

1 ***Diagnosing Appendicitis with Precision: A Comparative Analysis of Modified Alvarado and***
2 ***RIPASA Scoring Systems in a Northern Divisional Hospital of Bangladesh***

3 Nafisa Naz^{1*}, Md Mostafa Monower², Shah Md Ahsan Shahid³, Syeda Momena Hossain⁴, Tanvir Ahmad⁵,
4 Baharul Islam¹

5 ¹ Department of General Surgery, Rajshahi Medical College & Hospital, Rajshahi, Bangladesh

6 ² Department of Epidemiology & Research, National Heart Foundation Hospital & Research Institute, Dhaka,
7 Bangladesh

8 ³ Dept of Paediatric Surgery, Rajshahi Medical College & Hospital, Rajshahi, Bangladesh

9 ⁴ Department of General Surgery, Patnitala Upazila Health Complex, Naogaon, Bangladesh

10 ⁵ Department of General Surgery, Rangpur Medical College & Hospital, Rangpur, Bangladesh

11

12 ***Correspondence:**

13 Dr Nafisa Naz, Department of Surgery, Rajshahi Medical College & Hospital, Rajshahi, Bangladesh. Email:
14 nafisaa12@gmail.com; Mobile: +8801712969341

15

16 **Author and Co-authors:**

17 1. Nafisa Naz, MBBS, MS

18 ORCID ID: [https:// orcid.org/0009-0005-6737-6867](https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6737-6867)

19 Email: nafisaa12@gmail.com

20

21 2. Md Mostafa Monower, MBBS, MPhil

22 ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1531-5633>

23 Email: dr.monower@gmail.com

24

25 3. Shah Md Ahsan Shahid, MBBS, FCPS, MS, FACS, PhD

26 Email: smashahid293@gmail.com

27

28 4. Syeda Momena Hossain, MBBS, MS

29 Email: syedamomenanishi@gmail.com

30

31 5. Tanvir Ahmad, MBBS, MS

32 Email: tanvirahmad35th@gmail.com

33

34 6. Baharul Islam, MBBS, FCPS

35 Email: drbaharulislam64@gmail.com

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

Abstract

Objective: This study aimed to evaluate the diagnostic efficacy of the Modified Alvarado Scoring System (MASS) and the Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Saleha Appendicitis (RIPASA) scoring system, assessing their sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and overall accuracy.

Methods: A cross-sectional analysis was conducted at the Department of General Surgery, Rajshahi Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh, from September to December 2020. The study included 138 purposively selected individuals aged 13 years and above, suspected of acute appendicitis. Data were collected through structured interviews, detailing socio-demographic characteristics, medical history, clinical examinations, and specific laboratory tests (CBC, Urine RE). Histopathology reports from post-operative cases were used as the gold standard for diagnosis. MASS and RIPASA scores, derived from their respective criteria, were analyzed using STATA.

Results: Participants had a mean age of 26.2 years, with males constituting 55.0% of the sample. The MASS scoring system reported a sensitivity of 79.8%, specificity of 57.9%, PPV of 92.2%, NPV of 31.4%, and an overall diagnostic accuracy of 76.8%. In contrast, the RIPASA scoring system demonstrated a sensitivity of 96.6%, specificity of 73.7%, PPV of 95.8%, NPV of 77.8%, and a diagnostic accuracy of 93.5%. ROC AUC analysis yielded values of 0.6886 for MASS and 0.8516 for RIPASA, indicating a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$).

Conclusion: The findings highlight the superior clinical utility of the RIPASA scoring system over MASS, particularly in settings with limited access to advanced diagnostic facilities. Adopting the RIPASA scoring system could significantly enhance the diagnosis of acute appendicitis, suggesting its potential for improving clinical outcomes in similar healthcare environments.

