Study	Randomization	Randomization	Allocation Concealment	Allocation Concealment	Blinding of Personnel and Participants	Blinding of Personnel and Participants	Blinding of Assessor	Blinding of Assessor
Abe 2006	Judgement ^{Unclear}	Reason No mention of method of randomization	Judgement Unclear	Reason No mention of method of allocation concealment	Judgement	Reason Study is labeled double-blind and double-dummy but there is no mention of blinding method	Judgement ^{Unclear}	Reason Study is labeled double-blind and double-dummy but there is no mention of blinding method
Bae 2013	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	High Risk	Non-blinded	High Risk	Non-blinded
Chen 2009	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	"A complete joint assessment (68-joint version) was performed for detection of a tender joint count, swollen joint count, and duration of morning stiffness, which were recorded by an experienced rheumatologist who was blinded to the results of other evaluations." There is no mention of how blinding was ensured in the evaluation of other outcomes.	Unclear	Study is labeled double-blind and double-dummy but there is no mention of blinding method
Choy 2012	Low Risk	"Patients were randomized on a 1:1 basis via an interactive voice- response system to"	Unclear	No mention of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"To preserve the blind to clinical research staff, the study site pharmacist labelled clinical supplies and a sorbitol placebo was used to match the viscosity of CZP."		"In order to match the viscosity of CZP and therefore maintain blinding"
Cohen 2002	Unclear	Method of randomization was not	Unclear	Method not described	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Low Risk	Likely all received injections.
Cohen 2004	Unclear	Method of randomization was not reported	Unclear	Method not described	Low Risk	"Every 4 weeks a "blinded" evaluator assessed patients for disease activity and adverse events."	Unclear	Unclear how blinded
Combe 2006	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Low Risk	"All patients received identical- appearing injectible and oral test articles."	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Low Risk	"All patients received identical appearing injectible and oral test articles."
Combe 2009	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	Study is labeled double-blind but there is no mention of blinding method	Unclear	Study is labeled double-blind but there is no mention of blinding method
Conaghan 2013	Low Risk	"Randomization was by central allocation of a unique number in order for qualification of treatment."	Low Risk	"Randomization was by central allocation of a unique number in order for qualification of treatment."		"Clinicians and patients were blinded."	Low Risk	"Clinicians and patients were blinded."
Dougados 2013	Low Risk	"Randomisation was stratified by study site and baseline DAS28–ESR (≤ or >5.5) using a minimisation algorithm."	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"The treatment allocation of individual patients remained blinded for patients, site personnel and the data analysis/interpretation team, except for the separate subgroup technically preparing the data Each radiograph was assessed applying the Genant- modifi ed Sharp scoring system (GSS) by two independent readers (Perceptive Informatics Medical Imaging Services, Berlin, Germany) who were blinded to treatment assignment, chronological order of radiographs and patient's clinical status."		"All patients received open- label tocilizumab 8 mg/kg intravenously every 4 weeks. Treatment with methotrexate/placebo was double-blind: all patients received identical capsules of either placebo (switch strategy arm) or methotrexate 2.5 mg (add-on strategy arm), with the number of capsules at study entry being consistent with prestudy dosage."
Edwards 2004	Unclear	Method of randomisation not described	Unclear	Method of concealment not reported	Low Risk	Investigators and patients remianeded blinded to the assigned study medications	Low Risk	Double blinding reported. Personnel at all sites remained blinded to treatment during the follow-up
Emery 2006a	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	Study is labeled double-blind but there is no mention of blinding method	Unclear	Study is labeled double-blind but there is no mention of blinding method
Emery 2006b	Low Risk	"Central randomization"	Low Risk	"Central randomization"	Low Risk	"Double blind". Additional info provided by BMS: "subjects and clinical assessor(s) were blinded to treatment assignment"	Low Risk	"Double blind". "Assessments were performed by rheumatologists or trained professional staff members who were unaware of patients' treatment assignments and were not involved in the infusion of CTLA4Ig or placebo."
Emery 2010	Unclear	No mention of the method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of concealment	Unclear	Double-blind but unclear who was blinded	Unclear	Double-blind but unclear who was blinded
Fleischmann 2003	Unclear	Method of randomization was not reported	Unclear	Method not described	Low Risk	Drug looked similar to placebo, and ID hidden	Low Risk	Drug looked similar to placebo, and ID hidden
Fleischmann 2009	Low Risk	"Patients were randomised 1:1 using an interactive voice randomisation service to lyophilised subcutaneous certolizumab pegol 400 mg or placebo (sorbitol solution) every 4 weeks from baseline to week 20."	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"Solutions of active drug or placebo were prepared by the pharmacist or other unblinded, qualified site personnel, before distributing to blinded study personnel for administration."	Unclear	The study is labeled double- blind but there is no mention of how participant blinding was ensured.
Furst 2003	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of allocation concealment	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Unclear	Unclear how blinded
Gashi 2014	Unclear	Insufficient information	Unclear	Insufficient information	Unclear	Insufficient information	Unclear	Insufficient information

Genovese 2004	Unclear	Method of randomization was not reported	Unclear	Method of allocation not described	Low Risk	The placebo formulation was the same, but without anakinra.	Low Risk	In order to blind patients to the treatment assignment, additional sham injections of etanercept were administered as necessary, so that all patients received twice weekly injections of etanercept/sham and once daily injections of anakinra or matched placebo.
