Factors independently associated with prognosis in patients operated for pancreatic cancer: Assessing the role of various parameters including red cell distribution width, neutrophilto-lymphocyte ratio, and platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio

[®]Ahmet Karayiğit¹, [®]Dursun Burak Özdemir², [®]Hayrettin Dizen³, [®]Bülent Ünal⁴

¹Healthy Science University, Adana City Training and Research Hospital, Department of Surgical Oncology, Adana, Turkey ²Healthy Science University, Samsun Training and Research Hospital, Department of Surgical Oncology, Samsun, Turkey ³Acıbadem Eskişehir Hospital, Department of General Surgery, Eskişehir, Turkey ⁴İstanbul Aydın University, Medical Park Florya Hospital, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Organ Transplantation, İstanbul, Turkey

Cite this article as: Karayiğit A, Özdemir DB, Dizen H, Dizen H, Ünal B. Factors independently associated with prognosis in patients operated for pancreatic cancer: Assessing the role of various parameters including red cell distribution width, neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio, and platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio. J Health Sci Med 2022; 5(5): 1319-1327.

ABSTRACT

Objective: We aimed to assess whether, among other parameters, preoperative red cell distribution width (RDW), neutrophilto-lymphocyte ratio (NLR), and platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio (PLR) values were associated with prognosis in patients operated for pancreatic cancer (PC).

Material and Method: This retrospective cohort was conducted from February 1, 2016 to February 1, 2021 at the general surgery department of a university hospital in Turkey. A total of 75 patients histologically diagnosed with PC who had undergone surgery were included in the study.

Results: The PLR values of patients with poorly differentiated and undifferentiated tumors were found to be higher than those with moderately and highly differentiated tumors. Also, there was a significant relationship between PLR values and the length of hospital stay. PLR values increased as the length of hospital stay increased. There was a statistically significant positive correlation between CA 19-9 levels and NLR and PLR. High total bilirubin level was related with increased risk of death, while adjuvant chemotherapy recipients had 4.049-fold lower risk of death than those without adjuvant chemotherapy.

Conclusion: Our results indicate that preoperative NLR, PLR and RDW cannot be used as prognostic indicators of mortality in patients with operated PC, but high PLR appears to be associated with lower level of tumor differentiation and prolonged hospital stay. We also found that high total bilirubin was a poor prognostic factor, while adjuvant chemotherapy was a good prognostic factor. Further multicenter, prospective studies with larger sample sizes will help to verify these results.

Keywords: Pancreatic cancer, NLR, PLR, RDW, CA 19-9, bilirubin

INTRODUCTION

Pancreatic cancer (PC) is one of the malignancies with the highest reported levels of short- and mid-term morbidity and mortality (1). Despite developing medical technologies, adjuvant therapies and surgical techniques, the 1-year and 5-year survival rates of the operated patients are reported to be 21% and 3%, respectively (1-3). Surgical resection and adjuvant chemotherapy remain as the primary management options in PC; however, overall survival (OS) and prognosis are still very poor due to rapid local recurrence and systemic spread of disease (4). Careful preoperative risk assessment of patients with PC can optimize patient selection for radical surgery and improve treatment outcomes and patient outcomes. Therefore, there is a fundamental need for the identification of preoperatively-measurable prognostic markers (5).

Various markers have been associated with poor prognosis in PC, such as carbohydrate antigen 19-9 (CA 19-9) and bilirubin (6,7). In addition, it is well established that inflammatory activation plays a key role in carcinogenesis and the tumor microenvironment (8). Despite the fact that information is limited regarding the mechanisms of these relationships (5), a number of inflammation markers and indices, including neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR),

Corresponding Author: Ahmet Karayigit, drkarayigitahmet@gmail.com



platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio (PLR) and lymphocytemonocyte ratio (LMR), and red cell distribution width (RDW), have been investigated for their potential importance in PC prognosis and diagnosis (9,10). Many authors have identified pretreatment RDW (10), NLR (11) and PLR (12) values as being associated with OS in patients with PC. Meta-analyses have also supported these suggestions by showing that high PLR, NLR, and RDW were suggestive of poor prognosis in PC (1,4,10,13). Since PLR, NLR, and RDW are easily-accessible inflammatory indices, their possible association with postoperative outcomes can be valuable for the assessment of patients with PC and treatment decisions, such as identifying candidates for either surgery or neoadjuvant therapy (5).

We hypothesized that these markers could predict prognosis in patients with operated for PC. In this study, we aimed (i) to reveal whether preoperative levels of RDW, PLR, NLR and other parameters were associated with stage, morbidity and survival of PC, and (ii) to identify significant prognostic factors associated with mortality in patients with operated PC.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

Study Design

This was a retrospective single center study conducted between February 1, 2016 to February 1, 2021 at the General Surgery & Surgical Oncology Department of Osmangazi University Faculty of Medicine, Eskişehir, Turkey. The protocol of this study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Osmangazi University Faculty of Medicine (Date: 15.06.2021, Decision No: 04), and all steps and procedures associated with the research were carried out in accordance with the ethical standards stated in the Declaration of Helsinki and its amendments. As the study has a retrospective nature, Osmangazi University Medical Ethics Committee did not require acquisition of written informed consent from patients. All data were recorded anonymously.

Study Population and Follow-up

A total of 75 patients histologically diagnosed with PC who had undergone surgery were included in the study. Exclusion criteria were presence of synchronous or metachronous cancer, undergoing emergency tumor surgery, having cirrhosis, autoimmune disease or hematological malignancy, and having used corticosteroids within the last 6 months. In addition, recipients of neoadjuvant treatment and subjects with stage 4 disease or incomplete data were also excluded.

The following information of each patient was acquired from hospital records: demographic characteristics, laboratory measurements, pathological outcomes (detailed later), preoperative application of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) and stenting, time between diagnosis and surgery (days), resectable lesion (according to preoperative computed tomography), whether adjuvant chemotherapy or adjuvant radiotherapy was applied, length of stay in hospital. Recorded surgical characteristics were: operation type, whether the spleen was preserved, pancreaticojejunostomy type, gastrojejunostomy type, whether the pylorus was preserved, and portal vein resection. Finally, all recurrences and outcomes, such as leakage, fistula, postoperative infection, recurrence and mortality data (including survival time) were recorded.

Laboratory Analysis

Blood samples were acquired from the antecubital vein for complete blood count (CBC) and other parameters including albumin, total bilirubin, direct bilirubin, and CA 19-9. Hemoglobin level, RDW value, and counts for neutrophils, lymphocytes and platelets were obtained from CBC. NLR was defined as the total number of neutrophils divided by the total number of lymphocytes. PLR was defined as the total number of platelets divided by the total number of platelets divided by the total number of lymphocytes. Laboratory analyses were carried out in all patients within 2 weeks prior to respective surgeries via routine devices in the Clinical Biochemistry Department of Osmangazi University Faculty of Medicine.

Pathological Analysis

All of the specimens obtained from fully resected tumors were sent to the pathology unit of the Pathology Department of Osmangazi University Faculty of Medicine for pathological examinations. Pathological diagnosis, differentiation, tumor primary and localization, tumor size (mm), number of lymph nodes, number of metastatic lymph nodes, extracapsular invasion, perineural invasion, lymphovascular invasion, resection margin, surgical margin, clinical stage (reported according to the pathological classification criteria of the 7th Edition of the American Joint Committee on Cancer guidelines for PC) were determined and reported by qualified pathologists.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical analyses of this study were performed with SPSS ver. 25.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Histogram and Q-Q plots were used to determine whether variables are normally distributed. Data are given as mean±standard deviation or median (1st quartile-3rd quartile; interquartile range; IQR) for continuous variables according to normality of distribution, and as frequency (percentage) for categorical variables. Between-group analyses were performed with the Mann-Whitney U test. Spearman correlation coefficients were calculated to evaluate relationships between continuous variables. Survival times were calculated with the Kaplan Meier method. Between-group comparisons of survival times were performed with the Log rank test. Cox regression analysis (forward conditional method) was performed to determine

significant prognostic factors that were independently associated with mortality. Two-tailed p values of less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Forty-six male and 29 female patients were included in our study, and the median age of the patients was 65 (IQR: 59-70) (range: 40-80) years. Summary of patients and tumor characteristics, laboratory measurements, pathological features, surgical features and all other outcomes are depicted in **Table 1** and **Table 2**.

