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An updated meta-analysis

Yao Liu, MD, PhD*; Yang Li, MM; Ling Wang, MM; Ci-Jun Peng, MD, PhD*

Abstract
Background: Postoperative pancreatic fistula (POPF) is a potentially fatal complication following pancreaticoduodenectomy. Early prediction and exclusion of POPF may be highly advantageous to enhance patient outcomes, and accelerate recovery. In this meta-analysis, we sought to assess the prediction of drain pancreatic amylase concentration on postoperative day 1 (DPA1) for POPF.

Methods: By searching online databases up to April 2018, all researches mentioned DPA1 for detecting POPF were analyzed. STATA 12.0 was used to analyze pooled predictive parameters.

Results: Seventeen studies were finally analyzed including 4676 patients in total. The pooled sensitivity and specificity of DPA1 were respectively 0.85 (95% CI: 0.71, 0.93), 0.80 (95% CI: 0.74, 0.85) to predict overall POPF, and 0.70 (95% CI: 0.53, 0.82), 0.88 (95% CI: 0.86, 0.90) to predict CR-POPF. If pretest probability was 50%, corresponding post-test (+) were respectively 81%, 86% for overall POPF and CR-POPF when DPA1 was above cutoffs, while the post-test (−) were respectively 16%, 26% when DPA1 was under cutoffs. In subgroup analysis, sensitivities of cutoff >5000 group, 1000 <cutoff <5000 group, and cutoff <1000 group were respectively 0.85 (0.83-0.86), 0.82 (0.71–0.89), 0.87 (0.78–0.92); and specificities were respectively 0.88 (0.83–0.92), 0.83 (0.77–0.88), 0.71 (0.62–0.79). Positive LR was 5.5 (3.4–8.8), 4.8 (3.4–6.7), and 3.0 (2.3–4.0) respectively. Negative LR was 0.40 (0.22–0.72), 0.22 (0.13–0.37), and 0.19 (0.11–0.32) respectively.

Conclusion: DPA1, which has good sensitivity and specificity, is useful for predicting overall POPF and CR-POPF, according to the present studies. Meanwhile, it should be cautious to apply because there is a wide range in cutoffs between different studies.

Abbreviations: DPA1 = drain pancreatic amylase concentration on postoperative day 1, I2 = inconsistency index, ISGPF = International Study Group on Pancreatic Fistula, LR = likelihood ratio, PD = pancreaticoduodenectomy, POPF = postoperative pancreatic fistula, QUADAS = Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies.
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1. Introduction

Although perioperative management of patients undergoing pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD) has been improved, morbidity still ranges from 20% to 50%.[1–4]

Postoperative pancreatic fistula (POPF), which develops in a range from 16% to 28% of patients undergoing PD, remains the major fatal complication.[5–7] POPF was classified to grades A, B, and C by the International Study Group on Pancreatic Fistula (ISGPF).[8] Grade A POPF is biochemical fistula, which does not have any adverse consequences. Grade B and C fistulas are generally designated as clinically relevant POPF (CR-POPF), which usually demand percutaneous drainage and hardly, laparotomy.[6]

So far, it has been proved that early drain removal (postoperative day (POD) <4) decreases incidence of complications, compared with late drain removal (POD >5).[9] Usually, drains will be removed according to surgeon’s discretion after excluding the risk of POPF. The prognosis of POPF can be advantageous to manage drains removal, enhance recovery pathway, and promote hospital discharge.[10]

Recently, many studies show high interests in drain pancreatic amylase concentration on POD 1 (DPA1) for the prediction of POPF. Although DPA1 has been implied with superb specificity and sensitivity for overall POPF and CR-POPF, there is still controversy in inconsistent opinions. The present meta-analysis especially aims to assess the value of DPA1 to predict POPF after PD.