Genovese 2008	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"Patients were assessed using a dual-assessor approach for efficacy and safety evaluations, to ensure that blinding was not compromised. Tender and swollen joint counts (66 joints assessed and 68 joints assessed, respectively) were performed by a trained joint assessor who had no access to other patient data. No radiologic examinations were performed as part of this study."		Study is labeled double-blind and double-dummy but there is no mention of blinding method
Genovese 2011	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment		"A double-dummy design was used to maintain blinding. Patients randomized to the SC abatacept group received IV placebo on days 15 and 29 and every 4 weeks thereafter, and patients randomized to the IV abatacept group received SC placebo on day 8 and weekly thereafter. For all patients, SC injection was administered 30 minutes after the end of IV infusion. Patients and study site personnel remained blinded with regard to treatment assignments during the double- blind period."		"A double-dummy design was used to maintain blinding. Patients randomized to the SC abatacept group received IV placebo on days 15 and 29 and every 4 weeks thereafter, and patients randomized to the IV abatacept group received SC placebo on day 8 and weekly thereafter. For all patients, SC injection was administered 30 minutes after the end of IV infusion. Patients and study site personnel remained blinded with regard to treatment assignments during the double-blind period."
Goekoop-Rulterman 2007	Unclear	"Patients were allocated to 1 of 4 treatment groups by variable block randomization (9 –13), which was stratified per center."	Unclear	"Patients were allocated to 1 of 4 treatment groups by variable block randomization (9 –13), which was stratified per center."	Unclear	"Assessments were done every 3 months by blinded research nurses, who were trained at study onset and every 6 months thereafter to maintain consistency. Two study physicians ensured adherence to the protocol every 3 months."		Non-blinded
Heimans 2013	Low Risk	"Patients not in early remission were randomized using variable block randomization and stratified per center to ensure numerical equality of the two treatment groups."		"At local centers, allocation of UA and RA patients was performed by drawing opaque envelopes from separate boxes."	Unclear	Unclear whether blinded	Unclear	Unclear whether blinded
Huizinga 2015	Unclear	During the first 24 weeks, all patients were randomised either to continue oral MTX with the addition of open-label TCZ 8 mg/kg intravenously every 4 weeks (add-on strategy) or switch to TCZ alone with PBO (switch strategy)." (p.37). Comment: No mention of how the randomization process was performed.	Unclear	There is no mention of allocation concealment.	Low Risk	Double-blind, PBO- controlled, parallel-group" (p.35)	Low Risk	Double-blind, PBO- controlled, parallel-group" (p.35)
Jobanputra 2012	Low Risk	"A random sequence of numbers was generated, by computer, for patients on methotrexate and separately for patients not on methotrexate Randomisation was done in random block sizes."		"Opaque, sealed envelopes of the allocation sequences were prepared and managed at the sponsoring centre by a member of staff not involved in the patient management."		Non-blinded	High Risk	Non-blinded
Kaine 2011	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of allocation concealment	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Low Risk	"Patients randomized to SC abatacept during period II received IV placebo loading to maintain blinding."
Kameda 2010	Low Risk	"Enrollment and randomization were performed on the University Hospital Medical Information Network (UMIN; Tokyo, Japan) on the website on the day on which the informed consent was received."	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	High Risk	Non-blinded	High Risk	Non-blinded

Kay 2008	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"Study medication was administered by SC injection every 2 weeks from week 0 to week 18. Patients who received golimumab every 4 weeks received placebo injections at the alternate visits to maintain blinding Study medication was administered by SC injection every 2 weeks from week 0 to week 18. Patients who received golimumab every 4 weeks received placebo injections at the alternate visits to maintain blinding." Though blinding in the placebo group was halted at wk 20, we only abstracted data for blinded timepoints.		"Study medication was administered by SC injection every 2 weeks from week 0 to week 18. Patients who received golimumab every 4 weeks received placebo injections at the alternate visits to maintain blinding Study medication was administered by SC injection every 2 weeks from week 0 to week 18. Patients who received golimumab every 4 weeks received placebo injections at the alternate visits to maintain blinding."
Keystone 2004a	Unclear	No mention of method of	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Unclear	Unclear how blinded
Keystone 2004b	Unclear	randomization "Randomization was stratified by MTX usage at baseline, and patients were randomized on the basis of a 1:4:3 allocation to receive placebo, etanercept 50 mg once weekly, or etanercept 25 mg twice weekly, respectively."	Unclear	concealment No mention of method of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"To maintain blinding, all patients self-administered the injections twice each week, as outlined in Table 1 The masked study drug was supplied to patients in syringes that contained the contents of 1 vial of etanercept (25 mg etanercept, mannitol, sucrose, and tromethamine) or placebo (the same constituents but without etanercept), reconstituted with bacteriostatic water."	Low Risk	"To maintain blinding, all patients self-administered the injections twice each week, as outlined in Table 1 The masked study drug was supplied to patients in syringes that contained the contents of 1 vial of etanercept (25 mg etanercept, mannitol, sucrose, and tromethamine) or placebo (the same constituents but without etanercept), reconstituted with bacteriostatic water."
Keystone 2008	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"Readers were blinded as to the patient's identity, clinical data, treatment, and time point (sequence) at which the radiograph was taken"	Unclear	The study is labeled double- blind but there is no mention of how participant blinding was ensured.