Table 1. Summary of patients and tumor characteristic	cteristics
Age	65 (59-70)
Sex	
Female	29 (38.7%)
Male	46 (61.3%)
Preoperative ERCP + Stent	19 (25.3%)
Time between diagnosis and surgery, days	22 (14-36)
Operation	
Whipple procedure	66 (88.0%)
Distal pancreatectomy	5 (6.7%)
Total pancreatectomy	4 (5.3%)
Diagnosis	
Adenocarcinoma	72 (96.0%)
Neuroendocrine tumor	0 (0.0%)
Other	3 (4.0%)
Spleen	
Not-preserving	52 (69.3%)
Preserving	23 (30.7%)
Differentiation	
Undifferentiated	2 (2.7%)
Poorly differentiated	23 (30.7%)
Moderately differentiated	42 (56.0%)
Highly differentiated	8 (10.7%)
Stage	
Stage 1A	4 (5.3%)
Stage 1B	3 (4.0%)
Stage 2A	4 (5.3%)
Stage 2B	38 (50.7%)
Stage 3	26 (34.7%)
Primary tumor	
Pancreas	75 (100.0%)
Ampulla	0 (0.0%)
Distal choledochal	0 (0.0%)
Location	
Head	69 (92.0%)
Neck	0(0.0%)
Body	2 (2.7%)
Tail	4 (5.3%)
Uncinate process	0 (0.0%)
Tumor size, mm	31.83±13.27
Number of lymph nodes	23.79±12.91
Number of metastatic lymph nodes	2 (1-4)
Extracapsular invasion	14 (18.7%)
Resectability (preoperative CT)	
Resectable	48 (64.0%)
Borderline	27 (36.0%)
Unresectable	0 (0.0%)
Perineural invasion	62 (82.7%)
Lymphovascular invasion	52 (69.3%)
Data are given as mean±standard deviation or median (1st q	uartile-3rd quartile)
for continuous variables according to normality of distribution	on and as frequency
(percentage) for categorical variables	

Table 2. Summary of laboratory and surgic	cal outcomes
Resection margin	
R0	59 (78.7%)
R1	16 (21.3%)
R2	0 (0.0%)
Surgical margin	
Negative	59 (78.7%)
Pancreatic parenchyma	3 (4.0%)
Choledochal	1 (1.3%)
Retropancreatic	12 (16.0%)
Choledochal and pancreatic parenchyma	0 (0.0%)
Pancreaticojejunostomy type	
Ducto-jejunostomy	60 (80.0%)
Others	6 (8.0%)
None	9 (12.0%)
Gastrojejunostomy type	
Simple	58 (77.3%)
Roux-en-Y	11 (14.7%)
None	6 (8 0%)
Pylorus	0 (0.070)
Preserving	0 (0.0%)
Classic	69 (92 0%)
None	6 (8 0%)
Portal vein resection	12 (16.0%)
A diuvant chemotherany	12 (10.070) 59 (78 7%)
A diuvant radiothorapy	11(14.7%)
Longth of stay in bosnital days	11(14.770) 11(7.15)
Leakage	11 (7-13)
Diashamiaal	4 (E 20/)
Magragaonia	4 (5.5%)
Macroscopic Distale	10 (15.5%)
Fistula Crude A	2 (4.00/)
Grade A	3 (4.0%) 2 (4.0%)
Grade B	3 (4.0%)
Grade C	7 (9.3%)
Postoperative infection	21 (28.0%)
Recurrence	24 (33.8%)
Albumin	4.04±0.52
Hemoglobin	12.78±1.58
Neutrophil (×10 ³)	4.8 (3.8-6.4)
Lymphocyte (×10 ³)	1.7 (1.4-2.11)
Platelet (×10 ³)	276.56±79.43
RDW	14.9 (13.7-16.8)
Total bilirubin	3.69 (1.15-8.18)
Direct bilirubin	2.87 (0.43-6.91)
CA 19-9	122.5 (39.5-476.0)
Neutrophil / lymphocyte ratio	2.92 (1.92-3.79)
Platelet / lymphocyte ratio	157.14 (116.74-203.36)
Status	
Exitus	38 (50.7%)
Alive	37 (49.3%)
Data are given as mean±standard deviation or median for continuous variables according to normality of distr (percentage) for categorical variables	(1st quartile-3rd quartile) ribution and as frequency

We examined the association of tumor characteristics and tumor related continuous variables with RDW, NLR, and PLR. It was observed that the PLR value decreased significantly as the degree of differentiation of the tumor (un-differentiated and poorly differentiated versus moderately and highly differentiated) increased (p=0.030). There was a significant positive correlation between the length of stay in hospital and PLR value (r=0.262, p=0.023). We also found a significant positive correlation between CA 19-9 values and NLR (r=0.277, p=0.016) and PLR (r=0.278, p=0.016). The RDW, PLR and NLR values did not demonstrated any significant relationships with other tumor characteristics or tumorrelated continuous variables, including differentiation, clinical stage, extracapsular invasion, perineural invasion, lymphovascular invasion, resection margin, tumor size, number of lymph nodes, number of metastatic lymph nodes, leakage, fistula, postoperative infection, recurrence, death status, resectability, length of stay in hospital and CA 19-9 (Table 3 and Table 4).

Table 4. Relationships	between	RDW,	PLR,	NLR	and	tumor	related	
continuous variables								

		RDW	NLR	PLR		
Tumor size	r	-0.143	0.155	0.060		
	р	0.221	0.185	0.612		
Number of lymph	r	0.117	-0.071	-0.039		
nodes	р	0.316	0.547	0.740		
Number of metastatic	r	0.005	-0.022	0.002		
lymph nodes	р	0.968	0.854	0.986		
Length of stay in hospital	r	0.068	0.152	0.262		
	р	0.561	0.192	0.023		
CA 10.0	r	0.093	0.277	0.278		
CA 19-9	р	0.427	0.016	0.016		
r: Spearman correlation coefficient						

Table 3. Summary of RDW, NLR and PLR wit	h regard to tumor ch	naracteris	tics			
	RDW	р	NLR	р	PLR	р
Differentiation		0.800		0.067		0.030
Un-differentiated & poorly differentiated	14.5 (13.5-17.2)		3.14 (2.43-5.63)		174.00 (138.57-220.00)	
Moderately & highly differentiated	15.0 (14.1-16.1)		2.75 (1.74-3.70)		147.45 (111.76-181.82)	
Stage		0.978		0.956		0.533
Stage 1 & 2	14.8 (13.7-16.5)		2.92 (1.93-3.79)		156.80 (115.64-188.89)	
Stage 3	15.15 (13.8-17.0)		2.89 (1.92-3.78)		164.67 (126.95-203.77)	
Extracapsular invasion		0.678		0.523		0.138
No	14.9 (13.7-16.7)		2.92 (1.92-3.78)		151.58 (114.55-195.07)	
Yes	14.9 (14.5-17.0)		2.90 (2.43-4.86)		169.17 (137.70-253.57)	
Resectability (preoperative CT)		0.187		0.877		0.453
Resectable	15.2 (13.7-17.6)		2.99 (1.83-3.80)		164.35 (126.34-203.65)	
Borderline	14.5 (13.7-15.9)		2.82 (1.93-3.54)		141.73 (111.76-195.65)	
Perineural invasion		0.700		1.000		0.944
No	15.2 (13.5-15.9)		2.36 (1.95-3.60)		164.36 (114.55-188.89)	
Yes	14.8 (13.8-17.0)		2.94 (1.75-3.79)		154.19 (117.14-203.36)	
Lymphovascular invasion		0.304		0.654		0.679
No	15.7 (13.5-18.4)		3.03 (1.61-4.06)		158.50 (105.88-195.07)	
Yes	14.7 (13.9-16.15)		2.92 (1.95-3.74)		156.97 (122.87-203.57)	
Resection margin		0.591		0.393		0.130
R0	14.7 (13.7-16.8)		2.92 (1.83-3.79)		151.58 (114.55-188.89)	
R1	15.25 (13.8-16.7)		3.09 (2.24-4.66)		176.65 (128.75-230.18)	
Leakage		0.812		0.765		0.978
No	14.9 (13.8-16.7)		3.03 (1.83-3.81)		156.80 (115.64-203.36)	
Yes	14.95 (13.6-17.2)		2.87 (2.22-3.43)		161.42 (125.73-168.10)	
Fistula		0.732		0.425		0.644
No	14.85 (13.8-16.7)		3.04 (1.83-3.96)		156.97 (115.64-203.77)	
Yes	15.2 (13.6-17.2)		2.82 (2.22-3.03)		158.50 (125.73-166.00)	
Postoperative infection		0.781		0.962		0.243
No	14.85 (13.7-16.8)		2.99 (1.83-3.81)		146.32 (110.96-195.65)	
Yes	15.2 (14.0-16.4)		2.92 (2.22-3.60)		164.35 (144.00-203.95)	
Recurrence		0.711		0.488		0.402
No	14.9 (13.5-17.0)		2.82 (1.92-3.78)		161.82 (116.74-206.92)	
Yes	14.55 (13.8-16.3)		3.17 (1.84-4.25)		151.50 (121.29-179.60)	
Status		0.311		0.147		0.275
Exitus	15.2 (14.2-16.8)		3.10 (2.15-4.29)		165.29 (126.95-210.00)	
Alive	14.6 (13.4-16.5)		2.49 (1.83-3.50)		144.00 (116.74-181.82)	
Data are given as median (1st quartile-3rd quartile) accord	ing to normality of distrib	ution				

In addition, we evaluated patient-related, tumorrelated and surgical characteristics, presence/absence of chemotherapy or radiotherapy after surgery, and complications during follow-up with respect to their possible association with survival time, 2-year survival rate and mortality rates using the Kaplan Meier method with Log rank test (**Table 5**). There was a significant positive correlation between receiving adjuvant chemotherapy and survival time and survival percentage (p < 0.001). No significant correlation was found between survival and any of the other variables (**Table 5**, **Figure 1**, **Figure 2**).