2. Methods

The PRISMA statement and appropriate methods for meta-analysis were followed.[11,12] The ethical statement is not necessary for this meta-analysis.
2.1. Study selection

MEDLINE (PubMed), Cochrane Database, Embase, and other databases were retrieved to find out corresponding papers published until April 2018. The following items were searched: “pancreatectomy,” “pancreaticoduodenectomy,” “whipple,” “pancreatic resection,” “pancreatic fistula,” “drain amylase,” “intraperitoneal drainage amylase,” “early drain removal,” “sensitivity and specificity.” Two researchers independently reviewed the articles. When disagreements appeared, a final consensus was reached after arguing with each other.

2.2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Studies were selected by inclusion criteria as follows: prediction of DPA1 for POPF after PD; POPF recorded and defined as grade A, B, and C according to ISGPF; articles published in English language in peer-reviewed journals. Editorials, case reports, expert opinions, letters, abstracts, and studies without sufficient data to assess predictive value of DPA1 were excluded.

2.3. Quality assessment

The QUADAS criteria was accorded to evaluate qualities of involved studies.[13]

2.4. Data collection and statistical analysis

Data including sensitivity, specificity, and cutoff values of DPA1 for the prediction of POPF or CR-POPF were documented. STATA 12.0 was used for statistical analysis. The following figures were calculated: sensitivity, specificity, positive likelihood ratio (LR), negative LR (with corresponding 95% confidence interval), pretest probabilities, corresponding post-test probabilities, Cochran Q test, inconsistency index (I²), and area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC). Deeks funnel plot asymmetry test was performed to assess publication bias.

Two investigators (Y Liu and Y Li) independently extracted the data, and disagreements were settled by discussion with each other.

3. Results

3.1. Description of studies

Finally, 17 articles with a total of 4676 patients in 8 countries were involved.[5,14–29] The procedure of selection is illustrated in Fig. 1. The information of the involved 17 studies is displayed in Table 1. There are 11 prospective and 6 retrospective studies. Diagnostic index of studies assessing prediction of DPA1 for overall POPF and CR-POPF is integrated in Table 2. Twelve studies supplied cutoffs for overall POPF, extending from 100 to 5000 U/L, while 6 for CR-POPF ranging from 1000 to 5000 U/L. And there were no significantly threshold effects of DPA1 for overall POPF and CR-POPF.

Figure 1. Flowchart showing literature search and selection.
3.2. Overall diagnostic indices

Sensitivity and specificity of DPA1 for overall POPF and CR-POPF are displayed in Table 3. For predicting overall POPF, sensitivity and specificity of DPA1 were respectively 0.85 (0.71–0.93) and 0.80 (0.74–0.85), while positive and negative LR were respectively 4.30 (3.24–5.70) and 0.19 (0.10–0.37). AUROC, which was 0.87 (0.84–0.90), is illustrated in Fig. 2A.

Cochran Q test showed there was significant heterogeneity of DAP1 (I² = 97.28%, P < .001), which implied nonthreshold effects.

For predicting CR-POPF, sensitivity and specificity of DPA1 were respectively 0.70 (0.53–0.82) and 0.88 (0.86–0.90). Positive LR, negative LR, and AUROC were respectively 5.90 (4.90–7.10), 0.34 (0.21–0.55), and 0.89 (0.86–0.92) as in Fig. 2B.

3.3. Fagan plot analysis

In Fig. 3, the Fagan plot in DPA1 for overall POPF and CR-POPF implied that when the pretest probabilities were respectively 25%, 50%, 75% the positive post-test probabilities (post-test (+)) were 0.59, 0.81, 0.93 and the negative post-test probabilities (post-test (−)) were 0.06, 0.16, 0.36. For CR-POPF, when the pretest probabilities were respectively 25%, 50%, 75% the post-tests (+) were 0.66, 0.86, 0.95, and the post-tests (−) were 0.10, 0.26, 0.51.