Keystone 2009	Low Risk	"Randomisation was stratified by investigational site and was conducted using a telephone interactive voice response system."	Low Risk	"Randomisation was stratified by investigational site and was conducted using a telephone interactive voice response system."	Low Risk	"The study included a double- blind controlled phase to week 52 and an open-label extension up to 5 years At week 16, patients in groups 1, 2 or 3 with less than a 20% improvement from baseline in both tender and swollen joint counts had their study medication adjusted in a double-blind fashion (ie, early escape) Placebo injections contained the same solution as active golimumab but did not contain the monoclonal antibody. Active methotrexate and placebo methotrexate were supplied as identical opaque capsules. Injections were administered every 4 weeks and each patient received two injections per dose (0.5 ml and 1.0 ml syringes) to maintain the blind."		"The study included a double- blind controlled phase to week 52 and an open-label extension up to 5 years At week 16, patients in groups 1, 2 or 3 with less than a 20% improvement from baseline in both tender and swollen joint counts had their study medication adjusted in a double-blind fashion (ie, early escape) Placebo injections contained the same solution as active golimumab but did not contain the monoclonal antibody. Active methotrexate were supplied as identical opaque capsules. Injectionswere administered every 4 weeks and each patient received two injections per dose (0.5 ml and 1.0 ml syringes) to maintain the blind."
Kim 2007	Unclear	No mention of method of	Unclear	No mention of allocation	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Unclear	Unclear how blinded
Kim 2012	Unclear	randomization "The randomization schedule was generated by Wyeth and implemented by the Clinical Operations Randomization Environment (CORE)."	Unclear	concealment No mention of method of allocation concealment	High Risk	Non-blinded	High Risk	Non-blinded
Kim 2013	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"Investigators, independent joint assessors, and patients were blinded to the treatment assignments."	Low Risk	"Investigators, independent joint assessors, and patients were blinded to the treatment assignments."
Kivitz 2014	Unclear	Insufficient information	Unclear	Insufficient information	low risk	Blinding of participants and key study personnel ensured	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Kremer 2003	Low Risk	"Central randomization"	Low Risk	"Central randomization"	Low Risk	"Double blind". Additional information provided by BMS: "Subjects and clinical assessor(s) were blinded to treatment assignment"	Low Risk	"Double blind". "Assessments were performed by rheumatologists or trained professional staff members who were unaware of patients' treatment assignments and were not involved in the infusion of CTLA4Ig or placebo."

Kremer 2005	Low Risk	"Patients were randomly assigned in a ratio of 1:1:1 to receive 10 mg/kg abatacept, 2 mg/kg abatacept, or placebo using a central randomization procedure."		"Patients were randomly assigned in a ratio of 1:1:1 to receive 10 mg/kg abatacept, 2 mg/kg abatacept, or placebo using a central randomization procedure."	Unclear	The study is labeled double- blind. The following is described as the method of assessor blinding: "Assessments were carried out 28 days prior to the start of the study by physicians blinded to the treatment group, and before treatment administration on treatment days 1, 15, 30, 60, 90, 120, 150, 180, 240, 300, 330, and at one posttreatment time point—day 360 (12 months)."		The study is labeled double- blind. but there is no mention of how blinding of participants was ensured.
Kremer 2006	Low Risk	"Central randomization"	Low Risk	"Central randomization"	Low Risk	"Physicians blinded to treatment group assignment performed assessments at enrolment and at every visit before treatment administration"	Low Risk	"Double"; stated patient and "investigators were blinded to treatment group assignment throughout the 1-year study."
Kremer 2010	Low Risk	"Eligible patients were randomly assigned (1:1:1:1), using an interactive voice-response system, to receive blinded intravenous infusions of placebo plus MTX, 2 mg/kg golimumab with or without MTX, or 4 mg/kg golimumab with or without MTX (Figure 1)."	Low Risk	"Eligible patients were randomly assigned (1:1:1:1), using an interactive voice-response system, to receive blinded intravenous infusions of placebo plus MTX, 2 mg/kg golimumab with or without MTX, or 4 mg/kg golimumab with or without MTX (Figure 1)."	Unclear	"Golimumab and placebo were supplied as sterile liquid (aqueous medium of histidine, sorbitol, polysorbate 80, pH 5.5, with or without golimumab) ready for intravenous infusion. Active and placebo MTX were supplied as matching opaque capsules (microcrystalline cellulose filled with or without MTX; those with MTX were overencapsulated and provided the stable prescreening dose)."		"Golimumab and placebo were supplied as sterile liquid (aqueous medium of histidine, sorbitol, polysorbate 80, pH 5.5, with or without golimumab) ready for intravenous infusion. Active and placebo MTX were supplied as matching opaque capsules (microcrystalline cellulose filled with or without MTX; those with MTX were overencapsulated and provided the stable prescreening dose)."
Kremer 2011	Unclear	No mention of the method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of concealment	Low Risk	Radiographs were assessed with the Genant-modified Sharp scoring system by 2 independent readers who were blinded to treatment assignment, chronological order of radiographs, and patients' clinical responses.'		Patients blinded thru 1st year
Kremer 2012	Unclear	No mention of the method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of concealment	Unclear	Double-blind but unclear who was blinded	Low Risk	nonresponders and were automatically reassigned to receive tofacitinib 5 mg twice daily for the remaining 12 weeks of study (blinding maintained).
