Hyuk Jung Kim, et al: Meaningful appendiceal perforation

Ann Surg Treat Res 2017;93(2):88-97 https://doi.org/10.4174/astr.2017.93.2.88

Supplementary lable 4. Use of laparoscopic appendectomy by s
--

Investigating site	Overall	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Overall	67.9% (976/1,438)	70.7% (766/1,083)	73% (40/55)	52.5% (106/202)	65% (64/98)
Site 1	25.8% (112/434)	25.7% (73/284)	25% (4/16)	23% (22/97)	35% (13/37)
Site 2	47% (88/189)	50% (85/170)	0% (0/1)	21% (3/14)	0% (0/4)
Site 3	98% (161/165)	98% (134/137)	100% (7/7)	100% (13/13)	88% (7/8)
Site 4	92% (141/154)	93% (116/125)	NA (0/0)	81% (17/21)	100% (8/8)
Site 5	96% (117/122)	98% (88/90)	80% (4/5)	85% (11/13)	100% (14/14)
Site 6	97% (110/113)	100% (80/80)	100% (15/15)	100% (7/7)	73% (8/11)
Site 7	96% (71/74)	98% (51/52)	100% (1/1)	94% (16/17)	75% (3/4)
Site 8	95% (56/59)	98% (47/48)	50% (1/2)	75% (3/4)	100% (5/5)
Site 9	96% (54/56)	98% (46/47)	100% (1/1)	83% (5/6)	100% (2/2)
Site 10	98% (44/45)	100% (29/29)	100% (5/5)	88% (7/8)	100% (3/3)
Site 11	82% (22/27)	81% (17/21)	100% (2/2)	100% (2/2)	50% (1/2)

Values are presented as % (number of patients).

NA, not available.

Group 1, nonperforation; group 2, perforation identified pathologically but not surgically; group 3, perforation identified surgically but

not pathologically; group 4, perforation identified both pathologically and surgically.

Nine cases with open conversion after initial laparoscopic approach were counted as open appendectomies.