Keywords: Acute appendicitis, MASS, RIPASA, Diagnostic Performance, Bangladesh

59 **Introduction**

60 Acute appendicitis is a prevalent surgical emergency that demands prompt and accurate diagnosis for
61 optimal patient management.[1] However, the diagnostic challenge of acute appendicitis is compounded
62 by atypical symptoms in approximately 50% of cases and the potential for other conditions to mimic its
63 signs and symptoms.[2] Medical history, clinical examination, and laboratory investigations are critical to
64 the diagnostic process. Despite the availability of diagnostic aids such as abdominal Ultrasonography,
65 Computerized Tomography, Laparoscopy, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, and Computer-Aided Barium
66 Enema, their utility is limited by the need for expertise and associated high costs.[3] In peripheral districts,
67 limited access to these diagnostic facilities further complicates the accurate diagnosis of acute
68 appendicitis, underscoring the need for accurate and timely diagnosis to facilitate appropriate patient
69 management and optimize clinical outcome.[4]

70 To aid in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis, various scoring systems have been developed to improve
71 diagnostic accuracy and reduce unnecessary surgical interventions.[5] The Alvarado scoring system,
72 introduced in 1986 and later refined as the Modified Alvarado Scoring System (MASS) in 1994,[6], [7]
73 assigns scores based on clinical signs, symptoms, and laboratory findings associated with acute
74 appendicitis. It has been extensively studied and validated across different populations, demonstrating
75 reasonable accuracy in diagnosing appendicitis. Conversely, the Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Saleha
76 Appendicitis (RIPASA) scoring system, developed by Chong et al. in 2010,[2] is tailored specifically for the
77 Asian population. It includes clinical, laboratory, and imaging findings alongside demographic
78 characteristics, offering promising results in diagnostic accuracy and potential advantages over other
79 scoring systems.[8], [9]

80 Despite the widespread application of both scoring systems, a consensus on their comparative
81 performance in various clinical settings, especially in resource-limited environments like peripheral
82 district hospitals, remains elusive.[10] Moreover, research directly comparing the Modified Alvarado

83 (MASS) and RIPASA Scoring Systems within the context of Bangladesh's peripheral medical facilities is
84 scarce. Therefore, this study aims to conduct a thorough analysis of both scoring systems' diagnostic
85 performance, assessing their sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive
86 value (NPV), and overall accuracy. The insights gained from this research are expected to contribute to
87 minimizing negative appendectomies, particularly in peripheral hospital settings.[11] The outcomes of this
88 study may have important implications for clinical practice, guiding the selection and implementation of
89 the most suitable scoring system for the accurate and efficient diagnosis of acute appendicitis in similar
90 healthcare environments.

91 **Methodology**

92 ***Study design, setting and sampling***

93 This cross-sectional study was conducted at the Department of General Surgery, Rajshahi Medical College
94 Hospital, Bangladesh, from September to December 2020. A total of 173 patients suspected of acute
95 appendicitis were initially considered for the study (**Supplementary figure 1**). However, 35 patients
96 (20.2%) were excluded due to unavailable histopathology reports (n=17), conservative treatment (n=12),
97 and urogenital causes identified through ultrasonography (n=6). After these exclusions, the final sample
98 size was 138 patients. Additional exclusions were applied to patients with a prior history of RIF pain, those
99 who developed RIF pain after being admitted for another reason, or those with generalized peritonitis,
100 septic shock, or pregnancy.

101 ***Data collection***

102 Data on suspected acute appendicitis patients were collected through investigator-led interviews in the
103 admission unit.[12] Informed consent was obtained prior to 15 to 20-minute sessions, which covered
104 demographic, and medical history details. Clinical examination data were recorded at admission or
105 retrieved from post-operative files. Routine laboratory investigations (CBC, Urine RME) and
106 histopathology reports of post-operative cases were collected for further analysis. Surgical decisions were

107 made by the attending surgeons. A ward round the following morning facilitated the completion of
108 pending information and enrollment of new cases. Data collection utilized a pre-tested, semi-structured
109 questionnaire available in both English and Bangla.