Lan 2004	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	The study is labeled double- blind but there is no mention of method of blinding	Unclear	The study is labeled double- blind but there is no mention of method of blinding
Lipsky 2000	Unclear	No mention of the method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of concealment	Low Risk	"The number of tender and swollen joints was evaluated by an independent assessor who had no knowledge of the patient's treatment assignment."	High Risk	No mention of whether blinded
Lisbona 2008	Unclear	"Patients [21 women, 1 man; median age 50.5 yrs (range 28–73); mean duration of disease 6.4 yrs (range 2.4–27); among whom 72.7% were positive for rheumatoid factor] were assigned by simple randomization to 2 groups: 8 patients as a control group, and 14 as a treatment group (etanercept)."	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	"At baseline and at 6 weeks, complete clinical [DAS28, visual analog scale (VAS) for pain, Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ)] and laboratory [erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR), C- reactive protein (CRP)] evaluations were performed by one rheumatologist (JM) blinded to patient's treatment regimen."		Non-blinded
Lisbona 2010	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	"Clinical evaluation was performed by one rheumatologist (JM) and MR images were scored by two readers (JP, radiologist and MPL, rheumatologist), all blind to the patients' treatment."	High Risk	Non-blinded
Machado 2014	Low Risk	Randomization using eClinical	Unclear	Insufficient information	High Risk	No blinding	High Risk	No blinding
MacIsaac 2014	Unclear	enrollment system Insufficient information	Unclear	Insufficient information	Low Risk	Blinding of participants and key	Low Risk	Outcome assessors were
Maini 1998	Low Risk	"Randomization was performed centrally"	Low Risk	Central procedure	Low Risk	study personnel ensured "The coded study medications was not revealed to the patients or the assessors"	Low Risk	blinded "The coded study medications was not revealed to the patients or the assessors"

Variant: 2015 See Risk Paratements on a perform Barefield Factor and a sector and a
Number 2010Under 2011One paire was due to was due to any due
Interve <t< td=""></t<>
Normed 727AlbertSet of a location with the same set of a loc
Neurone 2019Neurone prison on regionNeurone prison on region on regi
Name 7/17Determination and controlDetermination and controlSelection and controlSelection and controlMethod control <t< td=""></t<>
Network 2012Latence IV Codes board latence is below points for a contra- to
InstructionMarket points for a contribution of an contributionMarket points for a con
ResultNo. ResultN
Nuclead 2010InstanceSays is in ancentrate bar (under an second sec
Netled 212UsderSpyl II in defaults. Lut usder in the spyl II in default and default in the spyl II in default and
Interend 2012 Under Says Halmardonicad, bul under and south and south and
National 2012JuditaryJu
Nordiand 2017NordiandNordiand of NameNordiand of Name
Image: Second
Indexes Jestise Service Service <t< td=""></t<>
Notice Notice State is an opported, but indice as it is an opported, but indice as it is an opported for
Links
Image: Second
Image: Second
Links
Image: Section of the section of th
Image: Section of the start
Nethinoto 2009 Undear The rendomization was drive by registration confer utilizing operation confer utilizing centralized discistor method.* The rendomization was drive by registration confer utilizing centralized discistor method.* The rendomization was drive by registration confer utilizing centralized discistor method.* The rendomization was drive by registration confer utilizing centralized discistor method.* The rendomization registration confer utilizing centralized discistor method.* The rendomization centralized discistor method.* The rendomization centralized discistor centralized discistor rendomization Undear The rendomization centralized discistor centralized discistor rendomization Undear No mention of allocation or creation of y Undear Undear Undear Institution centralized is using a simple to train ans A and B using a simple
Isinihinoto 2009UndeerThe randomization was done by registring the patient is to the patient registring the patient is one method."UnclearThe study is lakeled doube: binded but there is no method of nethod of bindingUnclearUncl
egistering the patients for the patients or the patient spiring the pa
egistering the patients for the patients or the patient spiring the pa
egistering the patients for the patients or the patient spiring the pa
negletering the patients to the patient ocentralized allocation method.*negletering the patient registering the patient r
registering the patients to the patients or the patients or the patient service rule and out patient registering the patients or the rule of a service rule and out patient registering the patients or the rule of a service rule and out patient registering the patient service rule and out patient registering the patients were rule rule and out patient registering the patients were rule rule and out patient rule rule and out patient rule rule rule and rule rule rule rule rule and rule and rule and rule rule rule rule rule rule rule rule
Image: Section controlregistration center vilizing a centralized allocation method."patient registration centrulizing a contralized allocation method."of method of centralized allocation concealmentof method of allocation concealmentof method of allocation concealmentUnclearUnclear how bindedLow Riskpatients pace bindingOTD al 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationNo mention of method of randomizationNo mention of allocation concealmentUnclearUnclearUnclearUnclearNo method."Otta 2014UnclearInsufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationInsufficient informationInclearInsufficient informationUnclearNo bindingPaveKa 2009UnclearSubjects were randomly assigned block randomisation procedure with three stratification orteria"Insufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationUnclearNo bindingUnclearNo bindingPope 2014UnclearInsufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationUnclearNo bindingUnclearUnclearNo bindingRuz 2004UnclearNo mention of the method of vasingUnclearInsufficient informationUnclearNo bindingUnclearUnclearUnclearNo bindingRuz 2014UnclearNo mention of the method of vasingInsufficient informationUnclearNo method of the method of unclearUnclearNo bindingUnclearUnclearNo bindin
Image: Constraint of the method of randomizationNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of allocation concealmentUnclearUnclear how blindedLow Risk"Binded sul practices allocation concealmentO'Del 2013UnclearInsufficient informationUnclearNo mention of allocation concealmentUnclearUnclear how blindedLow Risk"Binded sul practices allocation concealmentO'Del 2014UnclearInsufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationUnclearSubjects were randomly assigned to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification oriteria"UnclearThe study is albeled double- to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification oriteria"UnclearThe study is albeled double- to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification oriteria"UnclearThe study is albeled double- to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification oriteria"UnclearThe study is albeled double- to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification oriteria"UnclearNo blindingMolearNo block randomisation oriteria"Pope 2014UnclearInsufficient informationUnclearUnclearNo block randomisation oriteria"UnclearNo block randomisation was stratified by region, RFUnclearThe sponsor, investigators and public and was stratified by region, RFUnclearThe sponsor, investigators and public and was stratified by region, RFUnclearThe sponsor, investigators and
Image: Section of the secting and participating and partical bese
Image: Section of the secting and the section of the section of t
Image: Section of the secting and participating and partical bese
Image: series of the series
Otha 2014UnclearInsufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationNo blindingPavelka 2009UnclearSubjects were randomly assigned to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria*UnclearThe study is labeled double- blind but there is no mention of method of blindingUnclearUnclearPope 2014UnclearInsufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationUnclearNo blindingRau 2004UnclearNo mention of the method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of method of concealmentUnclearDouble-bling vas blindedUnclearDouble-bling vas blindedRubbert-Roth 2010Lew Risk"Peiers were randomly assigned to using an interactive voice response system; the randomization was statified by region, RF system; the randomization was statified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-UnclearUnclearUnclear vas blinded using an interactive voice response system; the randomization was statified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomization gate instanded by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomization was