3.4. Meta-regression and subgroup analysis

For the wide range of cutoffs between studies when predicting overall POPF in DPA1, meta-regression analysis was applied to

### Table 1: Characteristics of the selected studies.

| Author       | Country | Years        | N    | Gender (M/F) | Settings | Pathology | T       | Stent | Pancreatic soft texture |
|--------------|---------|--------------|------|--------------|----------|-----------|---------|-------|------------------------|
| Ansorge[5]   | Sweden  | 2008–2012    | 315  | 174/141      | Prospective | 44 benign; 271 malignant | PD      | Nonstented | NR                      |
| Zelga[14]    | UK      | 2002–2012    | 405  | 218/187      | Prospective | 263 malignant; 142 other | PD      | Internal  | NR                      |
| Yamane[15]   | Japan   | 2006–2016    | 99   | 69/30        | Retrospective | 59 malignant; 40 other   | PD      | NR        | 43                      |
| Nissen[16]   | America | 2007–2010    | 76   | 40/36        | Prospective | 33 PDAC; 43 other        | PD      | NR        | 27                      |
| Takeishi[17] | Japan   | 2005–2013    | 120  | 61/59        | Retrospective | 46 cancer; 74 other      | PD      | NR        | 55                      |
| Dugalic[18]  | Serbia  | 2005–2012    | 382  | 231/151      | Prospective | 74 benign; 308 malignant | PD      | NR        | 84                      |
| Casadei[19]  | Italy   | 2015–2017    | 84   | 43/41        | Prospective | 44 malignant; 40 other   | PD      | NR        | 50                      |
| Israel[20]   | America | 2012–2014    | 63   | 30/33        | Prospective | 45 PDAC; 18 Unclear      | PD      | NR        | 32                      |
| El Nakeeb[21]| Egypt   | 2001–2012    | 471  | 278/193      | Retrospective | 59 benign; 412 malignant | PD      | NR        | 307                     |

### Table 2: Diagnostic data evaluating DPA1 for overall POPF (0 vs A+B+C) and CR-POPF (0+A vs B+C).

| Author       | Cutoff | Sensitivity (%) | Specificity (%) | Cutoff | Sensitivity (%) | Specificity (%) |
|--------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Ansorge[5]   | 1322   | 76              | 70              | 1322   | 80              | 86              |
| Zelga[14]    | 1400   | 76              | 70              | 1400   | 76              | 70              |
| Yamane[15]   | 5000   | 100             | 93.2            | 5000   | 71.4            | 80.8            |
| Nissen[16]   | 1300   | 79              | 81              | 1300   | 92.3            | 87.5            |
| Takeishi[17] | 1200   | 93.1            | 87.5            | 1200   | 92.3            | 87.5            |
| Dugalic[18]  | 100    | 96              | 69              | 100    | 71.9            | 86.5            |
| Casadei[19]  | 5000   | 50              | 71.1            | 5000   | 44.1            | 92              |
| Israel[20]   | 5000   | 92.6            | 83.6            | 5000   | 44.1            | 92              |
| Molinar[23]  | 5000   | 71              | 90              | 5000   | 71              | 90              |
| Partelli[24] | 5000   | 71              | 90              | 5000   | 71              | 90              |
| Magino[25]   | 2000   | 74.3            | 62.1            | 2000   | 74.3            | 62.1            |
| Fong[26]     | 600    | 95.7            | 70.3            | 600    | 95.7            | 70.3            |
| Bertens[27]  | 600    | 94              | 60              | 600    | 94              | 60              |
| Sutcliffe[28] | 350    | 100             | 79              | 350    | 100             | 79              |
| Kawal[29]    | 3000   | 76              | 70              | 3000   | 76              | 70              |

M/F = male/female, N = number of patients, NR = not reported, PD = pancreatectoduodenectomy, PDAC = pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma, T = type of operation.
find the heterogeneity sources. The “country,” “study setting,” “stent,” “type of operation,” and “pancreatic soft texture” were involved. According to the results, the main sources of heterogeneity were country, type of operation, and pancreatic soft texture.

