97(4):898–904. doi: 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2002.05606.x

5. Martin JA, Slivka A, Rabinovitz M, Carr BI, Wilson J, Silverman WB. ERCP and stent therapy for progressive jaundice in hepatocellular carcinoma: Which patients benefit, which patients don't? *Dig Dis Sci* (1999) 44(7):1298–302. doi: 10.1023/a:1026618927885.

6. Eklund JW, Trifilio S, Mulcahy MF. Chemotherapy dosing in the setting of liver dysfunction. Oncol Williston Park N (2005) 19(8):1057-63.

7. Donelli MG, Zucchetti M, Munzone E, D'Incalci M, Crosignani A. Pharmacokinetics of anticancer agents in patients with impaired liver function. *Eur J Cancer* (1998) 34(1):33–46. doi: 10.1016/S0959-8049(97)00340-7

8. Venook AP, Egorin MJ, Rosner GL, Hollis D, Mani S, Hawkins M, et al. Phase I and pharmacokinetic trial of gemcitabine in patients with hepatic or renal dysfunction: Cancer and leukemia group b 9565. *J Clin Oncol* (2000) 18 (14):2780–7. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2000.18.14.2780

9. LAG R, Harkins D, Krapcho M. SEER cancer statistics review 1975–2003, Bethesda: National cancer institute(2005) (Accessed May, 2019).

10. Baron TH. Palliation of malignant obstructive jaundice. Gastroenterol Clin North Am (2006) 35(1):101–12. doi: 10.1016/j.gtc.2006.01.001

11. Paik WH, Park YS, Hwang J-H, Lee SH, Yoon CJ, Kang S-G, et al. Palliative treatment with self-expandable metallic stents in patients with advanced type III or IV hilar cholangiocarcinoma: A percutaneous versus endoscopic approach. *Gastrointest Endosc* (2009) 69(1):55–62. doi: 10.1016/j.gie.2008.04.005

12. Isla AM, Worthington T, Kakkar AK. Williamson RCN. A continuing role for surgical bypass in the palliative treatment of pancreatic carcinoma. *Dig Surg* (2000) 17(2):143–6. doi: 10.1159/000018817.

13. Shepherd HA, Royle G, Ross APR, Diba A, Arthur M, Colin-Jones D. Endoscopic biliary endoprosthesis in the palliation of malignant obstruction of the distal common bile duct: A randomized trial. *Br J Surg* (1988) 75(12):1166–8. doi: 10.1002/bjs.1800751207.

14. Smith AC, Dowsett JF, Russell RCG, Hatfield ARW, Cotton PB. Randomised trial of endoscopic stenting versus surgical bypass in malignant low bile duct obstruction. *Lancet* (1994) 344(8938):1655–60. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(94)90455-3

15. Speer AG, Christopher R, Russell G, Hatfield AR, Macrae KD, Cotton PB, et al. Randomized trial of endoscopic versus percutaneous stent insertion in malignant obstructive jaundice. *Lancet* (1987) 330(8550):57–62. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(87)92733-4

16. Andersen JR, Sorensen SM, Kruse A, Rokkjaer M, Matzen P. Randomised trial of endoscopic endoprosthesis versus operative bypass in malignant obstructive jaundice. *Gut* (1989) 30(8):1132–5. doi: 10.1136/gut.30.8.1132

17. Inamdar S, Slattery E, Bhalla R, Sejpal DV, Trindade AJ. Comparison of adverse events for endoscopic vs percutaneous biliary drainage in the treatment of malignant biliary tract obstruction in an inpatient national cohort. *JAMA Oncol* (2016) 2(1):112. doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2015.3670

 Strom TJ, Klapman JB, Springett GM, Meredith KL, Hoffe SE, Choi J, et al. Comparative long-term outcomes of upfront resected pancreatic cancer after preoperative biliary drainage. Surg Endosc (2015) 29(11):3273–81. doi: 10.1007/ s00464-015-4075-3

19. Dumonceau J-M, Tringali A, Papanikolaou I, Blero D, Mangiavillano B, Schmidt A, et al. Endoscopic biliary stenting: indications, choice of stents, and results: European society of gastrointestinal endoscopy (ESGE) clinical guideline – updated October 2017. *Endoscopy* (2018) 50(09):910–30. doi: 10.1055/a-0659-9864

20. Prat F, Chapat O, Ducot B, Ponchon T, Fritsch J, Choury AD, et al. Predictive factors for survival of patients with inoperable malignant distal biliary strictures: a practical management guideline. *Gut* (1998) 42(1):76–80. doi: 10.1136/gut.42.1.76

