

**Supplementary Table 1.** Adjusted mean total and itemized costs for LAMS and plastic stent groups\*

| <b>Costs</b>                   | <b>LAMS (US\$)</b> | <b>Plastic (US\$)</b> | <b>p-value</b> |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| <b>Hospital stay</b>           | 13,635.31          | 15,341.57             | 0.719          |
| <b>Procedure</b>               | 12,155.38          | 6,608.71              | < 0.001        |
| <b>Pharmacy</b>                | 14,379.35          | 16,951.82             | 0.666          |
| <b>Radiology</b>               | 5,184.30           | 5,485.70              | 0.846          |
| <b>Anesthesia</b>              | 1,188.90           | 1,449.62              | 0.224          |
| <b>Laboratory</b>              | 4,059.40           | 4,873.70              | 0.516          |
| <b>Other support services†</b> | 4,295.49           | 6,817.14              | 0.024          |
| <b>Total</b>                   | 53,117.54          | 50,131.78             | 0.775          |

\* Cost data frequently have certain characteristics that violate many of the assumptions of standard statistical tests and methods like the student t-test or ordinary least squares regression models. Cost data are frequently highly positively skewed, bi-modal, and sometimes kurtotic. Standard regression models require that the variance of the residual error term have a constant variance and that cost is linearly related to the explanatory variables. With cost data, the variance is frequently not constant (heteroskedastic) and often non-linearly related to the dependent variables. The Pregibon and modified Park test help us to determine the nature of the heteroskedasticity and to determine the goodness of fit for alternative (non-linear) relationships between cost and the explanatory variables.

† Includes food services, respiratory services, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and sterile supply services

Abbreviations: LAMS, lumen-apposing metal stent

**Supplementary Table 2.** Procedures performed to achieve treatment success

| Type of procedures performed       | LAMS | Plastic |
|------------------------------------|------|---------|
| Repeat EUS-guided drainage         | 2    | 5       |
| Endoscopic necrosectomy            | 4    | 6       |
| Percutaneous drain placement       | 2    | 5       |
| Enteral feeding tube placement     | 7    | 13      |
| ERCP for pancreatic duct integrity | 31   | 29      |
| Management of adverse events       | 14*  | 3†      |

\* Procedures performed for management of adverse events in the LAMS group: upper GI endoscopy for LAMS-induced gastrointestinal bleeding (n=3); IR-guided coil embolization for pseudoaneurysm (n=3); IR-coil embolization for bleeding after removal of buried LAMS (n=1); EGD for removal of buried LAMS (n=1); ERCP for biliary stricture (n=3); small bowel enteroscopy and colonoscopy for retrieval of migrated LAMS (n=2); endoscopic removal of PEG-J tube (n=1)

† Procedures performed for management of adverse events in the plastic stent group: Repeat IR-guided coil embolization for bleeding from a splenic artery pseudoaneurysm (n=1); upper GI endoscopy for retrieval of migrated plastic stents (n=2)

Abbreviations: ERCP, endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography; IR, interventional radiology; LAMS, lumen-apposing metal stent; PEG-J, percutaneous endoscopic gastrojejunostomy

**Supplementary Table 3.** Poisson regression analysis to determine factors associated with the number of procedures performed to achieve treatment success

| Predictor variable                   |                    | Incidence rate ratio<br>(95% CI) | p-value |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| Stent type (Plastic vs. Metal)       |                    | 1.12 (0.82 - 1.51)               | 0.478   |
| Age (> 60 years vs. ≤ 60 years)      |                    | 0.86 (0.63 - 1.18)               | 0.346   |
| Gender (Male vs. Female)             |                    | 0.93 (0.67 - 1.29)               | 0.664   |
| Ethnicity                            | White vs. Black    | 1.27 (0.64 - 2.50)               | 0.491   |
|                                      | Hispanic vs. Black | 1.30 (0.55 - 3.07)               | 0.556   |
| Pre-procedure SIRS (Yes vs. No)      |                    | 1.05 (0.76 - 1.46)               | 0.760   |
| Degree of necrosis (≥ 40% vs. < 40%) |                    | 1.22 (0.86 - 1.74)               | 0.269   |
| Size of WON (cm)                     |                    | 1.02 (0.99 - 1.04)               | 0.250   |

**Supplementary Table 4.** Multiple linear regression analysis with adjustment for possible clustering of procedures within patients

| <b>Predictor variable</b>                      | <b>Coefficient (95% CI)</b> | <b>p-value</b> |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Stent type (Plastic vs. Metal)</b>          | 0.36 (-0.25 to 0.97)        | 0.246          |
| <b>Age (&gt; 60 years vs. ≤ 60 years)</b>      | -0.39 (-1.07 to 0.29)       | 0.259          |
| <b>Gender (Male vs. Female)</b>                | -0.26 (-0.94 to 0.42)       | 0.445          |
| <b>Ethnicity (Non-Caucasian vs. Caucasian)</b> | -0.25 (-1.09 to 0.59)       | 0.556          |
| <b>Pre-procedure SIRS (Yes vs. No)</b>         | 0.12 (-0.59 to 0.83)        | 0.738          |
| <b>Degree of necrosis (≥ 40% vs. &lt; 40%)</b> | 0.50 (-0.14 to 1.15)        | 0.124          |
| <b>Size of WON (cm)</b>                        | 0.05 (-0.02 to 0.11)        | 0.155          |