nnbitsMean (95% CI)MediaMediaPOverall survival75832517 (1851 31.84)15 (10.36 19.64)20NASox3405 (22.18.45.93)22 (78.38.2)42.212.2222.122.22Male642017.89 (12.97.27.84)15 (10.89.19.11)21.81.8621.82.122Male64500.14 (15.44.24.85)15 (10.89.19.11)21.81.8621.81.92Operation93040.75 (20.26.61.24)*50.10.93.19.1138.32.11Obtal & Total pancreatectomy93040.57 (20.26.61.24)16.11.92.0338.32.9.1138.32.9.11Operation2030.45 (20.85.40.05)14 (8.1.19.9)38.32.9.1138.32.9.1111.85.93Operation2030.45 (20.85.40.05)19 (10.17.26.03)38.32.9.1111.95.9311.02.27.01Operation2030.45 (20.85.40.05)19 (10.17.26.03)36.32.9.1111.95.9311.02.27.0111.95.9311.02.27.01 <t< th=""><th>Table 5. Survival times (months) with Kaplan Meier</th><th>method</th><th>and comp</th><th>arisons of groups with</th><th>Log rank test</th><th></th><th></th></t<>	Table 5. Survival times (months) with Kaplan Meier	method	and comp	arisons of groups with	Log rank test		
Overall survival 75 38 25.7 (18.51-31.84) 15 (10.36-19.44) 29.627.2 N/A Sex 0095 Female 29 12 34.05 (22.18-45.93) 23 (7.8-38.2) 42.2412.2 Operation 0 23 42.7412.433 15 (10.89-19.11) 21.848.6 Operation 20.14 (15.442.83) 15 (11.96-18.04) 66.12.75 0.833 Not-preserving 23 40.75 (20.26-61.24) 7.5 0.21.53 0.833 Preserving 23 40.55 (15.04-28.27) 19 (11.17-26.83) 0.4439 Undertatly & highly differentiated 25 2.7 26 (137.73.61) 19 (10.61-27.4) 36.12.90 Undertatly & highly differentiated 25 2.5 4.5 (4 (7.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-21.1) 31.14.84 Stage 3 26 2.5 5.5 (4 (7.09-34.18) 19 (12.87.25.13) 34.84.85 Stage 3 26 2.5 4.5 (4 (7.09-34.18) 19 (12.87.25.13) 34.84.85 Stage 3 26 2.5 4.5 (4 (7.09-34.18) 19 (12.87.25.13) 34.84.85 Stage 3 2.6 (13.03 (12.87.		n	Exitus	Mean (95% CI)	Median (95% CI)	2-year survival rate (%)	р
Sex	Overall survival	75	38	25.17 (18.51-31.84)	15 (10.36-19.64)	29.6±7.2	N/A
Fernale 29 12 34.05 (22,18.45.93) 23 (7,8-38.2) 42,211.22 Male 6 17.89 (12.97-2.28) 15 (10.89-19.11) 21.85.60 Operation 75.09 (12.97-2.28) 15 (10.89-19.11) 21.85.60 Spleen 75.09 (12.97-2.28) 15 (11.96-18.04) 26.12.75 Spleen 75.09 (12.97-2.28) 15 (11.96-18.04) 36.35.91 Ortspresving 23 0.45 (20.85-40.05) 14 (8.1-19.9) 38.35.91 Ortspresving 23 18 21.65 (15.04.28.27) 19 (10.17.26.33) 30.459.6 Und-differentiated & poorly differentiated 25 27.06 (19.27.34.18) 19 (10.6-12.74) 31.18.8 Stage 1 & 2 25.41 (7.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-21.1) 31.18.8 26 25.31 (12.73.249) 10 (42.92.12) 2.07.66 Stage 1 & 2 2.62 (11.09-34.18) 13 (8.58 17.49) 2.6.78.53 2.00.90 Stage 1 & 2 2.62 (12.92.55.13) 34.28.25 9.00 2.00.90 2.00.90 Stage 1 & 2 2.72 (10.27.34.29) 10 (12.87.57.51) 10.42.99 <td< td=""><td>Sex</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0.095</td></td<>	Sex						0.095
Male 46 26 17.89 (1.9.7 22.81) 15 (10.89-19.11) 21.828.6 Whipple procedure 66 35 20.14 (15.44-24.83) 15 (11.96-18.04) 26.127.5 Spleen 0.304 (20.85-10.24) 7.502.15.3 0.4393 Not-preserving 52 20 30.45 (20.85-10.24) 11.17-26.83) 0.4496 Differentiation 0.45 (20.85-10.24) 19 (11.17-26.83) 0.4496 0.102 Un-differentiated & poorly differentiated 50 23 (48 (20.95-10.24)) 10 (5.55-14.45) 11.55-99 Moderately & highly differentiated 50 23 (44 (1.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-2.11) 31.18.8 Stage 1 & 2 249 25 25.46 (17.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-2.11) 31.18.8 Stage 3 20.04 (1.48-26.00) 16 (7.57-24.49) 27.64 (12.3 20.020 No 11 9 13.90 (9.16-18.64) 13 (8.58-17.43) 10.449.9 Resctable 14 9 13.90 (9.16-18.64) 14 (8.22-19.78) 82.747.2 No 13 15 (9.07-22.23) 26.72.85	Female	29	12	34.05 (22.18-45.93)	23 (7.8-38.2)	42.2±12.2	
Operation 0.0000 Whippe procedure 66 35 20.44 (15.44.24.83) 16.(1.96.18.04) 2.6.17.5 Distal & Total pancreatectomy 9 3 40.75 (20.26-61.24) * 75.0415.3 Spleen 0.839 Not-preserving 23 18 21.65 (15.04-28.27) 19 (11.17-26.33) 0.449.6 Differentiation 0.002 10 (5.55-14.45) 11.549.9 0.002 Un-differentiated & poorly differentiated 25 27.96 (19.77-36.15) 19 (10.61-27.4) 36.149.0 Stage 1 26 13 20.04 (14.48-25.60) 16 (7.51-24.49) 27.641.23 0.209 Stage 3 26 13 20.04 (14.48-25.60) 16 (7.51-24.49) 27.641.23 0.209 Kage 3 26 13 20.04 (14.48-25.60) 16 (7.51-24.49) 27.641.23 0.209 Rescatability (preoperative CT) 7 12 19.90 (12.83-26.93) 14 (42.21-27.8) 0.422 Rescatability (preoperative CT) 7 12 19.90 (12.83-26.95) * 67.341.36	Male	46	26	17.89 (12.97-22.81)	15 (10.89-19.11)	21.8±8.6	
Whipple procedure 66 35 20.14 (15.44-24.38) 15 (11.96-10.40) 2.6.127.5 Spleen 75.015.3 .	Operation						0.216
Distal & Total pancreatectomy 9 3 40.75 (20.26-61.24) * 75.0115.3 Spleen 0.893 Not-preserving 23 18 21.65 (15.04-28.27) 19 (11.17-26.8) 36.34.91.0 Differentiated 25 13 41.65 (9.01-20.12) 10 (5.55-14.45) 11.52.99 Un-differentiated 50 25 27.96 (19.77-36.15) 19 (10.61-27.4) 36.14.90 Stage 1 & 2 49 25 25.64 (17.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-21.1) 31.12.8.8 Stage 1 & 2 49 25 25.64 (17.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-21.3) 34.84.8.5 Extracepalar invasion 0.200 2.85 (16.12.7) 34.14.8.2.500 16 (7.51-24.49) 35.412.4 No 61 29 27.06 (19.27) 34.81 10.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.99 0.42.91.93 0.42.19.93 0.42.19.93 0.42.19.93 0.42.19.9	Whipple procedure	66	35	20.14 (15.44-24.83)	15 (11.96-18.04)	26.1±7.5	
Spleen 0.903 Spleen 52 0 0.45 (2.0.85-0.40.05) 14 (8.1-19.9) 38.12.9.1 Differentiated 0 0.25 2.5 (2.5.04-2.8.27) 19 (11.17-26.83) 0.0429.6 Differentiated 0.001 0.102 0.102 0.102 0.102 Moderately 8 highly differentiated 0.5 2.5 2.7.96 (19.77-36.15) 19 (10.61-27.4) 36.14.9.0 Stage 2.6 2.5 2.5.64 (17.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-21.1) 31.14.8.8 Stage 1 & 2 4.9 2.5 2.5.64 (17.09-34.18) 16 (7.51-2.4.9) 2.7.6412.2 Extracapsular invasion 0.209 1.3.0.04 (1.4.8-2.5.0.0) 16 (7.72-2.2.3) 2.5.7.8.5 Resectable 1.4 2.9 2.7.06 (19.27-34.24) 19 (1.07.5.0.3) 3.8.2.1.1 Preincural invasion 2.0 2.0.3 1.8.8.17 (1.2.8.7.2.1.3) 3.8.2.1.1 0.4.9.9 No 1.3 5 3.9.07 (22.56.55.8) * 6.7.3.4.1.3.6 0.9.1.2.1.8.0 Tymphovaculari invasion 2.3 1.	Distal & Total pancreatectomy	9	3	40.75 (20.26-61.24)	*	75.0±15.3	
Not preserving 52 20 30.45 (20.85-40.05) 14 (81.19) 38.39.1 Differentiation	Spleen						0.893
Preserving 23 18 21.65 (15.04-28.27) 19 (11.17-26.83) 30.429.6 Differentiated 50 25 13 14.56 (9.01-20.12) 10 (5.55-14.45) 11.549.9 Moderately & highly differentiated 25 27.96 (19.77-36.15) 19 (10.61-27.4) 30.129.0 Stage 2 25 25.64 (17.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-21.1) 31.18-8.8 Stage 3 2.6 13 20.04 (14.48-25.60) 16 (7.51-24.49) 27.64 12.3 Extracaspular invasion	Not-preserving	52	20	30.45 (20.85-40.05)	14 (8.1-19.9)	38.3±9.1	
Differentiated 0014 014 015	Preserving	23	18	21.65 (15.04-28.27)	19 (11.17-26.83)	30.4±9.6	