110 ***Index case***

111 In this study, the Modified Alvarado Scoring System (MASS) and the Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Saleha
112 Appendicitis (RIPASA) scoring system were used as the index tests to predict acute appendicitis. The MASS
113 score was calculated based on seven standard clinical and laboratory parameters, while the RIPASA score
114 utilized 14 parameters, including an additional criterion for patients holding a Foreign National Record of
115 Identity Card (NRIC), as outlined in **Supplementary Tables 1 and 2**, respectively. To minimize bias in
116 surgical decision-making, neither scoring system was calculated during the data collection phase. Instead,
117 the total scores were categorized post-hoc using a cut-off threshold of 7 for MASS and 7.5 for RIPASA,
118 with scores above these thresholds indicating a high likelihood of appendicitis.

119 ***Gold standard***

120 In this study, histopathology served as the operational gold standard for confirming acute appendicitis of
121 the post-operative cases. It ensured a definitive and accurate assessment of the condition, providing a
122 detailed understanding of the underlying pathological changes. Consistent with findings from the
123 literature, where histopathology has been widely acknowledged as the gold standard for confirming acute
124 appendicitis,[9], [13], [14], [15], [16] post-operative specimens' histopathological analysis was considered
125 the benchmark for confirming cases of acute appendicitis and distinguishing them from normal or non-
126 appendicitis cases.

127 **Quality control**

128 The study implemented extensive quality control measures, including pre-piloting of the questionnaire
129 and daily review of completed forms for consistency and completeness. Laboratory data and
130 histopathological reports were verified against patient identifiers to ensure accuracy. The research
131 adhered strictly to its planned timeline and budget.

132 **Minimization of bias**

133 Several steps were taken to minimize potential sources of bias. To reduce selection bias, participants were
134 purposively selected, though this may limit the generalizability of the findings. Recall bias was addressed
135 by ensuring that data were collected through structured interviews conducted shortly after admission,
136 reducing the reliance on long-term memory. Observer bias was minimized by using consistent clinical
137 examination protocols across all surgeons. Additionally, neither the Modified Alvarado nor the RIPASA
138 scores were calculated during data collection to prevent decision-making bias in surgical procedures.

139 **Statistical analysis**

140 Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of the
141 participants. The diagnostic performance of the Modified Alvarado Scoring System (MASS) and the Raja
142 Isteri Pengiran Anak Saleha Appendicitis (RIPASA) scoring system was assessed by calculating their
143 sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and overall
144 diagnostic accuracy, using histopathological findings as the reference standard.

145 Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves were generated for both scoring systems by systematically
146 varying the classification thresholds. The Area Under the ROC Curve (AUC) was determined to evaluate
147 each system's discriminative capability in diagnosing appendicitis. Statistical associations between
148 categorical variables were assessed using the chi-square (χ^2) test. All p-values were two-tailed, with
149 statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$. Statistical analyses were performed using STATA 17, with findings
150 presented in tables and graphs.

151 **Ethical consideration**

152 Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Rajshahi Medical
153 College Hospital (Ref: RMC/IRB/2019/20-011/54, Date: 04 Aug 2020). Detailed information about the
154 study's objectives, procedures, potential risks, and benefits was provided to participants before obtaining
155 informed consent. For illiterate participants, thumbprints were collected in lieu of signatures, witnessed
156 and co-signed. Participants were assured of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without
157 affecting their medical care. The research was conducted in strict adherence to the Helsinki Declaration,
158 ensuring the confidentiality and privacy of all participants. Results from medical examinations were
159 distributed and explained to participants, who were then given the opportunity to discuss their reports
160 with the researcher and receive appropriate guidance as needed.

161 **Results**

162 The demographic characteristics, symptoms, signs, and pathological findings of the 138 participants are
163 presented in **Table 1**. The median age was 22 years (IQR: 17, 35), with 55.0% being male. A majority
164 (60.1%) resided in rural areas. Among symptoms, anorexia and nausea or vomiting were prevalent in
165 76.1% and 90.6% of cases, respectively. Notably, all participants exhibited right iliac fossa (RIF) pain, with
166 86.2% reporting pain extending from the umbilicus to the RIF. The duration of pain was less than 48 hours
167 in 67.4% of cases. Clinical signs showed 47.9% had a febrile temperature, and RIF tenderness was present
168 in all cases. Rovsing's sign was positive in 58.0%, while muscle guarding and rebound tenderness were
169 observed in 79.0% and 86.2% of participants, respectively. Pathological findings revealed positive urine
170 analysis in 35.5% and leukocytosis in 88.4% of cases.

