

## 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 3. eTable 1. Number of randomized patients by study hospital.

eTable 2. Baseline characteristics comparison for APPAC II baseline population and non-randomized eligible patients.

eTable 3. Tumor findings in the APPAC II trial.

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

**eTable 1. Number of randomized patients by study hospital.**

<b>Number of randomized patients by study hospital</b>	<b>oral antibiotic monotherapy group (n=301)</b>	<b>intravenous followed by oral antibiotics group (n=298)</b>
Turku University Hospital	54	61
Oulu University Hospital	56	59
Tampere University Hospital	47	48
Kuopio University Hospital	35	33
Pori Central Hospital	45	41
Seinäjäki Central Hospital	22	16
Jyväskylä Central Hospital	12	13
Mikkeli Central Hospital	18	16
Rovaniemi Central Hospital	12	11

**eTable 2. Baseline characteristics comparison for APPAC II baseline population and non-randomized eligible patients.**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>APPAC II baseline population (n=599)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Non-randomized eligible patients (n=569)</b>
Female sex, n, (%)	263(43.9%)	293(51.5%)
Male sex, n, (%)	336(56.1%)	276(48.5)
Age, median (IQR), years	34(26-44)	35(26-46)
Visual analog scale score for pain on admission, mean (SD) <sup>b</sup>	5.2(2.4)	5.9(2.2)
Body temperature, mean (SD), °C	37.2(0.6)	37.3(0.7)
Leukocyte count, median (IQR), x10 <sup>9</sup> /l	12.2(9.3-14.9)	12.3(9.5-14.9)
C-reactive protein, median (IQR), mg/l	32.0(12.0-62.5)	30.0(10.0-59.4)
Neutrophil count, median (IQR), x10 <sup>9</sup> /l	9.4(6.5-11.9)	9.5(7.0-12.3)
Body mass index, median (IQR), kg/m <sup>2</sup> <sup>c</sup>	26.6(23.9-30.1)	26.5(23.8-30.4)
Appendiceal diameter on CT, mean (SD), mm	10.8(2.5)	10.8(2.7)

Abbreviation: IQR, interquartile range

SI conversion factor: To convert C-reactive protein to mg/dL, divide by 10.

<sup>a</sup>Includes all randomized patients excluding erroneously randomized patients with complicated appendicitis initially seen on CT.

<sup>b</sup>Score range 0-10; a score of 0 indicates no pain and 10 indicates the worst possible pain.

<sup>c</sup>Body mass index is the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters.

**eTable 3. Tumor findings in the APPAC II trial.**

Patient Sex/Age	Preintervention imaging	Initial operative treatment/Other operative treatment	Histology/ Location
F/26	Uncomplicated appendicitis, appendiceal diameter 16 mm	Appendectomy	Neuroendocrine tumor/ Tip of the appendix
M/59	Uncomplicated appendicitis, appendiceal diameter 11 mm	Appendectomy	Sessile serrated non-dysplastic adenoma/ Tip of the appendix
M/45	Uncomplicated appendicitis, appendiceal diameter 13 mm	Appendectomy/ Right hemicolectomy	Goblet cell tumor with positive surgical margin <sup>a</sup>
M/46	Uncomplicated appendicitis, appendiceal diameter 21 mm <sup>b</sup>	Appendectomy/ Right hemicolectomy with subsequent hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC)	Adenocarcinoma

<sup>a</sup> Due to suspected tumor involvement at the surgical margin patient underwent right hemicolectomy with no signs of pathology in the resected colon specimen

<sup>b</sup> In blinded retrospective evaluation of the initial CT, this patient had appendiceal diameter of 21 mm with a focal enhancement defect in the appendiceal wall, and substantial periappendiceal edema strongly indicating a complicated form of disease, but no suspicion of a tumor