Huge differences of various cutoffs existed in the involved studies, and then subgroup analysis was performed. Results are demonstrated in supplementary Table 1, http://links.lww.com/MD/C504. The summary sensitivities of cutoff $\leq 1000$ group, 1000$<$ cutoff $\leq 5000$ group, and cutoff $\geq 5000$ group were respectively 0.87 (0.78–0.92), 0.82 (0.71–0.89), and 0.65 (0.43–0.82); the summary specificities were respectively 0.71 (0.62–0.79), 0.83 (0.77–0.88), and 0.88 (0.83–0.92). Positive LR were respectively 3.0 (2.3–4.0), 4.8 (3.4–6.7), and 5.5 (3.4–8.8). Negative LR were respectively 0.19 (0.11–0.32), 0.22 (0.13–0.37), and 0.40 (0.22–0.72). AUROC were respectively 0.86 (0.83–0.89), 0.89 (0.86–0.91), and 0.89 (0.86–0.91). The results of Fagan plot analysis show that, in cutoff $\geq 5000$ group, when the pretest probabilities were respectively 25%, 50%, 75%, post-test (+) were 0.65, 0.85, 0.94, and post-test (−) were 0.12, 0.28, 0.54; in 1000$<$ cutoff $\leq 5000$ group, post-test (+) were 0.61, 0.83, 0.93, and post-test (−) were 0.07, 0.18, 0.40; and in cutoff $\leq 1000$ group, post-test (+) were 0.50, 0.75, 0.90, and post-test (−) were 0.06, 0.16, 0.36.

Meta regression was applied to estimate overall sensitivity and specificity, using the various cutoffs among studies as an independent predictor in Fig. 4.

### 3.5. Publication bias

Deeks funnel plot asymmetry test indicates there is no publication bias among the studies in Fig. 5.
Figure 3. Fagan plot for the assessment of clinical application (A) DPA1 for overall POPF, B, DPA1 for CR-POPF. CR = clinically relevant, DPA1 = drain pancreatic amylase concentration on postoperative day 1, POPF = postoperative pancreatic fistula.

Figure 4. Meta regression of DPA1 for overall POPF (A) sensitivity. B, Specificity. DPA1 = drain pancreatic amylase concentration on postoperative day 1, POPF = postoperative pancreatic fistula.
4. Discussion

POPF is still a potentially fatal complication, which may increase financial utilization after pancreatic resection. There already arise controversies about intraperitoneal drains following PD. In a recent study, it indicated that early drains removal (POD 4) had significant benefits on decreasing incidence of POPF. Furthermore, in a prospective study with 84 patients who were performed PD, it revealed that it is safe to pull out drains on POD 3 following PD with a lower incidence of POPF in patients with DPA1 ≤5000U/L.19

Early prediction of POPF can significantly benefit the patient following PD; however, few studies have assessed the predictive accuracy of DPA for developing of POPF.

Several markers, such as DPA, CRP, WBC, have been proposed as predictors for POPF.1,2,5,7,28,30,31 It was implied by Molinari et al23 that DPA1 > 5000U/L had a respectively sensitivity and specificity of 93% and 84% for the prediction of POPF following PD. Besides, Ansorge et al5 recommended serum CRP association with DPA to predict CR-POPF. With the comprehensive consideration, this meta-analysis aimed to assess the accuracy of DPA1 for the prediction of POPF. Up to now, there are few studies to assess the pooled performance of DAP1 for overall and clinically relevant POPF.

In this meta-analysis, DPA1 displayed an outstanding capability in identifying POPF with a high positive LR, which could be acted as a rule-in means for the diagnosis of POPF. Meanwhile, it also showed an acceptable sensitivity and specificity. When the pretest probability was set at 50%, DPA1 indicated an accurate diagnosis of overall POPF in 81% patients and misdiagnosis only in 16% patients by Fagan plot analysis, besides, it also showed accuracy for CR-POPF in 86% positive patients and misdiagnosis in 26% patients. With comprehensive consideration of the pooled results, DPA1 is an appropriate marker for the prediction of POPF. Certainly, more randomized controlled trials should be implemented to provide evidence.