Un-differentiated spoorly differentiated 25 13 14.56 (9.01-20.12) 10 (15.571.44.5) 11.579.9 Moderately & highly differentiated 50 25 27.96 (19.77-36.15) 19 (10.61-27.4) 36.1±9.0 Stage 26 13 20.04 (14.48-25.60) 16 (7.51-24.49) 27.64 (17.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-21.1) 31.1±8.8 Stage 3 26 13 20.04 (14.48-25.60) 16 (7.51-24.49) 27.64 (17.09-34.18) 10 (14.99.9 No 61 29 27.06 (19.27-34.84) 19 (12.87-25.13) 34.88.5 Yes 14 9 13.90 (9.16-18.64) 13 (8.58-17.43) 10.449.9 Resctablity (preoperative CT)	Differentiation						0.102
Moderately & highly differentiated 50 25 27.96 (19.77-36.15) 19 (10.61-27.4) 36.1±.0 Stage 1 2 25 25.64 (17.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-21.1) 31.1±.8.8 Stage 3 26 13 20.04 (14.48-25.60) 16 (7.51-24.49) 27.05 (19.27-34.84) 19 (12.87-25.13) 34.8±.8.5 Extracapular invasion 61 29 27.06 (19.27-34.84) 19 (12.87-25.13) 34.8±.8.5 Yes 14 9 13.09 (9.16-18.64) 13 (8.8-17.43) 10.04±.99 Resectability (preoperative CT) 7 12 19.90 (12.83-26.96) 14 (8.21-97.8) 38.2±12.4 Perineural invasion 7 13 5 39.07 (22.56-55.58) * 67.3±13.6 Ves 62 33 18.88 (12.42-23.51) 14 (10.12-17.88) 19.7±7.2 Lymphovascular invasion 7 20.12 (15.03-25.20) 15 (12.37±1.7.63) 22.1±8.0 Resection margin 7 21.94 (20.01-35.26) 16 (10.44-21.56) 66.2±8.0 Resection margin 22.25 (27 20.12 (15.03-25.20) 15 (12.37±1.7	Un-differentiated & poorly differentiated	25	13	14.56 (9.01-20.12)	10 (5.55-14.45)	11.5±9.9	
Stage 0.763 Stage 1 & 2 25 25 (4 (7, 09 - 34, 18) 15 (8.9 - 21, 1) 31, 14.8.8 Stage 2 26 13 20.04 (14.48 - 25.60) 16 (7, 51 - 24.49) 27, 64 (12, 27 - 34.88) 19 (12, 87 - 25.13) 34, 84 - 88.5 No 61 29 27, 06 (19, 27 - 34.84) 19 (12, 87 - 25.13) 34, 84 - 88.5 Resctability (preoperative CT) 7 12 19.90 (12, 83 - 26.66) 14 (8.22 - 19.78) 38, 2± 12.4 0.091 Resctable 8 26 25, 13 (17, 27 - 32.99) 16 (9, 77 - 22.23) 26, 7± 8.5 0.091 No 13 5 39, 07 (22, 56 - 55.58) * 67 - 3± 1.36 0.091 No 13 5 39, 07 (22, 56 - 55.58) * 67 - 3± 1.36 0.001 Yes 62 33 18.88 (14, 24 - 23.51) 14 (10, 12 - 17.88) 91 - 72.2 Lymphovascular invasion 7 12 29.86 (16, 60 - 43.13) 19 (1.07 - 36.93) 46.3 ± 12.7 No 59 30 27, 63 (20, 01 - 35.26) 16 (10, 44 - 15.6) 36.2 ± 8.0 <td>Moderately & highly differentiated</td> <td>50</td> <td>25</td> <td>27.96 (19.77-36.15)</td> <td>19 (10.61-27.4)</td> <td>36.1±9.0</td> <td></td>	Moderately & highly differentiated	50	25	27.96 (19.77-36.15)	19 (10.61-27.4)	36.1±9.0	
Stage 1 & 2 49 25 25.64 (17.09-34.18) 15 (8.9-21.1) 31.14.8.8 Stage 3 26 13 20.04 (14.48-25.60) 16 (7.51-24.49) 27.6±12.3 Extracapular invasion 0.029 77.06 (19.27-34.84) 19 (12.87-25.13) 34.8±8.5 No 61 29 77.06 (19.27-34.84) 19 (12.87-25.13) 34.8±8.5 Rescatability (preoperative CT) 0.791 78.85 16.97.7-22.23) 26.7±8.5 0.7±8.5 Borderline 27 12 19.90 (12.83-26.96) 14 (8.22.19.78) 38.212.4 Perineural invasion 7 12 19.90 (12.83-26.55.81) 67.3±13.6 0.91 No 13 5 39.07 (22.56-55.81) 4 (10.12-17.88) 19.7±7.2 Lymphovascular invasion 0.684 0.31 19 (10.73-65.93) 46.3±12.7 Yes 62 27 20.12 (15.03-25.20) 15 (12.37-17.63) 22.1±8.0 No 16 8 13.96 (8.65-19.28) 10 (4.61-15.39) 0.0±0.0 Resction margin 0.763 (20.01-35.26)	Stage						0.736
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Stage 1 & 2	49	25	25.64 (17.09-34.18)	15 (8.9-21.1)	31.1±8.8	
Extracapsular invasion 0.00 No 61 29 27.06 (19.27.34.84) 19 (12.87.25.13) 34.84.59 Resctability (preoperative CT) 0.791 Perineural invasion 0.791 No 13 5 39.07 (22.56-55.88) * 67.313.60 Yes 62 33 18.88 (14.24-23.51) 14 (10.12-17.88) 19.75.2 Lymphovascular invasion 13 5 39.07 (22.56-55.80) * 67.313.6 Yes 23 11 29.86 (16.60-43.13) 19 (1.07-36.93) 46.312.12 Yes 52 20.12 (15.03-25.20) 15 (12.37-16.3) 21.140 Resction margin 13 5 22.88 (16.15-29.60) 10 (14.15	Stage 3	26	13	20.04 (14.48-25.60)	16 (7.51-24.49)	27.6±12.3	
No612927.06 (19.27-34.84)19 (12.87-25.13)34.848.5Yes14913.90 (9.16-18.64)13 (8.58-17.43)10.449.9Rescatable482625.13 (17.27-32.99)16 (9.77-22.23)26.748.5Borderline271219.90 (12.83-26.96)14 (8.22-19.78)38.2±12.4Perincural invasion	Extracapsular invasion						0.209
Yes149 13.90 (9.16-18.64) 13 (8.58-17.43) 10.4 ± 9.9 Rescetability (preoperative CT)	No	61	29	27.06 (19.27-34.84)	19 (12.87-25.13)	34.8±8.5	
Resectability (preoperative CT) 0,791 Resectable 48 26 25.13 (17.27.32.99) 16 (9.77.22.33) 36.748.5 Borderline 27 12 19.90 (12.83-26.96) 14 (8.2-19.78) 38.241.24 Perineural invasion 0.091 0.091 0.091 0.091 No 13 5 39.07 (22.56-55.8) * 67.3413.6 Yes 23 11 29.86 (16.60-43.13) 19 (1.07.36.93) 46.3412.7 No 23 11 29.86 (16.60-43.13) 19 (1.07.36.93) 46.3412.7 Yes 52 27 20.12 (15.03-25.20) 15 (12.37.17.63) 22.118.0 Resection margin 0.162 Resection margin 0.162 No 63 35 22.88 (16.15-29.60) 14 (11.53.16.47) 22.72.7.3 Yes 12 7.85 (4.91-10.80) 9 (1.11-16.89) 11.5±10.0 No 16 12 7.85 (4.91-10.80) 9 (1.11-16.89) 11.5±10.0 Yes 16 12 7.85 (4.91-10.80) 9 (1.11-16.89) 11.5±10.0 No <td>Yes</td> <td>14</td> <td>9</td> <td>13.90 (9.16-18.64)</td> <td>13 (8.58-17.43)</td> <td>10.4±9.9</td> <td></td>	Yes	14	9	13.90 (9.16-18.64)	13 (8.58-17.43)	10.4±9.9	
Resectable482625.13 (17.27-32.9)16 (9.77-22.23)26.7±8.5Borderline271219.09 (12.83-26.96)14 (8.22-19.78)38.2±12.4Perineural invasion0.091013539.07 (22.56-55.58) $*$ 67.3±13.6Yes620.239.07 (22.56-55.58) $*$ 67.3±13.60.012Jymphovascular invasion0.68400.231129.86 (16.60-43.13)19 (1.07-36.93)46.3±12.7Yes522720.12 (15.03-25.20)15 (12.37-17.63)22.1±8.00.624Resection margin0.953027.63 (20.01-35.26)16 (10.44-21.56)36.2±8.0R116813.96 (8.65-19.28)10 (4.61-15.39)0.0±0.0Portal vein resection0.142331.00 (21.72-40.28) $*$ 83.3±10.8Adjuvant chemotherapy $ -$ 0.013No633522.88 (16.15-29.60)14 (11.53-16.47)22.7±7.3Yes12331.00 (21.72-40.28) $*$ 83.3±10.8Adjuvant chemotherapy $ -$ 0.013No643321.37 (14.52-28.22)15 (12.07-17.93)19.8±7.9Yes11529.65 (17.92-41.38) $*$ 58.3±16.1Leakag $ -$ No612929.30 (17.83-32.77)16 (10.57-21.43) $-$ No612925.30 (17.83-32.77)16 (10.57-21.43) $-$ No </td <td>Resectability (preoperative CT)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.791</td>	Resectability (preoperative CT)						0.791
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Resectable	48	26	25.13 (17.27-32.99)	16 (9.77-22.23)	26.7±8.5	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Borderline	27	12	19.90 (12.83-26.96)	14 (8.22-19.78)	38.2±12.4	
No13539.07 (22.56-55.8) $*$ 67.3 \pm 13.6Yes623318.88 (14.24-23.51)14 (10.12-17.88)19.7 \pm 7.2Lymphovascular invasion0.684No231129.86 (16.60-43.13)19 (1.07-36.93)46.3 \pm 12.7Yes522720.12 (15.03-25.20)15 (12.37-17.63)22.1 \pm .0Rescetion margin0.162RO593027.63 (20.01-35.26)16 (10.44-21.56)36.2 \pm .0R116813.96 (8.65-19.28)10 (4.61-15.39)0.0 \pm .0Portal vein resection0.142331.00 (21.72-40.28) $*$ 83.3 \pm 10.8Adjuvant chemotherapy83.3 \pm 10.8No633522.88 (16.15-29.60)14 (11.53-16.47)22.7 \pm 7.3Yes12331.00 (21.72-40.28) $*$ 83.3 \pm 10.8Adjuvant chemotherapy </td <td>Perineural invasion</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>(,</td> <td></td> <td>0.091</td>	Perineural invasion				(,		0.091
