

Supplemental Table 1. Quality assessment of included case series using the NHLBIQuality Assessment Scale for case series.

First Author	Was the study objective clearly stated?	Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?	Were the cases consecutive?	Were the subjects comparable?	Was the intervention clearly described?	Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Was the length of follow-up adequate?	Was the methodology well-described?	Were the results well-described?	Total score	Quality rating
Amin	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7	Good
Aversa	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	7	Good
Carboni	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Cheng	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Colen	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	8	Good
Dias	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Isozaki	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Jatzko	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	Fair
Jeong	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Kim	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Kobayasbi	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Korenaga	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	8	Good
Martin	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	7	Good
Min	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Mita	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Pacelli	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Molina	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Shchepotin	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	8	Good
Wang	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	8	Good
Wang	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Zhang	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	7	Good
Yang	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	Good
Mita	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good

L. Xiao	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
H. Xiao	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Ozer	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Saito	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	8	Good
Sahakyan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good
Ocana	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	6	Fair
Tran	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	Good

The NHLBI scale ranges from 1-9; with a score of 1-3 denoting poor quality, 4-6 fair quality, and 7-9 suggesting high quality.

NHLBI: National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute

Supplemental Table 2: Survival rates based on R resection.

Authors	Survival based on R resection	
	R0 resection	R+ resection
Carboni et al. (4)	R0= 30.6% (p=0.001)	R+=0%
Dias et al. (26)	R0=56.9%	R+=28.6%
Kobayasbi et al. (27)	R0 better survival (P=0.004)	NM
Mita et al. (22)	R0=78.3% (1-year) R0= 47.7% (3-year) (P<0.002)	R1= 46.6% (1-year) R1= 14.3% (3-year)
Pacelli et al. (8)	R0= 43.7% (5-year) (P=0 .001)	R1=31.4 % (5-year)
Wang et al. (20)	R0-resection (P=0.0174)	NM
Yang et al. (21)	R0 better survival (P < 0.05)	NM
Mita et al. (30)	R0=78.1 (1-year) (P .001) R0= 62.1 (3-year) (P .001)	R+=8.6% (1-year) R+=0 (3-year)
Xiao et al.(10)	R0=68.2% (1-Year) (P =0.030)	R+=41.9% (1-year)
Xiao et al. (23)	R0=34 months (P = 0.004)	R1=11 months