

## **Supplemental Appendix**

**Note regarding discrepancy between the number of patients in each PET2 classification compared with previous publications (Press, JCO 2016; Stephens, ASH Abstract 2018):** In this analysis, one patient was moved from the PET2- category to the PET2+ category when compared to the previous publications. While cleaning the data for the current manuscript and evaluating reasons why the patients did not enroll to step 2 of the study, a discrepancy was found in the PET2 score for one patient. The reason why one patient moved from the PET2- category to the PET2+ category is as follows: For this patient, the initial PET2 was considered negative with a Deauville score of 3, and the patient was initially classified in the PET2- category. After central review of the PET2 scan, the Deauville score was revised to 4 indicating a positive PET2 result. This patient had already received cycle 3 of ABVD prior to revision of the PET2 classification. Therefore, this patient was subsequently taken off study and did not register to step 2. While cleaning the data for this manuscript, it was found that the patient's PET2 status had never been updated in the SWOG database, so we corrected this finding for the manuscript. With the slight change in the number of patients in each PET2 category, this also led to a minor difference in PFS in the PET2+ group [66% in the current manuscript versus 65% in the previously published abstract (Stephens, ASH Abstract 2018)].

## **Supplemental Figure Legends**

Supplemental Figure 1. Progression-Free (A) and Overall (B) Survival of Patients Who Received Continued ABVD versus eBEACOPP Per Protocol. Twelve patients with a positive PET2 who did not receive eBEACOPP were excluded from these analyses.

Supplemental Figure 2. Progression-Free Survival of Patients with PET2 Deauville Score of 1-2



