



### **Appendix 3**

**This appendix was part of the submitted manuscript and has been peer reviewed.  
It is posted as supplied by the authors.**

Appendix to: Burmeister EA, O'Connell DL, Jordan SJ, et al. Factors associated with quality of care for patients with pancreatic cancer in Australia. *Med J Aust* 2016; 205: 459-465. doi: 10.5694/mja16.00567.

Appendix 3: Associations between patient, tumour and health service characteristics and proportional care scores<sup>a</sup> in 1) all patients; 2) patients with no evidence of metastases; and 3) patients with evidence of metastases on clinical staging.

	Crude $\beta$ coefficient (95% confidence interval)		
	All patients (N = 1571)	Non-metastatic (N = 781)	Metastatic (N = 790)
<b>Age group (years)</b>			
< 60	ref	ref	ref
60 - 69	0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)	0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)	0.01 (-0.03, 0.05)
70 - 79	-0.06 (-0.08, -0.03)	-0.06 (-0.10, -0.03)	-0.05 (-0.09, -0.02)
80 +	-0.14 (-0.17, -0.12)	-0.19 (-0.23, -0.16)	-0.10 (-0.13, -0.06)
Overall p value, p trend	< 0.001, < 0.001	< 0.001, < 0.001	< 0.001, < 0.001
<b>Sex</b>			
Female	ref	ref	ref
Male	0.12 (-0.01, 0.03)	0.03 (0.01, 0.06)	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.08)
Overall p value	0.17	0.01	0.57
<b>Charlson Comorbidity score</b>			
0	ref	ref	ref
1	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.00)	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.16)
2	-0.02 (-0.05, -0.00)	-0.03 (-0.06, -0.00)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.02)
Overall p value, p trend	0.05, 0.02	0.07, 0.03	0.52, 0.27
<b>Performance Status</b>			
0	ref	ref	ref
1	-0.02 (-0.05, -0.00)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.06, -0.01)
2+	-0.10 (-0.12, -0.07)	-0.12 (-0.16, -0.09)	-0.07 (-0.11, -0.04)
Not stated	-0.13 (-0.15, -0.10)	-0.11 (-0.15, -0.07)	-0.14, (-0.18, -0.10)
Overall p value, p trend	< 0.001, < 0.001	< 0.001, < 0.001	< 0.001, < 0.001
<b>Place of residence</b>			
Major City	ref	ref	ref
Inner Regional	-0.05 (-0.07, -0.03)	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.00)	-0.07, (-0.10, -0.04)
Rural <sup>b</sup>	-0.08 (-0.11, -0.05)	-0.10 (-0.14, -0.06)	-0.07 (-0.11, -0.03)
Overall p value, p trend	< 0.001, < 0.001	< 0.001, < 0.001	< 0.001, < 0.001
<b>Socio-economic status-quintiles</b>			
Least disadvantaged	ref	ref	ref
2	-0.03 (-0.06, -0.00)	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)
3	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	-0.08 (-0.12, -0.04)	-0.06 (-0.10, -0.02)
4	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	-0.07 (-0.11, -0.03)	-0.07 (-0.11, -0.03)
Most disadvantaged	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.05)	-0.06 (-0.10, -0.02)	-0.08 (-0.12, -0.04)
Overall p value, p trend	< 0.001, < 0.001	0.001, < 0.001	< 0.001, < 0.001
<b>Clinical Stage of disease</b>			
Confined to pancreas	ref		
Locally advanced	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.01)	n/a	n/a
Metastatic	-0.03 (-0.06, -0.01)		
Overall p value, p trend	0.03, 0.01		
<b>First facility volume</b>			
> 30	ref	ref	ref
29 - 10	-0.06, (-0.08, -0.05)	-0.08 (-0.11, -0.06)	-0.04 (-0.07, -0.02)
< 10	-0.16 (-0.18, -0.13)	-0.14 (-0.18, -0.11)	-0.16 (-0.19, -0.13)
Overall p value, p trend	< 0.001, < 0.001	< 0.001, < 0.001	< 0.001, < 0.001
<b>First specialist seen</b>			
Hepatobiliary surgeon	ref	ref	ref
Gastroenterologist	-0.11 (-0.14, -0.08)	-0.14 (-0.18, -0.11)	-0.05 (-0.10, -0.01)
General Surgeon	-0.12 (-0.15, -0.10)	-0.16 (-0.19, -0.13)	-0.06 (-0.10, -0.02)
Other	-0.19 (-0.21, -0.16)	-0.23 (-0.27, -0.19)	-0.14 (-0.18, -0.10)
Overall p value	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001

<sup>a</sup> The higher the proportional care score the higher the quality of care.

<sup>b</sup> Includes patients in outer regional, remote and very remote areas