



Corrigendum to “Endoscopic and surgical drainage for pancreatic fluid collections are better than percutaneous drainage: Meta-analysis” [Pancreatol 20 1 (2020) 132–141]



Lajos Szakó ^a, Péter Mátrai ^{a, b}, Péter Hegyi ^a, Dániel Pécsi ^a, Zoltán Gyöngyi ^c,
Dezső Csupor ^d, Judit Bajor ^e, Bálint Eröss ^a, Alexandra Mikó ^a, Zsolt Szakács ^a,
Dalma Dobszai ^a, Ágnes Meczker ^a, Katalin Márta ^a, Ildikó Rostás ^a, Áron Vincze ^{e, *}

^a Institute for Translational Medicine, Szentagotthai Research Centre, Medical School, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

^b Institute of Bioanalysis, Medical School, University of Pécs, Hungary

^c Department of Public Health Medicine, Medical School, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

^d Department of Pharmacognosy, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary

^e Division of Gastroenterology, First Department of Medicine, Medical School, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

The authors regret including the data of an article in the descriptive tables of the publication. Kumar et al., 2014 (Pancreas. 2014 November; 43(8): 1334–1339. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MPA.0000000000000213>) was included in a previous version of our manuscript, but was omitted finally from our meta-analysis, because this study included only patients with suspected or infected walled-off pancreatic necrosis and direct endoscopic necrosectomy was compared with a step-up approach of percutaneous catheter drainage. None of our meta-analysis included data from the above-mentioned work, therefore the results and conclusions remain the same. One cohort on the other hand (Spivak et al., 1998) unfortunately was not listed in Tables 1 and 2 by mistake, while it was included in the metaanalysis. Furthermore, the publication year of some of the cited works and in one case the first author was incorrectly listed in our tables. Therefore, the following corrections should be made:

Results of the selection process (p.133): second sentence: "Finally, 24 relevant articles were included ... "

Characteristics of the studies included (p.133):

Second sentence: "One prospective observational study, two randomized controlled trials ... "

Table 1 (p.134):

Keane et al., 2016.

Kumar et al., 2014 the entire row of table should be omitted.

Melman et al., 2009.

Ng et al., 1998.

Rana et al., 2014.

Saul et al., 2016.

Last line, third column: 992, fourth column 8625, fifth column 7615.

Table 2 (p.135):

Keane et al., 2016.

Kumar et al., 2014 the entire row of table should be omitted.

Melman et al., 2009.

Ng et al., 1998.

Rana et al., 2014.

Saul et al., 2016.

The following row should be added to Table 1 after row of Siddiqui et al., 2017:

Spivak et al., 1998 | retrospective | - 27 32 |N/A |N/A | Clinical and radiological resolution | 3 years (median)

The following row should be added to Table 2 after row of Siddiqui et al., 2017:

Spivak et al., 1998 | - NR NR | - 49 50 | - 8.7 8.3 | - H:7 B:4 T:12
P:14 H:11 B:7 T:6 P:8 | - NR NR

Supplementary figure 1: Studied included in the quantitative

DOI of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pan.2019.10.006>.

* Corresponding author. Division of Gastroenterology, First Department of Medicine, Medical School, University of Pécs, Ifjúság u. 13., 7624, Pécs, Hungary.

E-mail address: vincze.aron@pte.hu (Á. Vincze).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pan.2024.11.007>

1424-3903/© 2019 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of IAP and EPC. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

synthesis: 24.

Supplemental content 1: Kumar et al., 2014 line and Varca et al., 2018 line should be omitted.

Tables 1 and 2 at row Varadarajulu et al., 2008 is citing Varadarajulu S, Lopes TL, Wilcox CM, Drelichman ER, Kilgore ML, Christein JD. EUS versus surgical cyst-gastrostomy for management of pancreatic pseudocysts. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2008; 68(4):649e55.

The authors would like to express their deepest regret for any inconvenience might have caused by the above-mentioned mistakes.