

## Supplemental Online Content

Sippola S, Haijanen J, Grönroos J, Rautio T, Nordström P, Rantanen T, Pinta T, Ilves I, Mattila A, Rintala J, Löyttyniemi E, Hurme S, Tammilehto V, Marttila H, Meriläinen S, Laukkarinen J, Sävelä EL, Savolainen H, Sippola T, Aarnio M, Paajanen H, Salminen P. Effect of Oral Moxifloxacin vs Intravenous Ertapenem Plus Oral Levofloxacin for Treatment of Uncomplicated Acute Appendicitis. *JAMA*. Published online January 11, 2021. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.23525

Supplement 2. Statistical analysis plan

This supplemental material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

# 1 APPAC II trial: Statistical analysis plan

2 Jussi Haijanen, M.D, Suvi Sippola, M.D., Juha Grönroos, M.D., Ph.D., Saija Hurme, M.Sc., Eliisa  
3 Löyttyniemi, M.Sc., and Paulina Salminen, M.D., Ph.D., on behalf of the APPAC II study group

4

5 Version number 0.1

6 Responsibilities:

7 Approved by Saija Hurme 27.10.2015 / amendment 2.4.2020

8 Issued by and analyses will be conducted By Eliisa Löyttyniemi.

9 SAS-programming will be done by Teemu Kempainen.

10

## 11 1. Introduction

12 APPAC II trial is a multicentre, open-label, non-inferiority randomized controlled trial  
13 comparing per oral (p.o.) antibiotic monotherapy with intravenous (i.v.) antibiotic therapy  
14 followed by p.o. antibiotics in the treatment of CT-scan confirmed uncomplicated acute  
15 appendicitis. Primary endpoint is the success of the randomized treatment, defined as  
16 resolution of acute appendicitis resulting in discharge from the hospital without the need for  
17 surgical intervention and no recurrent appendicitis during one-year follow-up. Secondary  
18 endpoints include post-intervention complications (possible postoperative complications  
19 classified using primarily the Clavien-Dindo classification<sup>1</sup>), late recurrence (after one year) of  
20 acute appendicitis after antibiotic treatment, duration of hospital stay, VAS scores, quality of  
21 life (QOL, using for example 5D or 15D validated QOL questionnaire), length of sick leave and  
22 treatment costs.

## 23 2. Sample size calculation

24 The primary objective of the study is to demonstrate that p.o. antibiotic therapy is non-  
25 inferior compared to a combination of i.v. and p.o. antibiotic therapy, i.e. the trial is designed  
26 as a non-inferiority study and sample size calculations were based on non-inferiority test for  
27 binomial proportion. Sample size was calculated from an estimated success rate of 73% for

28 i.v. + p.o. antibiotic group during the one year follow-up based on the results of our previous  
29 APPAC trial<sup>2</sup>. The hypothetical difference between the two groups ((i.v. + p.o.) vs (p.o.)) was  
30 set to zero and non-inferiority margin was set to 6 percentage points. We estimated that a  
31 total of 469 patients would yield a power of 0.9 (1-β) to establish whether p.o. antibiotic  
32 therapy was non-inferior to i.v. + p.o. using a one-sided significance level (α) of 0.05. With an  
33 estimated dropout rate of 15% total of 552 patients, 276 patients per group will be enrolled  
34 in the study. Targeted minimum sample size per study hospital will be 20 patients.

### 35 3. Interim analysis

36 When 250 patients have been enrolled to the study and discharged from the hospital, or  
37 even at an earlier stage if the investigators think it is necessary, the point estimate of the  
38 success rate at discharge will be calculated by study statistician and evaluated in each group  
39 to ensure patient safety. If the proportion is below 70% in at least one of the groups, the  
40 study will be terminated. No statistical tests will be conducted in interim analysis and  
41 therefore no corrections to the p-values are needed in the final analyses of the study.

### 42 4. Statistical analysis

43 Categorical variables of the study will be characterized using frequencies and percentages.  
44 For continuous variables means and standard deviations, or medians with range and 25<sup>th</sup> and  
45 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles will be used. The study site differences will be evaluated in statistical models  
46 and if major differences are detected, more complicated statistical models will be used in the  
47 analyses of primary and secondary outcomes. P-values less than 0.05 will be considered  
48 statistically significant. The analyses will be based on the intention-to-treat (ITT) principle (all  
49 randomized excluding possible erroneously randomized patients with a primary CT diagnosis  
50 of complicated appendicitis). Statistical analyses will be performed using SAS System for  
51 Windows, Version 9.4 or later (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC).

