Appendix C. DistillerSR Screening and Abstraction Forms

Title Screening
Is the article published in English?
Does the article report primary data?
Are the participants in the article human?
Is unresectable colorectal cancer the primary focus of the article?

Abstract Screening
Is the article published in English?
Does the article report primary data?
Are the participants in the article human?
Is unresectable colorectal cancer the primary focus of the article?

CRC Full-text Screening
Is article published in English?
Is treatment date prior to January 1, 2000?
Is the study of relevant design?
Are the study participants human?
Does the article report on the correct patient population?
Did the study employ a relevant intervention?
Did the study report a relevant outcome?

STUDY DESCRIPTION
First Author (Last name):
Year of Publication:
Study design:
What key question(s) does this article address?
Descriptors of Treatment (e.g., drug(s) used, route, etc)
Enrollment Start Date (mm/yyyy)
Enrollment End Date (mm/yyyy)
Number in Group
Outcomes
Setting
Patient population with CRC (%)
Previous Treatment
Previous resection: % yes
Previous systemic chemotherapy: % yes
Previous liver-directed therapy: Therapy: %, Therapy2: ...
Previous LDT: select all that apply
DIAGNOSIS
Adenocarcinoma
Mucinous
Synchronous
Mean Liver
Median Liver
Min Liver
Max Liver
Mean N Hepatic
Median N Hepatic
Min N Hepatic
Max N Hepatic
Other Liver Involvement: Name: %, Name2: ...
PATHOLOGY
Mean Size of Hepatic (cm) Lesion(s)
Median Size of Hepatic (cm) L**esion(s)**

Min Size of Hepatic Lesion(s)
Max Size of Hepatic Lesion(s)
% Unilobar Hepatic Lesion(s)
% Bilobar Hepatic Lesion(s)
Other noted lesion characteristics

PATIENT CHARACTERISITCS
Sex (% Male)
Mean Age
Median Age
Min Age
Max Age
RACE: White (%)
RACE: Black (%)
RACE: Asian (%)
RACE: Hispanic (%)
Child-pugh score: Mean
Child-pugh score: Median
Child-pugh score: Min
Child-pugh score: Max
Child-pugh class (A, B, or C)
ECOG Performance Score: Mean
ECOG Performance Score: Median
ECOG Performance Score: Min
ECOG Performance Score: Max
Karnofsky Score: Mean
Karnofsky Score: Median
Karnofsky score: Min
Karnofsky Score: Max
ABSTRACTOR COMMENTS: If you would like to leave a comment pertaining to the information above indicate your name below:

Outcomes Form

FOLLOW-UP
Follow-up assessed?
Length of Follow-up (weeks)
N Subjects Lost to Follow-up

OUTCOMES
Survival outcome definition:
Median Overall Survival (months)
95% CI: Lower limit
95% CI: Upper limit
Mean Overall Survival (months)
95% CI: Lower limit
95% CI: Upper limit

Survival by Year
% survived at year 1
% survived at year 2
% survived at year 3
% survived at year 4
% survived at year 5

Progression Free Survival
Progression free survival definition:
Liver PFS
Median (months)
95% CI: Lower Limit

95% CI: Upper Limit
Liver PFS
Mean (months)
95% CI: Lower Limit
95% CI: Upper Limit
Overall PFS
Median (months)
95% CI: Lower Limit
95% CI: Upper Limit
Overall PFS
Mean (months)
95% CI: Lower Limit
95% CI: Upper Limit

Outcomes Continued
Local Recurrence N
Local Recurrence %
Pain, Instrument
Mean Pain Score
Min Pain Score
Max Pain Score
Pain Score p-value

QOL, Instrument
Min QOL Score
Max QOL Score
QOL Score p-value
Mean LOS (days)
Min LOS (days)
Max LOS (days)
LOS p-value

Hepatic Abscess (%)
Hepatic Hemorrhage (%)
Biloma (%)
Steatohepatitis (%)
Injury to adjacent organ(s) (%)
Liver failure (%)
Increased alkaline phosphatase (N)
Increased alkaline phosphatase (%)
Increased bilirubin (N)
Increased bilirubin (%)
Increased transaminases (N)
Increased transaminases (%)

Please describe any rare adverse events which do not fit into the categorizations above:

ABSTRACTOR COMMENTS: If you would like to leave a comment pertaining to the information above indicate your name below:

Study Quality
Comparative Studies Quality Assessment (USPSTF)
Initial assembly of comparable groups
Maintenance of comparable groups (includes attrition, crossovers, adherence, and contamination)
Avoidance of important differential loss to followup or overall high loss to followup.
Measurements reliable, valid, equal (includes masking of outcome assessment)
Interventions comparable/ clearly defined

All important outcomes considered
Appropriate analysis of results (adjustment for potential confounders and intention-to-treat analysis)
Funding/ sponsorship source acknowledged
Overall Rating

Non-Randomized Comparative-Deeks and colleagues

Prospective sample definition and selection
Clearly described inclusion/exclusion criteria
Representative Sample
Attempt to balance groups by design
Comparable groups as baseline, including clearly described prognostic characteristics
Clearly specified interventions
Participants in treatment groups recruited within the same time period
Attempt to allocate particpants to treatment groups to minimize bias
Concurrent treatment(s) given equally to all treatment groups
Valid, reliable, and equal outcome measures
Blinded outcome assessment
Adequate length of follow-up
Attrition below an overall high level(<20%)
Difference in attrition between treatment groups below a high level (<15%)
Adjusted for confounders in statistical analysis

Carey and Boden case series quality assessment tool
Clearly Defined Question
Well-described study population
Well-described intervention
Use of Validated Outcome Measures
Appropriate Statistical Analysis
Well-Described Results
Discussion/Conclusions Supported by Data
Funding/Sponsorship Source Acknowledged