In the present study, it supplies beneficial information to help researchers and clinicians to predict POPF by DPA1. However, there are several limitations in this meta-analysis. First, few studies are assessed as high quality to offer unbiased data. Second, studies involved in this meta-analysis had a vast range in cut-off values. Besides, few studies provided specific amylase range or cutoff at each grade of POPF. Therefore, it is necessary to further explore the values of DPA1 and other markers for predicting the grade of POPF in randomized studies.

It is concluded that DPA1 is a valuable marker to predict POPF, and more randomized controlled trials should be implemented to provide unbiased evidences.

Acknowledgment

The authors thank Prof Yuan-Zhong Zhou from Public Health Institute, Zunyi Medical College for statistical consultation.

Author contributions

Y Liu proposed the study. Y Liu and Y Li performed research, collected the data, and wrote the first draft. Y Li and LW analyzed the data. C-JP revised the manuscript. All authors contributed to the design and to further drafts.

Data curation: Yao Liu, Yang Li, Ling Wang.
Software: Ling Wang.
Writing – original draft: Yao Liu, Yang Li.
Writing – review & editing: Ci-Jun Peng.

References

[1] Greenblatt DU, Kelly KJ, Rajamaniukam V, et al. Preoperative factors predict perioperative morbidity and mortality after pancreaticoduodenectomy. Ann Surg Oncol 2011;18:2126–35.

[2] Newhook TE, LaPar DJ, Linberg JM, et al. Morbidity and mortality of pancreaticoduodenectomy for benign and premalignant pancreatic neoplasms. J Gastrointest Surg 2015;19:1072–7.

[3] Gouna DJ, van Geenen RC, van Gulik TM, et al. Rates of complications and death after pancreaticoduodenectomy: risk factors and the impact of hospital volume. Ann Surg 2000;232:786–95.

[4] Grobmyer SR, Pieracci FM, Allen PJ, et al. Defining morbidity after pancreaticoduodenectomy: a prospective complication grading system. J Am Coll Surg 2007;204:556–64.

[5] Ansorge C, Nordin JZ, Lundell L, et al. Diagnostic value of abdominal drainage in individual risk assessment of pancreatic fistula following pancreaticoduodenectomy. Brit J Surg 2014;101:100–8.

[6] Fuks D, Piessen G, Huer E, et al. Life-threatening postoperative pancreatic fistula (grade C) after pancreaticoduodenectomy: incidence, prognosis, and risk factors. Am J Surg 2009;197:702–9.