#### 52 4.1 Primary outcome

53 The primary objective of the study is to demonstrate that p.o. antibiotic therapy is as efficient  
54 and safe as i.v. + p.o. antibiotics for CT-scan confirmed uncomplicated acute appendicitis. The  
55 primary outcome will be evaluated in two stages using the following statistical hypotheses:

56 1)  $H_0: p_1 \leq 65$  and  $p_2 \leq 65$

57  $H_1: p_1 > 65$  and  $p_2 > 65$

58 2)  $H_0: p_1 - p_2 > 6$

59  $H_1: p_1 - p_2 \leq 6$

60 where  $p_1$  is success of treatment proportion in i.v. + p.o. group and  $p_2$  for p.o. group and  $p_1 -$   
61  $p_2$  is the difference between the groups ((i.v. + p.o.) – p.o.).

62 The point estimate with 95% confidence interval (CI) for success of treatment will be  
63 calculated for both groups and if lower limit of 95% CI  $\geq 65\%$ , then treatment is good enough.  
64 Non-inferiority of p.o. antibiotics vs. i.v. + p.o. antibiotics will be evaluated using a two-sided  
65 90% CI of proportion difference between groups and one-sided Wald test for non-inferiority  
66 with an  $\alpha$  level of 0.05. Non-inferiority margin for difference is 6 percentage points. In cases  
67 of patients lost to follow-up, for the primary end-point of treatment success and the  
68 secondary endpoints of late recurrence, morbidity, and mortality, missing data will be  
69 retrieved from hospital registries.

70 Regarding the primary outcome, multiple prognostic factors potentially effecting the primary  
71 outcome will also be analyzed; for example patient age, gender, body mass index, laboratory  
72 test values, fever, VAS score, symptoms, and symptom duration prior to hospitalization as  
73 well as imaging features such as appendiceal diameter, minor fluid or edema around the  
74 appendix.

#### 75 4.2 Secondary outcomes

76 The secondary outcomes will be analyzed using chi-squared test, independent samples t-test  
77 or Mann-Whitney U-test. The assumptions of tests will be checked for justification of the  
78 analyses. For the secondary outcomes two-sided p-values will be used. The subjects with  
79 missing data will automatically be excluded from the analyses of the variables in concern.

80 The secondary outcomes will be evaluated primarily at the predefined follow-up time points,  
81 excluding the comprehensive QOL life assessment, which will mainly be carried out at the 3  
82 year time point, considering the current understanding that most of the recurrences after  
83 antibiotic treatment will occur during the first 2 years after initial treatment.<sup>3</sup> In a small  
84 subset of patients, earlier QOL data will be retrieved to assess the potential differences.

85 4.3 Subgroup analyses

86 Additional analyses will be performed for overall morbidity using intention-to-treat principle.

87 5. Follow-up

88 The primary outcome results of the trial will be assessed after one-year-follow-up of the  
89 patients. The patients will be assessed for the secondary outcomes also at 3, 5 and 10 years  
90 after treatment and the data is evaluated in every time-point. If the primary endpoint analysis  
91 at 1 year shows non-inferiority of the p.o. antibiotic therapy, this primary endpoint will also be  
92 assessed at further follow-up time points.

- 93 1. Clavien PA, Barkun J, de Oliveira ML, et al. The Clavien-Dindo classification of surgical  
94 complications: five-year experience. *Ann Surg.* 2009;250(2):187-196.
- 95 2. Salminen P, Paajanen H, Rautio T, et al. Antibiotic Therapy vs Appendectomy for Treatment  
96 of Uncomplicated Acute Appendicitis: The APPAC Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.*  
97 2015;313(23):2340-2348.
- 98 3. Salminen P, Tuominen R, Paajanen H, et al. Five-Year Follow-up of Antibiotic Therapy for  
99 Uncomplicated Acute Appendicitis in the APPAC Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.*  
100 2018;320(12):1259-1265.

101