Ohta 2014UnclearInsufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationigh iskIncomplete blindingigh iskNo blindingPavelka 2009Unclear"Subjects were randomly assigned block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"'Unclear"Subjects were randomly assigned block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"UnclearThe study is labeled double-blind but three is no mention of method of blindingUnclearThe study is labeled double-blind but three is no mention of method of blindingUnclearNo blindingPope 2014UnclearInsufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationHoclearHigh riskNo blindingRau 2004UnclearNo mention of the method of randomization randomizationUnclearNo realization criteria"UnclearThe sponsor, investigators and UnclearUnclearThe sponsor, inves
Pavelka 2009Unclear"Subjects were randomly assigned to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"Unclear"Subjects were randomly assigned to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"UnclearUnclearUnclearUnclearUnclearUnclearUnclearImatter block trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"UnclearUnclearUnclearUnclearUnclearImatter block trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"UnclearUnclearUnclearUnclearNo blindingHigh riskNo blindingPope 2014UnclearInsufficient informationUnclearInsufficient informationUnclearNo mention of method of concealmentUnclearNo blindingUnclearNo blindingUnclearNo blindingRubbert-Roth 2010Low Risk"Patients were randomly allocated using an interactive vice response system; the randomization was stratified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-Unclear"The sponsor, investigators and unclearUnclear"The sponsor, investigators and uncl
Image: http://withinto trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"blind but there is no mention of method of blindingblind but there is no mention of method of blindingblindid blindingRubbert-Roth 2010Low Risk'Patients were randomly allocated using an int
Image: http://withinto trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"blind but there is no mention of method of blindingblind but there is no mention of method of blindingblinded but is mention of method of randomizationblinded but is mention of method of concelmentblindities method of method of concelmentblindities method of concelmentblindities method of concelmentblindities method of method of method of method of method of method of method of method of randomization vas stratified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow RiskPatients were randomly assigned to randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow RiskNo mention of method of the sponsor the is approximate spatient were randomly assigned to randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow RiskNo blinding method of the sponsor analysis. The sponsor analysis. The sponsor analysis. The spons
Image: http://withinto trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"to trial arms A and B using a simple block randomisation procedure with three stratification criteria"blind but there is no mention of method of blindingblind but there is no mention of method of blindingblinded but is mention of method of randomizationblinded but is mention of method of concelmentblindities method of method of concelmentblindities method of concelmentblindities method of concelmentblindities method of method of method of method of method of method of method of method of randomization vas stratified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow RiskPatients were randomly assigned to randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow RiskNo mention of method of the sponsor the is approximate spatient were randomly assigned to randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow RiskNo blinding method of the sponsor analysis. The sponsor analysis. The sponsor analysis. The spons
Image: series of the series
Image: second
Rau 2004UnclearNo mention of the method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of method of concealmentUnclearDouble-blind but unclear who was blindedUnclearDouble-blind was blindedRubbert-Roth 2010Low Risk"Patients were randomly allocated using an interactive voice response system; the randomization was stratified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow Risk"Patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow Risk"Patients were randomly assigned to RTX-Unclear"InclearUnclearUnclearUnclearThe sponsor, investigators and patients were treatment allocation us on the time of the reatment analysis. Treatment assignments the time of the sponsor at this to the sponsor at this to the sponsor
Rau 2004UnclearNo mention of the method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of method of concealmentUnclearDouble-blind but unclear who was blindedUnclearDouble-blind was blindedRubbert-Roth 2010Low Risk"Patients were randomly allocated using an interactive voice response system; the randomization was stratified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow Risk"Patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow Risk"Patients were randomly assigned to RTX-Unclear"InclearUnclearUnclearUnclearThe sponsor, investigators and patients were treatment allocation us on the time of the reatment analysis. Treatment assignments the time of the sponsor at this to the sponsor at this to the sponsor
Rau 2004UnclearNo mention of the method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of method of concealmentUnclearDouble-blind but unclear who was blindedUnclearDouble-blind was blindedRubbert-Roth 2010Low Risk"Patients were randomly allocated using an interactive voice response system; the randomization was stratified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow Risk"Patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow Risk"Patients were randomly assigned to RTX-Unclear"InclearUnclearUnclearUnclearThe sponsor, investigators and patients were treatment allocation us on the time of the reatment analysis. Treatment assignments the time of the sponsor at this to the sponsor at this to the sponsor
Image: constant of the constan
Rubbert-Roth 2010Low Risk"Patients were randomly allocated using an interactive voice response system; the randomization was stratified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocationLow Risk"Patients were randomly allocated using an interactive voice response system; the randomization was stratified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-Unclear"The sponsor, investigators and patients were blinded to the treatment allocation up to the unblinded to the sponsor at this time for the purpose of the dataUnclear"The sponsor, investigators and patients were blinded to the the treatment and patients and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-Unclear"The sponsor, investigators and patients were blinded to the the treatment allocation up to the unblinded to the sponsor at this time for the purpose of the dataUnclear"The sponsor patients were patients were unblinded to the unblinded to the sponsor at this to the sponsorUnclear"The sponsor patients were patients were unblinded to the unblinded to the sponsor at this to the sponsorUnclear"The sponsor patients were patients were unblinded to the unblinded to the the treatment analysis. Treatment assignments to the sponsor to the sponsor
using an interactive voice response system; the randomization was stratified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocation
system; the randomization was stratified by region, RF seropositivity and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocation
stratified by region, RF seropositivitystratified by region, RFtime of the Week 48 analysis.the time of the time of the time of the Week 48 analysis.and prior biological use. Although allseropositivity and prior biologicalTreatment assignments wereanalysis.patients were randomly assigned touse. Although all patients wereuse. Although all patients wereuse. Although all patients wereRTX-containing regimens, allocationrandomly assigned to RTX-time for the purpose of the datato the sponsor