[7] Hiyoshi M, Chiwiwa K, Fuji Y, et al. Usefulness of drain amylase, serum C-reactive protein levels and body temperature to predict postoperative
pancreatic fistula after pancreaticoduodenectomy. World J Surg 2013;37:2436–42.
[8] Bassi C, Derenzis C, Butturrini G, et al. International Study Group on Pancreatic Fistula Definition. Postoperative pancreatic fistula: an international study group (ISGPF) definition. Surgery 2005;138:8–13.
[9] Bassi C, Molinari E, Malles G, et al. Early versus late drain removal after standard pancreatic resections: results of a prospective randomized trial. Ann Surg 2010;252:207–14.
[10] Kawai M, Tani M, Terasawa H, et al. Early removal of prophylactic drains reduces the risk of intra-abdominal infections in patients with pancreatic head resection: prospective study for 104 consecutive patients. Ann Surg 2006;244:1–7.
[11] Lee D, Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Int J Surg Res Methodol 2006;6:9.
[12] Zelga P, Ali JM, Brais R, et al. Negative predictive value of drain amylase concentration for development of pancreatic fistula after pancreaticoduodenectomy. Pancreatology 2015;15:179–84.
[13] Yamane H, Abe T, Amano H, et al. Visceral adipose tissue and skeletal muscle index distribution predicts severe pancreatic fistula development after pancreaticoduodenectomy. Anticancer Res 2018;38:1061–6.
[14] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Int J Surg 2010;8:336–41.
[15] Nissen NN, Menon VG, Puri V, et al. A simple algorithm for drain management after pancreaticoduodenectomy. Am Surg 2012;78:1143–6.
[16] Takeishi K, Maeda T, Yamashita Y, et al. A cohort study for derivation and validation of early detection of pancreatic fistula after pancreaticoduodenectomy. J Gastrointest Surg 2016;20:385–91.
[17] Dugalic V, Knezevic DM, Obрадовић VN, et al. Drain amylase value as an early predictor of pancreatic fistula after cephalic duodenopancreatectomy. World J Gastroenterol 2014;20:8691–9.
[18] Casadei R, Ricci C, Taffurelli G, et al. Prospective validation of a preoperative risk score model based on pancreatic texture to predict postoperative pancreatic fistula after pancreaticoduodenectomy. Int J Surg 2017;48:189–94.
[19] Israel JS, Rettammel RJ, Leverson GE, et al. Does postoperative drain amylase predict pancreatic fistula after pancreatocut? J Am Coll Surg 2014;218:978–87.
[20] El-Nakeeb A, Salah T, Sultan A, et al. Pancreatic anastomotic leakage after pancreaticoduodenectomy: Risk factors, clinical predictors, and management (single center experience). World J Surg 2013;37:1405–18.
[21] Jin S, Shi XJ, Sun XD, et al. The gastric/pancreatic amylase ratio predicts postoperative pancreatic fistula with high sensitivity and specificity. Medicine (Baltimore) 2015;94:e339.
[22] Molinari E, Bassi C, Salva R, et al. Amylase value in drains after pancreatic resection as predictive factor of postoperative pancreatic fistula: results of a prospective study in 137 patients. Ann Surg 2007;246:281–7.
[23] Partelli S, Tamburro D, Crippa S, et al. Evaluation of a predictive model for pancreatic fistula based on amylase value in drains after pancreatic resection. Am J Surg 2014;208:634–9.
[24] Mazzino L, Malles G, Basso C, et al. Identification of an optimal cut-off for drain fluid amylase on postoperative day 1 for predicting clinically relevant fistula after distal pancreatectomy: a multi-institutional analysis and external validation. Ann Surg 2017;Epub ahead of print.
[25] Fong ZV, Correa-Gallego C, Ferrone CR, et al. Early drain removal—the middle ground between the drain versus no drain debate in patients undergoing pancreaticoduodenectomy: a prospective validation study. Ann Surg 2015;262:378–83.
[26] Bertens KA, Crown A, Clanton J, et al. What is a better predictor of clinically relevant postoperative pancreatic fistula (CR-POPF) following pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD)? postoperative day one drain amylase (POD1DA) or the fistula risk score (FRS)? HPB (Oxford) 2017;19:75–81.
[27] Sutcliffe RP, Barrula N, Haque A, et al. Utility of drain fluid amylase measurement on the first postoperative day after pancreaticoduodenectomy. World J Surg 2012;36:879–83.
[28] Kawai M, Kondo S, Yamae H, et al. Predictive risk factors for clinically relevant pancreatic fistula analyzed in 1,239 patients with pancreaticoduodenectomy: multicenter data collection as a project study of pancreatic surgery by the Japanese Society of Hepato-Biliary-Pancreatic Surgery. J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci 2011;18:601–8.
[29] Sugimoto M, Takahashi S, Gotohda N, et al. Schematic pancreatic configuration: a risk assessment for postoperative pancreatic fistula after pancreaticoduodenectomy. J Gastroint Surg 2013;17:1744–51.
[30] Okano K, Kakino K, Suto H, et al. Persisting ratio of total amylase output in drain fluid can predict postoperative clinical pancreatic fistula. J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci 2011;18:815–20.