171 **Table 1: Characteristics of the participants (n=138)**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Sub-category</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
<i>Demographic characteristics</i>		
<i>Age, median (IQR), year*</i>		22 (17, 35)
<i>Gender</i>	Male	76 (55.0)
<i>Residence</i>	Urban	55 (39.9)
	Rural	83 (60.1)
<i>Clinical characteristics</i>		
<i>Symptoms</i>		
<i>Anorexia</i>	Yes	105 (76.1)
<i>Nausea/ vomiting</i>	Yes	125 (90.6)
<i>RIF pain</i>	Yes	138 (100)
<i>Umbilicus to RIF pain</i>	Yes	119 (86.2)
<i>Pain duration</i>	<48 hours	93 (67.4)
<i>Signs</i>		
<i>Temperature</i>	Febrile	66 (47.9)
<i>RIF tenderness</i>	Yes	138 (100)
<i>Rovsing's sign</i>	Yes	80 (58.0)
<i>Muscle guard</i>	Yes	109 (79.0)
<i>Rebound tenderness</i>	Yes	119 (86.2)
<i>Pathological findings</i>		
<i>Urine analysis</i>	Positive findings	49 (35.5)
<i>WBC count</i>	Leukocytosis	122 (88.4)

172 *Continuous non-normally distributed variables

173 **Table 2** details the distribution of diagnostic tool scores in relation to histopathological diagnosis. For the
 174 MASS, scores ≥ 7 indicated appendicitis, with 95 out of 103 cases confirmed histopathologically, and 8
 175 classified as other conditions. For scores < 7 , 24 out of 35 were confirmed as appendicitis. The RIPASA
 176 utilized a cutoff ≥ 7.5 , with 115 out of 120 cases confirmed for appendicitis, and 5 as other conditions.
 177 Scores < 7.5 resulted in 4 out of 18 cases confirmed as appendicitis. Both scoring models showed significant
 178 associations with histopathological outcomes ($p < 0.001$).

179 **Table 2: Diagnostic tool scores by histopathological outcome (gold standard)**

Diagnostic tool	score	Histopathological diagnosis		Total	P value
		Acute Appendicitis	Other than appendicitis		
MASS	≥7	95	8	103	
	<7	24	11	35	
	Total	119	19	138	p<0.001
RIPASA	≥7.5	115	5	120	
	<7.5	4	14	18	
	Total	119	19	138	p<0.001

180

181 Furthermore, **table 3** presents a comprehensive comparison of the diagnostic performance between the

182 MASS and the RIPASA scoring system. This study identified noteworthy differences in sensitivity,

183 specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and overall diagnostic accuracy

184 between the two scoring systems. The MASS system demonstrated a sensitivity of 79.8% (95% CI: 71.5-

185 86.6) and specificity of 57.9% (95% CI: 33.5-79.7), with a PPV of 92.2% (95% CI: 85.3-96.6) and an NPV of

186 31.4% (95% CI: 16.9-49.3), leading to a diagnostic accuracy of 76.8% (95% CI: 68.9-83.6). In contrast, the

187 RIPASA score outperformed MASS with a sensitivity of 96.6% (95% CI: 91.6-99.1), specificity of 73.7% (95%

188 CI: 48.8-90.9), a PPV of 95.8% (95% CI: 90.5-98.6), and an NPV of 77.8% (95% CI: 52.4-93.6), culminating

189 in a diagnostic accuracy of 93.5% (95% CI: 88.0-97.0).