and prior biological use. Although all patients were randomly assigned to RTX-containing regimens, allocation to the sponsor at this randomly assigned to RTX-
patients were randomly assigned to use. Although all patients were unblinded to the sponsor at this assignments RTX-containing regimens, allocation randomly assigned to RTX-
RTX-containing regimens, allocation randomly assigned to RTX-
to dose and repeat treatment regimen containing regimens, allocation to was blinded."
was biinded. was biinded. was biinded.
Schiff 2008 Unclear Not stated in published article Unclear Not stated in published article Low Risk Additional information from Low Risk Additional in
BMS: "Subjects and clinical BMS: "Subjects and clinical BMS: "Subjects and clinical BMS: "Subjects and clinical
assessor(s) were blinded to assessor(s)
treatment assignment". treatment assignment
order to mai study drug v
intravenousl
15, 29, 43, 5
169, 197, 22
and 337 as
Because the
for abatace
were differe
received not
at some dos
maintain the
blind."
blind."
blind."
Schiff 2013 Unclear No mention of method of Unclear No mention of how allocation Low Risk Investigator-blinded High Risk Not blinded
Schiff 2013 Unclear No mention of method of randomization Unclear No mention of how allocation concealment was done Low Risk Investigator-blinded High Risk Not blinded
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, un his double-blind, randomised,Low Risk"To maintain the double-blindUnclear"To maintain
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel groupLow Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel groupLow Risk"To maintain the double-blind status, a dual assessorUnclear"To maintain status, a dual assessor
Low RiskNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients withLow Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients withLow Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients withLow Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients withLow Risk"To maintain the double-blind, study, adual assessor approach for efficacy and safetyUnclear"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safetyUnclear"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safetyUnclear"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for approach for approach for approach for approach for"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for ender"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for approach for approach for approach for approach for"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for ender"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for approach for approach for approach for appr
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phace/bo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoidLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoidLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe activeLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe activeLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe activeLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoidLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe activeLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe activeLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe activeLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe activeLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe activeLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe activeLow Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, phaseLow Risk<
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHgh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis were randomly assigned withLow Risk"In this double-blind, status, a dual assessor sproach for efficacy and safety swollen and tender joint countsUnclear"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used. Swollen and tender joint countsUnclear"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used. Swollen and tender joint countsUnclear"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used. Swollen and tender joint countsUnclear"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used. Swollen and tender joint countsUnclear"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for approach for status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used. Swollen and tender joint countsUnclear"To maintain status, a dual assessor approach for approach for status, a dual assessor approach for <b< td=""></b<>
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis were randomly assigned with an interactive voiceLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis were randomly an interactive voiceLow Risk"To maintain the double-blind status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used. Swollen and tender joint countsUnclear"To maintain safety assigned with an interactive voiceSwolle and tender joint countsUnclear"To maintain safety assigned with an interactive voiceSwolle and tender joint countsSwolle and 66/68 joints wereSwolle and blint and blinter joint countsSwolle and for advite severe active assigned with an interactive voiceSwolle and for advite severe active assigned with an interactive voiceSwolle and tender joint countsSwolle and for advite severe active assigned with an interactive voiceSwolle and tender joint countsSwolle assigned with an interactive voiceSwolle assigned with an inte
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis were randomly assigned with an interactive voice response system, statified by site with a randomisationLow Risk"In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis were randomly assigned with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with a randomisationLow RiskIow Risk"To maintain the double-blind status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used. Swollen and tender joint counts based on 66/68 joints were done by trained assessors whoJone and tender joint counts placebo-controlled assigned with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with a randomisationLow Risk"To maintain the double-blind status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used. Swollen and tender joint counts based on 66/68 joints were done by trained assessors who joint counts
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-bindedBigh RiskNot bindedSmolen 2008Low Risk"In this double-bind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with arthritis were randomiy assigned with a ninteractive voice statified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor?"Low Risk"In this double-bind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active theumatoid arthritis were randomi assigned with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor?"Low Risk"In this double-bind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active theumatoid arthritis were randomi assigned with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor?"Low Risk"To maintain theumatoid arthritis were randomisation assigned with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list providedLow Risk"To maintain the double-bind stratified by site with a randomisation is provided by the study sponsor?"Low Risk"To maintain stratified by site with a randomisation is provided by the study sponsor?"Low RiskInvestigator-binded stratified by site with a randomisation is provided by the study sponsor?Low RiskInvestigator-binded stem the randomisation assessments was used.Low RiskInvestigator-binded stem the randomisation is p
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSchiff 2013Low Risk*In this double-blind, randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low Risk*In this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active freumatoid arthritis were randomly assigned with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor*Low RiskInvestigator-blinded status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments wa used. Swollen and tender joint counts adon 66(68 Joints were done by trained assessors who hed no access to patient data. A physician blinded to patient's A physician blinded to patient'sJoint Status, a dual assessors who approach for efficacy and safety assessores approach for efficacy and safety assessores the and onisation list provided by the study sponsor*Investigator-binded status, a dual assessors who approach for efficacy and safety assessores the and onisation list provided by the study sponsor*Investigator-binded status, a dual assessors who approach for efficacy and safety assessores the and onisation list provided by the study sponsor*Investigator-binded status, a dual assessors who approach for efficacy and safety assessores the and onisation list provided by the study sponsor*Investigator-binded sponsorInvestigator-binded study, 623 pa