21. Sripongpun P, Attasaranya S, Chamroonkul N, Sookpaisal T, Khow-Ean U, Siripun A, et al. Simple clinical score to predict 24-week survival times in patients with inoperable malignant distal biliary obstruction as a tool for selecting palliative metallic or plastic stents. *J Gastrointest Cancer* (2018) 49(2):138–43. doi: 10.1007/s12029-017-9918-9

22. Kaassis M, Boyer J, Dumas R, Ponchon T, Coumaros D, Delcenserie R, et al. Plastic or metal stents for malignant stricture of the common bile duct? results of a randomized prospective study. *Gastrointest Endosc* (2003) 57(2):178–82. doi: 10.1067/mge.2003.66

23. Soderlund C, Linder S. Covered metal versus plastic stents for malignant common bile duct stenosis: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial. *Gastrointest Endosc* (2006) 63(7):986–95. doi: 10.1016/j.gie.2005.11.052

24. Tipsunthonsak N, Piriyasupong T, Piriyaskanon A. Efficacy of biliary stent drainage and factors associated with complications in endoscopic palliative treatment of patients with hilar cholangiocarcinoma. *Thai J Surg* (2011) 32 (1):26–34.

25. Hernández Guerrero A, Sánchez del Monte J, Sobrino Cossío S, Alonso Lárraga O, Delgado de la Cruz L, Frías Mendívil MM, et al. Factores pronósticos de mortalidad en la estenosis biliar distal maligna irresecable después de la colocación de una prótesis endoscópica. *Rev Gastroenterol Mex* (2006) 71(1):22–30.

 Engelken FJF, Bettschart V, Rahman MQ, Parks RW, Garden OJ. Prognostic factors in the palliation of pancreatic cancer. *Eur J Surg Oncol* (2003) 29(4):368–73. doi: 10.1053/ejso.2002.1405 27. Spinella R, Sawhney R, Jalan R. Albumin in chronic liver disease: Structure, functions and therapeutic implications. *Hepatol Int* (2016) 10(1):124–32. doi: 10.1007/s12072-015-9665-6

28. Waghray A, Sobotka A, Marrero CR, Estfan B, Aucejo F, Narayanan Menon K. Serum albumin predicts survival in patients with hilar cholangiocarcinoma. *Gastroenterol Rep* (2017) 5(1):62–6. doi: 10.1093/gastro/gow021.

29. Fukasawa M, Takano S, Shindo H, Takahashi E, Sato T, Enomoto N. Endoscopic biliary stenting for unresectable malignant hilar obstruction. *Clin J Gastroenterol* (2017) 10(6):485–90. doi: 10.1007/s12328-017-0778-4

30. Coccolini F, Gheza F, Lotti M, Virzi S, Iusco D, Ghermandi C, et al. Peritoneal carcinomatosis. *World J Gastroenterol* (2013) 19(41):6979–94. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v19.i41.6979

31. Weston BR, Ross WA, Wolff RA, Evans D, Lee JE, Wang X, et al. Rate of bilirubin regression after stenting in malignant biliary obstruction for the initiation of chemotherapy: How soon should we repeat endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography? *Cancer* (2008) 112(11):2417–23. doi: 10.1002/cnrc.23454

32. Moole H, Jaeger A, Cashman M, Volmar FH, Dhillon S, Bechtold ML, et al. Are self-expandable metal stents superior to plastic stents in palliating malignant distal biliary strictures? A meta-analysis and systematic review. *Med J Armed Forces India* (2017) 73(1):42–8. doi: 10.1016/j.mjafi.2016.08.014

33. Zorrón Pu L, de Moura EG, Bernardo WM, Baracat FI, Mendonça EQ, Kondo A, et al. Endoscopic stenting for inoperable malignant biliary obstruction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World J Gastroenterol* (2015) 21(47):13374–85. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v21.i47.13374.

34. Hong W, Chen X, Wu W-Z, Zhu Q, Chen X. Metal versus plastic stents for malignant biliary obstruction: An update meta-analysis. *Clin Res Hepatol Gastroenterol* (2013) 37(5):496–500. doi: 10.1016/j.clinre.2012.12.002

35. Almadi MA, Barkun A, Martel M. Plastic vs. self-expandable metal stents for palliation in malignant biliary obstruction: A series of meta-analyses. *Am J Gastroenterol* (2017) 112(2):260–73. doi: 10.1038/ajg.2016.512.

36. Sawas T, Al Halabi S, Parsi MA, Vargo JJ. Self-expandable metal stents versus plastic stents for malignant biliary obstruction: A meta-analysis. *Gastrointest Endosc* (2015) 82(2):256–67.e7. doi: 10.1016/j.gie.2015.03.1980