Yes623318.88(14.24-23.51)14 (10.12-17.88)19.7 \pm 7.2Lymphovascular invasion0.684No231129.86 (16.60-43.13)19 (1.07-36.93)46.3 \pm 12.7Yes5222.720.12 (15.03-25.20)15 (12.37-17.63)22.1 \pm .0Resection margin0.1620.12 (15.03-25.20)16 (10.44-21.56)36.2 \pm .0R116813.96 (8.65-19.28)10 (4.61-15.39)0.0 \pm 0.0Portal vein resection0.142331.00 (21.72-40.28)*83.3 \pm 10.8Adjuvant chemotherapy0.101Yes12331.00 (21.72-40.28)*83.3 \pm 10.8Adjuvant chemotherapyNo16127.85 (4.91-10.80)9 (1.11-16.89)11.5 \pm 10.0YesYes102.925 (17.92-41.28)*83.3 \pm 10.1No643321.37 (14.52-28.22)15 (12.07-17.93)19.8 \pm 7.9-Yes11529.65 (17.92-41.38)*83.3 \pm 16.1-Leakage0.536-No612925.30 (17.83-32.77)16 (10.57-21.43)30.7 \pm 8.4Yes13820.24 (9.0-31.37)15 (12.2-0.78)29.9 \pm 8.2Yes13820.24 (9.0-31.37)15 (12.2-0.78)29.9 \pm 8.2Yes13820.24 (9.0-31.37)16 (10.57-21.43)30.7 \pm 8.4 <t< td=""><td>No</td><td>13</td><td>5</td><td>39.07 (22.56-55.58)</td><td>*</td><td>67.3±13.6</td><td></td></t<>	No	13	5	39.07 (22.56-55.58)	*	67.3±13.6	
Lymphovascular invasion 0.684 No 23 11 29.86 (16.60-43.13) 19 (1.07-36.93) 46.3±12.7 Yes 52 27 20.12 (15.03-25.20) 15 (12.37-17.63) 22.1±8.0 Resection margin 0.162 0.162 0.162 0.162 R0 59 30 27.63 (20.01-35.26) 16 (10.44-21.56) 36.2±8.0 R1 16 8 13.96 (8.65-19.28) 10 (4.61-15.39) 0.0±0.0 Portal vein resection 0.142 3 31.00 (21.72-40.28) * 83.3±10.8 Adjuvant chemotherapy	Yes	62	33	18.88 (14.24-23.51)	14 (10.12-17.88)	19.7±7.2	
No231129.86 (16.60-43.13)19 (1.07-36.93)46.3±12.7Yes522720.12 (15.03-25.20)15 (12.37-17.63)22.1±8.0Rescriton margin0.162R0593027.63 (20.01-35.26)16 (10.44-21.56)36.2±8.0R116813.96 (8.65-19.28)10 (4.61-15.39)0.0±0.0Portal vein resection0.142331.00 (21.72-40.28) $*$ 83.3±10.8Adjuvant chemotherapy0.001No16127.85 (4.91-10.80)9 (1.11-16.89)11.5±10.0Yes592629.07 (21.53-36.79)20 (12.03-27.97)35.7±6.6Adjuvant radiotherapyNo16127.85 (4.91-10.80)9 (1.11-16.89)11.5±10.0Yes592629.07 (21.53-36.79)20 (12.03-27.97)35.7±6.6Adjuvant radiotherapyNo643321.37 (14.52-28.22)15 (12.07-17.93)19.8±7.9Yes11529.65 (17.92-41.38) $*$ 58.3±16.1LeakageNo612925.30 (17.83-32.77)16 (10.57-21.43)30.7±8.4Yes14919.68 (9.36-29.99)14 (10.9-17.1)25.4±13.9No623024.98 (17.67-32.28)16 (11.22-20.78)29.9±8.2Yes13820.24 (9.10-31.37)15 (4.38-25.62) <td>Lymphovascular invasion</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>()</td> <td></td> <td>0.684</td>	Lymphovascular invasion				()		0.684
Yes522720.12 (15.03-25.20)15 (12.37-17.63)22.148.0Resection margin0.162R0593027.63 (20.01-35.26)16 (10.44-21.56)36.2 \pm 8.0R116813.96 (8.65-19.28)10 (4.61-15.39)0.0 \pm 0.0Portal vein resection0.1420.1420.142No633522.88 (16.15-29.60)14 (11.53-16.47)22.7 \pm 7.3Yes12331.00 (21.72-40.28)*83.3 \pm 10.8Adjuvant chemotherapy-0.011No16127.85 (4.91-10.80)9 (1.11-16.89)11.5 \pm 10.0Yes592629.07 (21.35-36.79)20 (12.03-27.97)35.7 \pm 8.6Adjuvant radiotherapy-0.1330.1330.14No643321.37 (14.52-28.22)15 (12.07-17.93)19.8 \pm 7.9Yes11529.65 (17.92-41.38)*58.3 \pm 16.10.536Leakage0.5360.5360.536No612925.30 (17.83-32.77)16 (10.57-21.43)30.7 \pm 8.4Yes14919.68 (9.36-29.99)14 (10.9-17.1)25.4 \pm 13.9Fistula0.536No623024.98 (17.67-32.28)16 (11.22-07.8)29.9 \pm 8.2Yes13820.24 (9.10-31.37)15 (4.38-25.62)27.7 \pm 15.0Postoperative infection0.739No542621.15 (15.92-26.39	No	23	11	29.86 (16.60-43.13)	19 (1.07-36.93)	46.3±12.7	
Resection margin0.1620.161 (100 10.00)0.161 (100 10.00)0.162R0593027.63 (20.01-35.26)16 (10.44-21.56)36.2 \pm 8.00.0 \pm 0.0Portal vein resection0.1420.0 \pm 0.00.142No633522.88 (16.15-29.60)14 (11.53-16.47)22.7 \pm 7.3Yes12331.00 (21.72-40.28)*83.3 \pm 10.8Adjuvant chemotherapy </td <td>Yes</td> <td>52</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>20.12 (15.03-25.20)</td> <td>15 (12.37-17.63)</td> <td>22.1+8.0</td> <td></td>	Yes	52	2.7	20.12 (15.03-25.20)	15 (12.37-17.63)	22.1+8.0	
R0593027.63 (20.01-35.26)16 (10.44-21.56)36.2 \pm 8.0R116813.96 (8.65-19.28)10 (4.61-15.39)0.0 \pm 0.0Portal vein resection0.142No633522.88 (16.15-29.60)14 (11.53-16.47)22.7 \pm 7.3Yes12331.00 (21.72-40.28)*83.3 \pm 10.8Adjuvant chemotherapy	Resection margin	01		20112 (10100 20120)	10 (1210) 11100)	2211_010	0.162
Ri 16 81 13.96 (8.65-19.28) 10 (4.61-15.39) 0.0.10.0 Portal vein resection 0.142 0.142 0.142 0.142 No 63 35 22.88 (16.15-29.60) 14 (11.53-16.47) 22.7±7.3 Yes 12 3 31.00 (21.72-40.28) * 83.3±10.8 Adjuvant chemotherapy No 16 12 7.85 (4.91-10.80) 9 (1.11-16.89) 11.5±10.0 Yes 59 26 29.07 (21.35-36.79) 20 (12.03-27.97) 35.7±8.6 Adjuvant radiotherapy 0.133 0.133 No 64 33 21.37 (14.52-28.22) 15 (12.07-17.93) 19.8±7.9 Yes 11 5 29.65 (17.92-41.38) * 58.3±16.1 Leakage 9 19.68 (9.36-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula 0.640 No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-0.78) </td <td>RO</td> <td>59</td> <td>30</td> <td>27.63 (20.01-35.26)</td> <td>16 (10.44-21.56)</td> <td>36.2+8.0</td> <td></td>	RO	59	30	27.63 (20.01-35.26)	16 (10.44-21.56)	36.2+8.0	
Portal vein resection 0.142 No 63 35 22.88 (16.15-29.60) 14 (11.53-16.47) 22.7±7.3 Yes 12 3 31.00 (21.72-40.28) * 83.3±10.8 Adjuvant chemotherapy No 16 12 7.85 (4.91-10.80) 9 (1.11-16.89) 11.5±10.0 Yes 0.133 0.143 2.9.05 (12.03-27.97) 35.7±8.6 Adjuvant radiotherapy 0.813 21.37 (14.52-28.22) 15 (12.07-17.93) 19.8±7.9 Yes 11 5 29.65 (17.92-41.38) * 58.3±16.1 Leakage 14 19 19.68 (9.3-62.299) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula <td>R1</td> <td>16</td> <td>8</td> <td>13.96 (8.65-19.28)</td> <td>10 (4.61-15.39)</td> <td>0.0+0.0</td> <td></td>	R1	16	8	13.96 (8.65-19.28)	10 (4.61-15.39)	0.0+0.0	
No 63 35 22.88 (16.15-29.60) 14 (11.53-16.47) 22.7±7.3 Yes 12 3 31.00 (21.72-40.28) * 83.3±10.8 Adjuvant chemotherapy No 16 12 7.85 (4.91-10.80) 9 (1.11-16.89) 11.5±10.0 Yes 59 26 29.07 (21.35-36.79) 20 (12.03-27.97) 35.7±8.6 Adjuvant radiotherapy 0.133 0.133 No 64 33 21.37 (14.52-28.22) 15 (12.07-17.93) 19.8±7.9 Yes 11 5 29.65 (17.92-41.38) * 58.3±16.1 Leakage 0.536 0.536 No 61 29 25.30 (17.83-32.77) 16 (10.57-21.43) 30.7±8.4 Yes 14 9 19.68 (9.36-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula 0.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 No 62 30 <t< td=""><td>Portal vein resection</td><td>10</td><td>Ū</td><td>10190 (0100 19120)</td><td>10 (1101 1010))</td><td>010_010</td><td>0.142</td></t<>	Portal vein resection	10	Ū	10190 (0100 19120)	10 (1101 1010))	010_010	0.142
No 12 3 31.00 (21.72-40.28) * 83.3±10.8 Adjuvant chemotherapy <0.001 No 16 12 7.85 (4.91-10.80) 9 (1.11-16.89) 11.5±10.0 Yes 59 26 29.07 (21.35-36.79) 20 (12.03-27.97) 35.7±8.6 Adjuvant radiotherapy 0.133 No 64 33 21.37 (14.52-28.22) 15 (12.07-17.93) 19.8±7.9 Yes 11 5 29.65 (17.92-41.38) * 58.3±16.1 Leakage 0.536 No 61 29 25.30 (17.83-32.77) 16 (10.57-21.43) 30.7±8.4 Yes 14 9 19.68 (9.36-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula 0.640 No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-20.78) 29.9±8.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (19.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 7 Yes 21 22 26.45 (13.	No	63	35	22.88 (16.15-29.60)	14 (11 53-16 47)	22 7+7 3	0.1 12