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RissNo thindedSmolen 2008Low Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, placeb-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis were randomiy assigned with an istratified by site with a randomisation ist provided by the study sponsor"Low Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, placeb-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis were randomiy assigned with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with a randomisation ist provided by the study sponsor"Low Risk'In this double-blind, randomised, placeb-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis were randomiy assigned with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low Risk'To maintain response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low Risk'To maintain response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low Risk'To maintain response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low Risk'To maintain response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low Risk'To maintain response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low Risk'To maintain respons
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low RiskUnclearLow RiskIn this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase II I study, 623 patients with an interactive voice response system, statified by site with a randomisationLow RiskTo maintain the double-blind status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearTo maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearTo maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearTo maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearTo maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearTo maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearTo maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearTo maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearTo maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearTo maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearUnclearTo maintain status, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.UnclearUnclearUnclearUnclearUn
Schiff 2013 Unclear No mention of method of randomization Unclear No mention of how allocation concealment was done Investigator-blinded High Risk Not blinded Smolen 2008 Low Risk In this double-blind, randomisad, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid antities worker eachieve vice response system, stratified by site with a niterative vicie response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor ⁴ Low Risk "To maintain the double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid antities worker response system, stratified by site with a niterative vice response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor ⁴ Low Risk Unclear "To maintain the double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid antities worker response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor ⁴ Low Risk "To maintain the double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with an interactive vice response system, stratified by site with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor ⁴ Low Risk Low Risk "To maintain the double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 623 patients with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor ⁴ Low Risk Low Risk Wielse Wielse Swolle nand tender joint counts, placebo-controlled, p
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-bindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low RiskIn this double-bind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase II study, 622 patients with moderate to severe active heumahold arthritis were randomi assigned with an interactive voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain the double-bind, end anteractive voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain the double-bind anteractive voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain the double-bind anteractive voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain the double-bind anteractive voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain the double-bind study, 622 patients with moderate to severe active heumahold arthritis were randomi assigned with an interactive voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study sponsor with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study sponsor with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskInteractive voice sponsor with a randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain sponsor moderate to sponsor had no access to patient data.Holear and no access to patient data.Study dataLow RiskInteractive voice response system, staffed by data.Low RiskInteractive voice respo
Schiff 2013 Unclear No mention of method of randomization Unclear No mention of how allocation concealment was done concealment was done Iow Risk Investigator-blinded High Risk Not londer Smolen 2008 Low Risk In this double-blind, randomisad, placebo-controlled, parallel group place II study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid antities worker andomisation is trovided by the study sponsor" Low Risk "To maintain the double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group place II study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid antities worker andomisation list provided by the study sponsor" Low Risk "To maintain the double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group place II study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid antities worker andomisation list provided by the study sponsor" Low Risk "To maintain the double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group place II study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active rheumatoid antities worker andomisation list provided by the study sponsor" Low Risk "To maintain the double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group place II study, 623 patients with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with a natomisation list provided by the study sponsor" Low Risk Low Risk "To maintain the double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group place II study, 623 patients with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with an interactive voice response system, stratified by site with a nandomisation list provided by the study sponsor" Low Risk Low Ri
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low RiskIn his double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase II study, 622 patients with moderate to severe active heumatol arthritis were randomij asigned with artifieractive voice response system, straffied by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskTo maintain the double-blind atous, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.ModerarTo maintain study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active heumatol assessments, straffied by study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and interactive voice response system, straffied by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low Ri
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low RiskIn his double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase II study, 622 patients with moderate to severe active heumatol arthritis were randomij asigned with artifieractive voice response system, straffied by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskTo maintain the double-blind atous, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.ModerarTo maintain study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active heumatol assessments, straffied by study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and interactive voice response system, straffied by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low Ri
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low RiskIn his double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase II study, 622 patients with moderate to severe active heumatol arthritis were randomij asigned with artifieractive voice response system, straffied by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskTo maintain the double-blind atous, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.ModerarTo maintain study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active heumatol assessments, straffied by study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and interactive voice response system, straffied by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low Ri