190 **Table 3: Comparison of diagnostic performance between MASS and RIPASA tool**

Parameter	MASS	RIPASA
	Estimate (95% C)	Estimate (95% C)
Sensitivity	79.8 (71.5-86.6)	96.6 (91.6-99.1)
Specificity	57.9 (33.5-79.7)	73.7 (48.8-90.9)
Positive predictive value	92.2 (85.3-96.6)	95.8 (90.5-98.6)
Negative predictive value	31.4 (16.9-49.3)	77.8 (52.4-93.6)
Diagnostic accuracy	76.8 (68.9-83.6)	93.5 (88.0-97.0)

191
192 In the presented ROC AUC analysis (**Fig 1**), this study further assessed the diagnostic performance of the
193 MASS and RIPASA scoring systems for acute appendicitis. The ROC (Receiver Operating Characteristic)
194 AUC (Area Under the Curve) serves as a critical metric for evaluating the discriminatory capabilities of
195 these systems. Notably, the MASS scoring system exhibited a ROC AUC of 0.6886 (95% CI: 0.5690-0.8083),
196 reflecting its fair capacity to distinguish between patients with and without acute appendicitis. In contrast,
197 the RIPASA scoring system demonstrated a significantly higher ROC AUC of 0.8516 (95% CI: 0.7486-
198 0.9546), evidencing superior discrimination between acute appendicitis and other conditions. The
199 significant difference in performance ($p < 0.05$) highlights RIPASA's enhanced diagnostic accuracy in the
200 studied population.

201 **Fig 1: ROC-AUC plots for the MASS and RIPASA score model**

202 Discussion

203 This study compared the diagnostic performance of the Modified Alvarado Scoring System (MASS) and
204 the RIPASA scoring system for acute appendicitis in a peripheral district medical college hospital in
205 Rajshahi, Bangladesh. Our analysis provides insights into their utility and limitations, offering a valuable
206 perspective on their application in a specific demographic.

207 The demographic and clinical profile of our patient cohort, with a mean age of 26.2 years, is reflective of
208 the global epidemiology of acute appendicitis, which predominantly affects individuals in this age
209 group,[17] underscoring the relevance of our findings. The male predominance (55.0%) in our study
210 corroborates the literature indicating a higher incidence of acute appendicitis among males.[18]
211 Symptoms such as anorexia, nausea/vomiting, and the classic presentation of right iliac fossa (RIF) pain,
212 alongside Rovsing's sign, muscle guarding, and rebound tenderness, align with the established clinical
213 manifestation of acute appendicitis.[19]

214 In evaluating the diagnostic scores against histopathological diagnosis as the gold standard, both the
215 MASS and RIPASA scoring systems demonstrated notable sensitivity and specificity in distinguishing acute
216 appendicitis from other conditions. The MASS system exhibited a sensitivity of 79.8%, correctly identifying
217 a significant proportion of true positive cases, and a specificity of 57.9% for accurately discerning non-
218 appendicitis cases. Comparing our study with previous research in Asian populations, the MASS model
219 demonstrated a higher sensitivity of 79.8% compared to Al-Hashemy et al. (53.8%),[15] Jang et al.
220 (50.6%),[20] and Chong et al. (68.3%)[9] but was close to Naeem et al. (83.3%),[16] and Shuaib et al.
221 (82.8%).[21]. However, its specificity in our study (57.9%) was lower than reported in Al-Hashemy et al.
222 (80%),[15] Jang et al. (94.5%),[20] and Chong et al. (87.9%),[9] but higher than Naeem et al. (41%),[16]
223 and similar as Shuaib et al. (56%).[21]

224 Conversely, the RIPASA score with a sensitivity of 96.6% and specificity of 73.7% performed consistently
225 high across other studies. Our study reported a sensitivity of 96.6%, aligning closely with Singla et al.