Adjuvant chemotherapy 0.000 (21.12 10.20) 0.000 (21.000) Adjuvant chemotherapy 0.001 No 16 12 7.85 (4.91-10.80) 9 (1.11-16.89) 11.5±10.0 0.001 Yes 59 26 29.07 (21.35-36.79) 20 (12.03-27.97) 35.7±8.6 0.133 No 64 33 21.37 (14.52-28.22) 15 (12.07-17.93) 19.8±7.9 0.536 No 64 33 21.37 (14.52-28.22) 15 (10.07-17.93) 19.8±7.9 0.536 No 61 29 25.30 (17.83-32.77) 16 (10.57-21.43) 30.7±8.4 0.536 0.640 0.640 0.640 0.640 0.640 0.640 <td>Ves</td> <td>12</td> <td>3</td> <td>31.00 (21.72-40.28)</td> <td>*</td> <td>83 3+10 8</td> <td></td>	Ves	12	3	31.00 (21.72-40.28)	*	83 3+10 8	
No 16 12 7.85 (4.91-10.80) 9 (1.11-16.89) 11.5±10.0 Yes 59 26 29.07 (21.35-36.79) 20 (12.03-27.97) 35.7±8.6 Adjuvant radiotherapy 0.133 No 64 33 21.37 (14.52-28.22) 15 (12.07-17.93) 19.8±7.9 Yes 11 5 29.65 (17.92-41.38) * 58.3±16.1 Leakage 0.536 No 61 29 25.30 (17.83-32.77) 16 (10.57-21.43) 30.7±8.4 Yes 14 9 19.68 (9.36-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula 0.6400 No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-0.78) 29.9±8.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 <t< td=""><td>Adjuvant chemotherapy</td><td>12</td><td>5</td><td>51.00 (21.72 10.20)</td><td></td><td>00.0±10.0</td><td>< 0.001</td></t<>	Adjuvant chemotherapy	12	5	51.00 (21.72 10.20)		00.0±10.0	< 0.001
Yes 59 26 29.07 (21.35-36.79) 20 (12.03-27.97) 35.7±8.6 Adjuvant radiotherapy 0.133 No 64 33 21.37 (14.52-28.22) 15 (12.07-17.93) 19.8±7.9 Yes 11 5 29.65 (17.92-41.38) * 58.3±16.1 Leakage 0.536 No 61 29 25.30 (17.83-32.77) 16 (10.57-21.43) 30.7±8.4 Yes 14 9 19.68 (9.36-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula 0.6640 No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-20.78) 29.9±8.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.4±43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes	No	16	12	7 85 (4 91-10 80)	9 (1 11-16 89)	11 5+10 0	<0.001
Adjuvant radiotherapy 0.133 Adjuvant radiotherapy 0.133 No 64 33 21.37 (14.52-28.22) 15 (12.07-17.93) 19.8±7.9 Yes 11 5 29.65 (17.92-41.38) * 58.3±16.1 Leakage 0.536 No 61 29 25.30 (17.83-32.77) 16 (10.57-21.43) 30.7±8.4 Yes 14 9 19.68 (9.36-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula 0.640 No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-20.78) 29.9±8.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12	Ves	59	26	29.07 (21.35-36.79)	20(1203-2797)	35 7+8 6	
No 64 33 21.37 (14.52-28.22) 15 (12.07-17.93) 19.8±7.9 Yes 11 5 29.65 (17.92-41.38) * 58.3±16.1 Leakage 0.536 No 61 29 25.30 (17.83-32.77) 16 (10.57-21.43) 30.7±8.4 Yes 14 9 19.68 (9.36-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula 0.640 No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-20.78) 29.9±8.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-33.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	Adjuvant radiotherany	57	20	29.07 (21.33 30.79)	20 (12.03 27.97)	55.7±0.0	0.133
No 64 55 21157 (14.52 20.22) 15 (12.67 17.53) 17.52175 Yes 11 5 29.65 (17.92-41.38) * 58.3±16.1 Leakage 0.536 No 61 29 25.30 (17.83-32.77) 16 (10.57-21.43) 30.7±8.4 Yes 14 9 19.68 (9.36-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula 0.640 No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-20.78) 29.9±8.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	No	64	33	21.37(14.52,28.22)	15(1207-1793)	19 8+7 9	0.155
Its 11 5 25,05 (17,52-41,36) 36,5110,1 Leakage 0.536 No 61 29 25,30 (17,83-32,77) 16 (10,57-21,43) 30,7±8,4 Yes 14 9 19,68 (9,36-29,99) 14 (10,9-17,1) 25,4±13,9 Fistula 0.640 No 62 30 24,98 (17,67-32,28) 16 (11,22-20,78) 29,9±8,2 Yes 13 8 20,24 (9,10-31,37) 15 (4,38-25,62) 27,7±15,0 Postoperative infection 0,739 No 54 26 21,15 (15,92-26,39) 16 (9,9-22,1) 28,4±8,7 Yes 21 12 26,45 (13,56-39,33) 14 (11,57-16,44) 30,8±12,6 Recurrence 0,251 No 47 17 32,90 (22,44+43,35) 19 (1,06-36,94) 47,1±10,3 Yes 24 17 17,27 (13,45-21,08) 15 (12,8-17,2) 15,5±9,5	Vac	11	5	21.57 (14.52 - 20.22) 29.65 (17.92 - 41.38)	*	58 3+16 1	
No 61 29 25.30 (17.83-32.77) 16 (10.57-21.43) 30.7±8.4 Yes 14 9 19.68 (9.36-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula 0.640 No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-20.78) 29.9±8.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	Lookago	11	5	29.03 (17.92-41.30)		50.5±10.1	0.536
No 01 25 25.30 (17.83+22.77) 10 (10.37+21.45) 50.716.4 Yes 14 9 19.68 (9.36-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 25.4±13.9 Fistula 0.640 No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-20.78) 29.9±8.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44+43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	No	61	20	25.20(17.83.32.77)	16 (10 57 21 43)	20 7+9 4	0.330
Fis 14 9 19.88 (9.30-29.99) 14 (10.9-17.1) 23.4±13.9 Fistula 0.640 No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-20.78) 29.9±8.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	Vac	14	29	23.30(17.83-32.77) 10.68(0.26,20.00)	10(10.37-21.43) 14(10.0, 17.1)	30.7 ± 0.4	
No 62 30 24.98 (17.67-32.28) 16 (11.22-20.78) 29.9±8.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	Fistula	14	9	19.08 (9.30-29.99)	14 (10.9-17.1)	23.4±13.9	0.640
No 54 26 21.15 (17.07-52.28) 16 (11.22-20.76) 29.9±6.2 Yes 13 8 20.24 (9.10-31.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	No	62	20	24.09 (17.67.22.29)	16 (11 22 20 78)	20.0+9.2	0.040
Its 6 20.24 (9.10-51.37) 15 (4.38-25.62) 27.7±15.0 Postoperative infection 0.739 No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	Voc	12	0	24.90(17.07-32.28) 20.24(0.10.21.27)	10(11.22-20.78) 15(4.29, 25, 62)	27.7±0.2	
No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	Postoparativa infaction	13	0	20.24 (9.10-31.37)	15 (4.58-25.62)	27.7±15.0	0.720
No 54 26 21.15 (15.92-26.39) 16 (9.9-22.1) 28.4±8.7 Yes 21 12 26.45 (13.56-39.33) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	No	54	26	21.15(15.02.26.20)	16(0,0,22,1)	29 4.19 7	0.739
Ies 21 12 26,45 (13.56-59.35) 14 (11.57-16.44) 30.8±12.6 Recurrence 0.251 No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	NO	54 21	20	21.15(15.92-20.39)	10(9.9-22.1)	20.4±8./	
No 47 17 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 47.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	les	21	12	20.45 (13.56-39.33)	14 (11.5/-16.44)	30.8±12.6	0.251
No 4/ 1/ 32.90 (22.44-43.35) 19 (1.06-36.94) 4/.1±10.3 Yes 24 17 17.27 (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-17.2) 15.5±9.5	Ne	47	17	22.00 (22.44.42.25)	10 (1 06 26 04)	47.1 + 10.2	0.251
res 24 1/ 1/.2/ (13.45-21.08) 15 (12.8-1/.2) 15.5±9.5	NO X	4/	17	52.90 (22.44-43.35)	19 (1.06-36.94)	4/.1±10.3	
SE: Standard error CI: Contidence interval * Can not be calculated due to low number of avitue cases	It's SE: Standard error CI: Confidence interval * Can not be estimated	24	1/	17.27 (13.45-21.08)	15 (12.8-17.2)	15.5±9.5	



Figure 1. Overall survival plot



Figure 2. Overall survival plot with regard to adjuvant chemotherapy

We performed Cox regression analysis to determine significant prognostic factors associated with mortality. High total bilirubin level was a poor prognostic factor and adjuvant chemotherapy was a good prognostic factor. High total bilirubin level was associated with increased risk of death (p=0.045). Patients who received adjuvant chemotherapy had 4.049-fold lower risk of death than those without adjuvant chemotherapy (HR: 0.247, 95% CI: 0.118-0.519, p < 0.001). Other variables included in the model, age (p=0.621), sex (p=0.299), time between diagnosis and surgery (p=0.130), tumor size (p=0.084), number of metastatic lymph nodes (p=0.915), albumin (p=0.557), hemoglobin (p=0.093), RDW (p=0.143), CA 19-9 (p=0.253), NLR (p=0.971) and PLR (p=0.601) were found to be non-significant (**Table 6**).

DISCUSSION

Currently, there is no suitable preoperative blood test or analysis method enabling the prediction of morbidity and mortality in patients with PC (14). In this study, we aimed to evaluate many factors, with particular focus on PLR, NLR and RDW, to ascertain whether they were associated with the various characteristics of patients with PC and its prognosis. According to our results, PLR values of patients with poorly-differentiated and undifferentiated tumors were significantly higher than those with moderately and highly differentiated tumors. In addition, we observed that the PLR values increased significantly as the length of hospital stay was prolonged. There was a significant positive correlation between CA 19-9 levels and NLR and PLR. Regarding the effects of factors on survival, we observed that high bilirubin (poor prognosis) and receiving adjuvant chemotherapy (good prognosis) were the only factors independently associated with mortality.

Many researchers have investigated the role of inflammation and inflammatory markers/indices in predicting the postoperative prognosis of various tumors, including PC (1,5,8). The ability of platelets to protect cancer cells from the immune response and facilitate their attachment to the endothelium and the antitumor role of lymphocytes support the hypothesis that PLR may be valuable in predicting prognosis in cancer patients (10,15). The mechanism underlying the prognostic value of PLR in PC remains unclear. Platelets can also promote tumor growth, angiogenesis, metastasis, and cancer-associated thrombosis (2). Some researchers focusing on PC have found results showing that patients with high PLR may have shorter OS compared to patients with low PLR (16,17). In contemporary studies, results have shown that PLR value is significantly associated with OS in patients with PC, similar to the research outcomes concerning other cancers (2,4). In a multivariable analysis, greater PLR was found to be an independent risk factor for OS, along with important prognostic factors such as larger tumor diameter, positive microscopic surgical margin, and moderate or poor differentiation (16). A meta-analysis including 14 studies with 2743 patients showed that low preoperative PLR values were associated with better OS in patients with PC. Furthermore, in the aforementioned review, four studies with a total of 1062 patients reported results pertaining to disease-free survival (DFS). They demonstrated that low PLR appeared to be prognostic for better DFS, whereas high preoperative PLR had no

Table 6. Significant prognostic factors of the mortality, Cox regression analysis									
β coefficient Standard Error p Exp(β) 95.0% CI for Exp(β)									
Adjuvant chemotherapy	-1.399	0.379	< 0.001	0.247	0.118	0.519			
Total bilirubin	0.053	0.027	0.045	1.055	1.001	1.111			
CI: Confidence Interval									

impact on OS (5). In another study, an optimal threshold value of 150 for PLR was associated with survival time in patients with resectable PC, while in another study, the same threshold value did not show prognostic value in patients with unresectable tumors (16,18). Another metaanalysis (including three studies) aiming to investigate the prognostic value of PLR found that PLR was not associated with OS in PC (19). Similar to the results of this study Kishi et al. (20) examined 65 patients with PC and concluded that PLR was not associated with the prognosis of these patients. We found a significant association between the presence of undifferentiated or poorly-differentiated PC and the level of PLR. We also observed that there was a significant relationship between CA 19-9 and PLR. While there was a statistically significant relationship between PLR and hospital stay, we did not find a significant association between PLR and survival or other morbidities. Although low PLR levels have the potential to be used as a predictor of better OS in patients with PC, current evidence does not support a role for PLR as a reliable prognostic factor for OS.

Similar to PLR, NLR is an inexpensive, easily available and widely used marker and has been found to be an important prognostic marker for many malignant tumors (3). Several studies have demonstrated the potential prognostic impact of NLR values in patients with PC (21,22). For instance, low NLR has been shown to be significantly associated with improved OS (22). On the other hand, interestingly, high NLR was reported as a surrogate marker in patients with resectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma (23). In another study conducted in China, preoperative NLR values were found to be an independent prognostic factor for OS in patients with early-stage PC (22). Similarly, preoperative serum NLR value in patients with operable pancreatic head cancer was found to provide prognostic information related to OS (24). In a meta-analysis of 34 studies involving 7105 patients with PC, NLR was shown to constitute new prognostic markers for predicting the prognosis of patients with PC, and high NLR value correlated with poor OS. In the same study, it was emphasized that NLR is a better predictor of the prognosis of patients with PC than PLR (1). A recent study investigating the prognostic predictive power of many important factors also found NLR to be an independent prognostic factor in PC, together with factors whose prognostic importance has been proven in many studies, such as CA 19-9, adjuvant chemotherapy, lymph node metastasis, and number of distant organ metastases (25). Hasegawa et al. (26) investigated the link between pretreatment NLR and response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in PC patients and concluded that pretreatment NLR levels were independently associated with pathological response to treatment. In a study evaluating NLR and PLR together, patients with normal values for both NLR and PLR were found to have significantly better OS compared to those with elevated PLR or NLR values. Additionally, the authors suggested that NLR was superior to PLR as a prognostic marker in patients with PC (27). Finally, high NLR at preoperative assessment has also been found to be associated with poor survival in patients with metastatic PC (21,28,29). As a result of our study, in contrast to all these studies, we did not find a significant relationship between NLR value and any other tumor-related, patient-related, prognostic and survival-related factor, except for CA 19-9.

The RDW reflects the heterogeneity of the volume and size of circulating red blood cells and is a parameter readily available from routine blood tests (10). Previous studies have demonstrated that RDW may have diagnostic and prognostic value for various tumor types (14,15). In a study on PC, it was concluded that high RDW levels in patients with pancreatic masses may indicate malignancy (13). Studies have also reported that RDW could be used as an independent prognostic factor in patients with PC undergoing radical surgery. It was concluded that patients with high RDW may be at a more advanced stage of the disease and that the timing of surgery and the duration of neoadjuvant therapy can be determined by looking at the preoperative values of RDW (10), while other research has revealed that high RDW was associated with disease progress and longer postoperative hospital stay (30). In the present study, we did not find a prognostic value for RDW in operated PC patients.

CA 19-9 is a type of modified Lewis(a) blood group antigen and is recommended by the National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines for the diagnosis and followup of PC (31). Several reports have noted the usefulness of CA 19-9 in the monitoring of patients with PC.(32,33) Several studies have shown independent relationships between high levels of CA 19-9 and poor OS in advanced PC (7,25). However, in approximately 20% of patients with PC, CA 19-9 level may be normal before surgery (31) –which must be taken into account when evaluating patients in this respect. In our study, a significant correlation was found between NLR and PLR values and the level of CA 19-9; however, the possible relationships between these seemingly unassociated parameters require further research.

This study reports neoadjuvant chemotherapy and bilirubin levels as the only parameters independently associated with mortality in patients who underwent surgery for PC. It is understood that PC development leads to early systemic spread, and the majority of patients relapse soon after therapeutic surgery. Since the poor prognosis of PC is primarily determined by systemic rather than local failure, it becomes clear that adjuvant treatment strategies need to be developed (34). Available data from randomized trials (35) and meta-analyses (34) showed that although receiving adjuvant chemotherapy significantly prolongs survival in patients with PC, no clear information is available for 5-year survival rate (34). Nonetheless, a recent study stated that receiving adjuvant chemotherapy was an independent good prognostic factor for PC (25), consistent with our findings.

Bilirubin is an endogenous antioxidant that plays a role in many physiological and pathological processes and also exhibits anti-carcinogenic effects (6). Increased bilirubin accumulation in the liver may be associated with PC and this condition can damage liver cells, causing liver dysfunction and even liver failure. These pathological processes may negatively affect survival in patients with advanced PC, resulting in poor prognosis (6). Nakata et al. (36) showed that, in patients with pancreatic head cancer, presence of obstructive jaundice at the time of diagnosis could predict unfavorable survival. Obstructive jaundice is a very common picture in patients with PC (37). Current discussions regarding the need for preoperative biliary drainage in these patients is another issue that should be taken into account (37). Previously, total bilirubin level has been identified as an independent prognostic factor in pancreatic body/tail cancer but not in pancreatic head cancer (25). A 10-year study of 5460 men and 4843 women revealed that high serum bilirubin (in the normal range) was associated with lower likelihood of cancer-related death (7). Supporting most of the literature, we found that high bilirubin was associated with poor prognosis in our group of patients with PC.

Study Limitations

Our study has some limitations. First, as this was retrospective single-center study, these results must be confirmed through unbiased prospective studies. Second, the number of investigated inflammatory markers was low, and the great range of variations in these parameters from patient to patient must be considered before attempting to generalize our findings. Third, the small number of patients may have affected the reliability of statistical evaluations. Finally, prognostic assessment in this study was directly based on mortality, and therefore, possible conclusions regarding associations with morbidity or quality of life cannot be drawn from our data.