226 (95.6%),[8] Chong et al. (98%)[9] and Shuaib et al. (94.5%).[21] However, RIPASA's specificity in our study
227 (73.7%) was slightly lower than reported in Singla et al. (80%),[8] Chong et al. (81.3%),[9] and Shuaib et al.
228 (88%).[21]

229 The higher sensitivity (96.6%) of the RIPASA score compared to the MASS system (79.8%) highlights its
230 enhanced ability to correctly identify individuals with acute appendicitis. The specificity of the RIPASA
231 score (73.7%), although higher than that of MASS (57.9%), suggests there is potential for further
232 refinement in distinguishing non-appendicitis cases. The diagnostic advantage of the RIPASA scoring
233 system in our study carries important clinical implications. Its elevated sensitivity indicates effectiveness
234 in identifying acute appendicitis, potentially reducing the incidence of unnecessary surgeries in false-
235 negative scenarios. The commendable specificity and positive predictive value also underscore its clinical
236 utility. Moreover, both scoring systems showed reasonably high positive predictive values (PPV), with
237 RIPASA marginally outperforming MASS. The notably higher negative predictive value (NPV) of RIPASA
238 (77.8%) compared to MASS (31.4%) suggests that RIPASA is more dependable in ruling out appendicitis
239 when the test result is negative. These outcomes collectively highlight the enhanced diagnostic accuracy
240 of the RIPASA scoring system (93.5%) over the diagnostic accuracy of MASS (76.8%).

241 The Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) AUC analysis highlights the diagnostic advantage of the
242 RIPASA scoring system over the Modified Alvarado Scoring System (MASS). Specifically, RIPASA's ROC AUC
243 is 23.7% higher than that of MASS, reflecting a statistically significant improvement in discriminatory
244 capability ($p < 0.05$). This finding aligns with previous studies showing that the RIPASA scoring system
245 provides superior diagnostic accuracy compared to MASS.[13], [14], [21], [22], [23]

246 This study has several strengths. It directly compares two widely used appendicitis scoring systems, the
247 Modified Alvarado and RIPASA scores, providing valuable insights in a resource-limited setting. To our
248 knowledge, this is the first study in Bangladesh to conduct such a comparison, utilizing histopathology as
249 the diagnostic benchmark to ensure reliable confirmation of appendicitis cases. Additionally, the study's

250 focus on a low-resource environment enhances its relevance to similar settings. However, the study has
251 some limitations. While twenty percent of the initially eligible patients were excluded from the final
252 analysis, these exclusions were necessary to maintain diagnostic consistency and accuracy, which could
253 limit the generalizability of the findings to cases without histopathology or those treated conservatively.
254 The study was conducted in a single hospital, which also limits its generalizability. Variability in clinical
255 assessments by different attending surgeons could result in observer bias.

256 **Conclusion**

257 This study provides valuable insights into the diagnostic performance of the Modified Alvarado and
258 RIPASA scoring systems for acute appendicitis in a specific population. The RIPASA scoring system
259 exhibited superior diagnostic performance across several metrics, including sensitivity, specificity, positive
260 and negative predictive values, overall diagnostic accuracy, and the AUC, when compared to the MASS
261 system. These results enrich the ongoing discourse on diagnostic strategies for acute appendicitis,
262 highlighting the RIPASA scoring system's value in similar healthcare settings where access to advanced
263 diagnostic resources may be limited.

264 Future research endeavors should focus on validating these findings in diverse populations and settings.
265 Additionally, prospective studies could explore the integration of advanced imaging modalities and
266 biomarkers to enhance diagnostic accuracy further and can develop a new scoring model which is more
267 appropriate for the local context. Comparative analyses with other scoring systems and clinical decision
268 support tools would contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the optimal approach to acute
269 appendicitis diagnosis.

270 **Acknowledgments:** This paper utilized data from Master's thesis of Nafisa conducted by the Rajshahi
271 Medical College & Hospital, Rajshahi, Bangladesh under the Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical
272 University (BSMMU), Bangladesh. We extend our sincere gratitude to the participants and the faculty

273 members of the Department of General Surgery, Pathology, and Biochemistry at Rajshahi Medical College
274 & Hospital, Rajshahi, Bangladesh, for their invaluable contributions to this study.