CONCLUSION

Preoperative levels of NLR, PLR and RDW do not appear to have value as prognostic indicators for mortality in patients with PC. Nonetheless, our results demonstrate that the PLR elevation in patients with PC could be indicative of the presence of poorly differentiated & undifferentiated tumors. We also observed that greater PLR values were associated with prolonged hospital stay, indicating that PLR could be valuable in estimating hospital stay. Although CA 19-9 levels showed significant correlations with NLR and PLR, the correlation coefficients were too low to suggest a direct relationship between this tumor marker and inflammation. Most importantly, high bilirubin level was found to be associated with increased likelihood of death, while having received adjuvant chemotherapy reduced the likelihood of death. Large-scale prospective studies with greater patient numbers are needed to adequately evaluate the possible role of inflammatory markers in predicting prognosis in PC.

ETHICAL DECLARATIONS

Ethics Committee Approval: The study was carried out with the permission of the Ethics Committee of Osmangazi University Faculty of Medicine (Date: 15.06.2021, Decision No: 04).

Informed Consent: Because the study was designed retrospectively, no written informed consent form was obtained from patients.

Referee Evaluation Process: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Financial Disclosure: The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

Author Contributions: All of the authors declare that they have all participated in the design, execution, and analysis of the paper, and that they have approved the final version.

REFERENCES

- 1. Oh D, Pyo J-S, Son BK. Prognostic roles of inflammatory markers in pancreatic cancer: comparison between the neutrophil-tolymphocyte ratio and platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio. Gastroenterol Res Pract 2018; 2018: 9745601.
- 2. Zhou Y, Cheng S, Fathy AH, Qian H, Zhao Y. Prognostic value of platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio in pancreatic cancer: a comprehensive meta-analysis of 17 cohort studies. Onco Targets Ther 2018; 11: 1899.
- 3. Zhiyao F, Guopei L, Yitao G, Liu C, Xianjun Y. ASO author reflections: C-reactive protein/lymphocyte ratio as a promising marker for predicting survival in pancreatic cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 2020; 27: 4026-7.
- 4. Yang J-J, Hu Z-G, Shi W-X, Deng T, He S-Q, Yuan S-G. Prognostic significance of neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio in pancreatic cancer: a meta-analysis. World J Gastroenterol 2015; 21: 2807-15.
- 5. Riauka R, Ignatavicius P, Barauskas G. Preoperative platelet to lymphocyte ratio as a prognostic factor for resectable pancreatic cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Dig Surg 2020; 37: 436-44.
- 6. Feng L, Gu S, Wang P, et al. Pretreatment values of bilirubin and albumin are not prognostic predictors in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer. Cancer Med 2018; 7: 5943-51.

- 7. Temme EH, Zhang J, Schouten EG, Kesteloot H. Serum bilirubin and 10-year mortality risk in a Belgian population. Cancer Causes Control 2001; 12: 887-94.
- Giakoustidis A, Neofytou K, Neves MC, et al. Identifying the role of neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio and platelets-to-lymphocyte ratio as prognostic markers in patients undergoing resection of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Ann Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg 2018; 22: 197-207.
- 9. Kwon H-C, Kim SH, Oh SY, et al. Clinical significance of preoperative neutrophil-lymphocyte versus platelet-lymphocyte ratio in patients with operable colorectal cancer. Biomarkers 2012; 17: 216-22.
- 10.Dang C, Wang M, Qin T, Qin R. Clinical importance of preoperative red-cell volume distribution width as a prognostic marker in patients undergoing radical surgery for pancreatic cancer. Surg Today 2021: 1-10.
- 11. Mowbray NG, Griffith D, Hammoda M, Shingler G, Kambal A, Al-Sarireh B. A meta-analysis of the utility of the neutrophil-tolymphocyte ratio in predicting survival after pancreatic cancer resection. HPB (Oxford) 2018; 20: 379-84.
- 12.Xu Z-S, Zhang F-P, Zhang Y, et al. Prognostic role of the pretreatment platelet-lymphocyte ratio in pancreatic cancer: a metaanalysis. Oncotarget 2017; 8: 99003.
- 13. Akturk O, Çakir M. The discriminative properties of erythrocyte anisocytosis in patients with resectable malignant pancreatic masses compared with an age and gender matched control group. Il Giornale di chirurgia 2020; 41: 34-9.
- 14.Smirne C, Grossi G, Pinato DJ, et al. Evaluation of the red cell distribution width as a biomarker of early mortality in hepatocellular carcinoma. Dig Liver Dis 2015; 47: 488-94.
- 15.Koma Y, Onishi A, Matsuoka H, et al. Increased red blood cell distribution width associates with cancer stage and prognosis in patients with lung cancer. PLoS One 2013; 8: e80240.
- 16.Shirai Y, Shiba H, Sakamoto T, et al. Preoperative platelet to lymphocyte ratio predicts outcome of patients with pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma after pancreatic resection. Surgery 2015; 158: 360-5.
- 17. Spolverato G, Maqsood H, Kim Y, et al. Neutrophil-lymphocyte and platelet-lymphocyte ratio in patients after resection for hepato-pancreatico-biliary malignancies. J Surg Oncol 2015; 111: 868-74.
- 18.Smith RA, Bosonnet L, Raraty M, et al. Preoperative plateletlymphocyte ratio is an independent significant prognostic marker in resected pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Am J Surg 2009; 197: 466-72.
- 19.Zhou X, Du Y, Huang Z, et al. Prognostic value of PLR in various cancers: a meta-analysis. PLoS One 2014; 9: e101119.
- 20.Kishi T, Nakamura A, Itasaka S, et al. Pretreatment C-reactive protein level predicts outcome and patterns of failure after chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced pancreatic cancer. Pancreatology 2015; 15: 694-700.
- 21. Varol U, Kaya E, Oflazoglu U, et al. Prognostic role of De Ritis and basal neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio in patients with advanced stage pancreatic cancer [İzmir Oncology Group (IZOG) Study]. JBUON 2020; 25: 1063-9
- 22. Cheng H, Luo G, Lu Y, et al. The combination of systemic inflammation-based marker NLR and circulating regulatory T cells predicts the prognosis of resectable pancreatic cancer patients. Pancreatology 2016; 16: 1080-4.
- 23.Ong S, Garcea G, Thomasset S, et al. Surrogate markers of resectability in patients undergoing exploration of potentially resectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma. J Gastrointest Surg 2008; 12: 1068-73.
- 24.Asaoka T, Miyamoto A, Maeda S, et al. Prognostic impact of preoperative NLR and CA19-9 in pancreatic cancer. Pancreatology 2016; 16: 434-40.

- 25.Li Q, Feng Z, Miao R, Liu X, Liu C, Liu Z. Prognosis and survival analysis of patients with pancreatic cancer: retrospective experience of a single institution. World J Surg Oncol 2022; 20: 1-16.
- 26.Hasegawa S, Eguchi H, Tomokuni A, et al. Pre-treatment neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio as a predictive marker for pathological response to preoperative chemoradiotherapy in pancreatic cancer. Oncol Lett 2016; 11: 1560-6.
- Wang D-S, Luo H-Y, Qiu M-Z, et al. Comparison of the prognostic values of various inflammation based factors in patients with pancreatic cancer. Med Oncol 2012; 29: 3092-100.
- 28. Piciucchi M, Stigliano S, Archibugi L, et al. The neutrophil/ lymphocyte ratio at diagnosis is significantly associated with survival in metastatic pancreatic cancer patients. Int J Mol Sci 2017; 18: 730.
- 29.Guo J, Wu M, Guo L, Zuo Q. Pretreatment blood neutrophil/ lymphocyte ratio is associated with metastasis and predicts survival in patients with pancreatic cancer. Bull Cancer 2018; 105: 146-54.
- 30.Yilmaz A, Malya F, Ozturk G, et al. Effect of pre-operative red blood cell distribution on cancer stage and morbidity rate in patients with pancreatic cancer. Int J Clin Exp Med 2014; 7: 3072.
- 31. Yagyu T, Saito H, Sakamoto T, et al. Preoperative albuminbilirubin grade as a useful prognostic indicator in patients with pancreatic cancer. Anticancer Res 2019; 39: 1441-6.
- 32. Scarà S, Bottoni P, Scatena R. CA 19-9: biochemical and clinical aspects. Advances in Cancer Biomarkers 2015: 247-60.
- 33. Nishida K, Kaneko T, Yoneda M, et al. Doubling time of serum CA 19-9 in the clinical course of patients with pancreatic cancer and its significant association with prognosis. J Surg Oncol 1999; 71: 140-6.
- 34.Boeck S, Ankerst DP, Heinemann V. The role of adjuvant chemotherapy for patients with resected pancreatic cancer: systematic review of randomized controlled trials and metaanalysis. Oncology 2007; 72: 314-21.
- 35.Bakkevold KE, Arnesjø B, Dahl O, Kambestad B. Adjuvant combination chemotherapy (AMF) following radical resection of carcinoma of the pancreas and papilla of Vater—results of a controlled, prospective, randomised multicentre study. Eur J Cancer 1993; 29: 698-703.
- 36. Nakata B, Amano R, Kimura K, Hirakawa K. Comparison of prognosis between patients of pancreatic head cancer with and without obstructive jaundice at diagnosis. Int J Surg 2013; 11: 344-9.
- 37. Aziz MH, Sideras K, Aziz NA, et al. The systemic-immuneinflammation index independently predicts survival and recurrence in resectable pancreatic cancer and its prognostic value depends on bilirubin levels: a retrospective multicenter cohort study. Ann Surg 2019; 270: 139-46.