275 **Author Contributions:** Nafisa, Shahid, Baharul, and Monower conceptualized and designed the study.
276 Nafisa led the study implementation, with data collection conducted by Nafisa, Momena, and Tanvir.
277 Nafisa prepared the initial manuscript draft, while Monower performed the statistical analyses and
278 interpreted the results. Nafisa and Monower jointly contributed to the interpretation of findings and the
279 literature review. Baharul supervised the thesis work.

280 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest related to this research.

281 **Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or
282 not-for-profit sectors.

283 **Data availability statement:** The data supporting the findings of this study are openly available in Zenodo
284 at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14043746>, under the citation: Naz, N. (2024). A Comparative Study of
285 RIPASA and Modified Alvarado Scoring System for the Diagnosis of Acute Appendicitis [Data set]. Access
286 to the dataset requires prior permission from the corresponding author for reuse.

287 References

- 288 [1] M. F. Ditillo, J. D. Dziura, and R. Rabinovici, "Is it safe to delay appendectomy in adults with acute
289 appendicitis?," *Ann Surg*, vol. 244, no. 5, pp. 656–660, Nov. 2006, doi:
290 10.1097/01.sla.0000231726.53487.dd.
- 291 [2] Chong C F, M I W Adi, Thien A, and Suyoi A, "Development of the RIPASA score: a new
292 appendicitis scoring system for the diagnosis of acute appendicitis.," *Singapore Med J*, vol. 51, no.
293 3, pp. 220–225, 2010.
- 294 [3] Delibegovic Samir, "Acute Appendicitis: Diagnosis and Treatment, with Special Attention to a
295 Laparoscopic Approach," *Emerg Med (Los Angel)*, vol. 05, no. 03, 2015, doi: 10.4172/2165-
296 7548.1000255.
- 297 [4] R. R. Gorter *et al.*, "Diagnosis and management of acute appendicitis. EAES consensus
298 development conference 2015," *Surg Endosc*, vol. 30, no. 11, pp. 4668–4690, Nov. 2016, doi:
299 10.1007/s00464-016-5245-7.
- 300 [5] M. Korkut, C. Bedel, Y. Karanci, A. Avci, and M. Duyan, "Accuracy of Alvarado, Eskelinen,
301 Ohmann, RIPASA and Tzanakis Scores in Diagnosis of Acute Appendicitis; a Cross-sectional
302 Study," *Archives of Academic Emergency Medicine*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. e20, Mar. 2020.
- 303 [6] Alvarado A, "A Practical Score for the Early Diagnosis of Acute Appendicitis," *Ann Emerg Med*, vol.
304 15, no. 5, pp. 557–564, 1986, doi: 10.1016/s0196-0644(86)80993-3.
- 305 [7] E. S. Kanumba, J. B. Mabula, P. Rambau, and P. L. Chalya, "Modified Alvarado Scoring System as a
306 diagnostic tool for Acute Appendicitis at Bugando Medical Centre, Mwanza, Tanzania," *BMC Surg*,
307 vol. 11, 2011, doi: 10.1186/1471-2482-11-4.
- 308 [8] A. Singla, S. Singla, M. Singh, and D. Singla, "A comparison between modified Alvarado score and
309 RIPASA score in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis," *Updates Surg*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 351–355,
310 Dec. 2016, doi: 10.1007/s13304-016-0381-0.
- 311 [9] C. F. Chong *et al.*, "Comparison of RIPASA and Alvarado scores for the diagnosis of acute
312 appendicitis.," *Singapore Med J*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 340–5, May 2011.
- 313 [10] H. Erdem *et al.*, "Alvarado, Eskelinen, Ohhmann and Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Saleha appendicitis
314 scores for diagnosis of acute appendicitis," *World J Gastroenterol*, vol. 19, no. 47, pp. 9057–9062,
315 Dec. 2013, doi: 10.3748/wjg.v19.i47.9057.
- 316 [11] Butt MQ, Chatha SS, Ghumman AQ, and Farooq M, "RIPASA Score: A New Diagnostic Score for
317 Diagnosis of Acute Appendicitis," *J Coll Physicians Surg Pak*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 894–897, 2014.
- 318 [12] Nafisa Naz, "A Comparative Study of RIPASA and Modified Alvarado Scoring System for the
319 Diagnosis of Acute Appendicitis [Data set]," *Zenodo*, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.14043746.
- 320 [13] N. Damburacı, B. Sevinç, M. Güner, and Ö. Karahan, "Comparison of Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak
321 Saleha Appendicitis and modified Alvarado scoring systems in the diagnosis of acute
322 appendicitis," *ANZ J Surg*, vol. 90, no. 4, pp. 521–524, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1111/ans.15607.

- 323 [14] S. Noor, A. Wahab, G. Afridi, and K. Ullah, "Comparing Ripasa Score And Alvarado Score In An
324 Accurate Diagnosis Of Acute Appendicitis.," *J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 38–
325 41, 2020.
- 326 [15] A. M. Al-Hashemy and M. I. Seleem, "Appraisal of the modified Alvarado Score for acute
327 appendicits in adults.," *Saudi Med J*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 1229–31, Sep. 2004.
- 328 [16] M. T. Naeem *et al.*, "Diagnostic accuracy of Alvarado scoring system relative to histopathological
329 diagnosis for acute appendicitis: A retrospective cohort study," *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*,
330 vol. 81, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.amsu.2022.104561.
- 331 [17] Y. J. Noudeh, N. Sadigh, and A. Y. Ahmadnia, "Epidemiologic features, seasonal variations and
332 false positive rate of acute appendicitis in Shahr-e-Rey, Tehran," *International Journal of Surgery*,
333 vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 95–98, Apr. 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.ijssu.2006.03.009.
- 334 [18] G. Y. Stein *et al.*, "Sex differences in the epidemiology, seasonal variation, and trends in the
335 management of patients with acute appendicitis," *Langenbecks Arch Surg*, vol. 397, no. 7, pp.
336 1087–1092, Oct. 2012, doi: 10.1007/s00423-012-0958-0.
- 337 [19] F. Dixon and A. Singh, "Acute appendicitis," *Surgery (United Kingdom)*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 310–
338 317, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.mpsur.2020.03.015.
- 339 [20] S. O. Jang, B. S. Kim, and D. J. Moon, "Application of alvarado score in patients with suspected
340 appendicitis," *Korean J Gastroenterol*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 27–31, Jul. 2008.
- 341 [21] A. Shuaib, A. Shuaib, Z. Fakhra, B. Marafi, K. Alsharaf, and A. Behbehani, "Evaluation of modified
342 Alvarado scoring system and RIPASA scoring system as diagnostic tools of acute appendicitis,"
343 *World J Emerg Med*, vol. 8, no. 4, p. 276, 2017, doi: 10.5847/wjem.j.1920-8642.2017.04.005.
- 344 [22] N. Heiranizadeh, S. M. H. Mousavi Beyuki, S. kargar, A. Abadiyan, and H. R. Mohammadi,
345 "Alvarado or RIPASA? Which one do you use to diagnose acute appendicitis?: A cross-sectional
346 study," *Health Sci Rep*, vol. 6, no. 1, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1002/hsr2.1078.
- 347 [23] M. M. Chisthi, A. Surendran, and J. T. Narayanan, "RIPASA and air scoring systems are superior to
348 alvarado scoring in acute appendicitis: Diagnostic accuracy study," *Annals of Medicine and
349 Surgery*, vol. 59, pp. 138–142, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.amsu.2020.09.029.

350


351

352 **Supporting information**

353 Supplementary figure 1: Flow diagram of participants

354 Supplementary tables 1: Modified Alvarado Scoring System (MASS)

355 Supplementary tables 2: Score distribution of RIPASA score system



--- RIPASA ROC area: 0.8516

-.-. MASS ROC area: 0.6886

— Reference