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low RiskIn his double-blind, randomised, placeb-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 622 patients with moderate to severe active method arthitis were randomly assigned with a rinteractive voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskTo maintain the double-blind ataus, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety sassesment was used.Moderation set placeb-controlled, parallel group phase III study, 622 patients with moderate to severe active method athus is were andomity assigned with a rinteractive voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskNo metion of how allocation concealment was done phase III study, 622 patients with and refractive voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskIn metricative voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskIn metricative voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskIn metricative voice response system, straffed by the study sponsor"Low RiskIn his and metanem sponsorHolesaHolesaHolesaStudie Line Line Line Line Line Line Line Li
Schiff 2013UnclearNo mention of method of randomizationUnclearNo mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskInvestigator-blindedHigh RiskNot blindedSmolen 2008Low RiskIn his double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, parallel group phase II study, 622 patients with moderate to severe active heumatol arthritis were randomij asigned with artifieractive voice response system, straffied by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot mention of how allocation concealment was doneLow RiskTo maintain the double-blind atous, a dual assessor approach for efficacy and safety assessments was used.ModerarTo maintain study, 623 patients with moderate to severe active heumatol assessments, straffied by study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and interactive voice response system, straffied by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low RiskNot RiskTo maintain study, 623 patients with and randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"Low Ri

Smolen 2013	Low Risk	"Allocation of patients to treatment	Low Risk	"Allocation of patients to treatment	High Risk	"In the double-blind period,	High Risk	"In the double-blind period,
		groups was done with the ICOPhone		groups was done with the		patients received their assigned		patients received their
		interactive voice response system on		ICOPhone interactive voice		weekly subcutaneous injections		assigned weekly
		the basis of information supplied by		response system on the basis of		and the dose of methotrexate		subcutaneous injections and
		the investigator or the study staff."		information supplied by the		they had received in the last 8		the dose of methotrexate they
		······································		investigator or the study staff ."		weeks of the open-label stage.		had received in the last 8
				investigator of the study start.		Methotrexate was supplied as		weeks of the open-label
								· · ·
						open label, repackaged		stage. Methotrexate was
						commercial blisters of 2.5 mg		supplied as open label,
						tablets during both stages."		repackaged commercial
								blisters of 2.5 mg tablets
								during both stages."
Smolen 2015	Unclear	"Patients were randomized	Unclear	Comment: Allocation	Low Risk	"Patients and investigators	Unclear	Patients and
		(1:1:1)" (additional file 1).		concealment not mentioned		were blinded to treatment		investigators were
		Comment: Method of sequence				assignment" (additional file		blinded to treatment
		generation not mentioned.				1)		assignment" (additional
								file 1). Comment: Are
								outcome assessors
								considered
								investigators?
Strand 2006	Unclear	No mention of method of	Unclear	No mention of allocation	Low Risk	"Patients and investigators	Low Risk	Patients and investigators
	Uncied					remained blinded to treatment		remained blinded to treatment
		randomization		concealment				
						assignments during the 2-year		assignments during the 2-
						follow-up period."		year follow-up period."
01		No secolo sufficiente d	Harbert	No C C. II C	Hadaa.	Lister by bPadad	Harbara.	Lister to the
Strand 2012	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of allocation concealment	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Unclear	Unclear how blinded
Tanaka 2011	Unclear	No mention of method of	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation	Unclear	The study is labeled double-	Unclear	The study is labeled double-
		randomization		concealment		blinded but there is no mention		blinded but there is no
						of method of blinding		mention of method of blinding
						Ť		, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
Tanaka 2012	Unclear Contract Cont	No mention of method of	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation	Unclear	The study is labeled double-	Unclear	The study is labeled double-
		randomization		concealment		blind but there is no mention of		blind but there is no mention
						method of blinding		of method of blinding
Taylor 2004	Unclear	"A pharmacist who did not participate	Unclear	"A pharmacist who did not	Unclear	"Half of the patients received	Unclear	"Half of the patients received
		in evaluating patient response		participate in evaluating patient		infliximab at 5 mg/kg, and the		infliximab at 5 mg/kg, and the
		randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2		response randomly assigned		other half received placebo		other half received placebo
		treatment groups."		patients to 1 of 2 treatment groups."		infusions (normal saline) at		infusions (normal saline) at
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		p = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =		weeks 0, 2, and 6, and then		weeks 0, 2, and 6, and then
						every 8 weeks until week 46. All		every 8 weeks until week 46.
						-		
						infusions wors administered		
						infusions were administered		All infusions were
						over 2 hours. All physicians,		administered over 2 hours. All
						over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other		administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses,
						over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the		administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical
						over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with		administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team
						over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the		administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to
						over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with		administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team
						over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the		administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent
						over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being		administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to
						over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being		administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent
Taylor 2006	Unclear	"A pharmacist who did not participate	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation	Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent
Taylor 2006	Unclear	"A pharmacist who did not participate in evaluating patient response	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered."	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered."
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered."	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. Al physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered."
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered."	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. Al physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered."
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. Al physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. Al physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. Al physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses,	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians,
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. Al physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses,	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians,
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent administered during	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the
Taylor 2006	Unclear	in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2	Unclear		Unclear	over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the	Unclear	administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with respect to the nature of the study agent being administered." "Those in the infliximab MTX group received a placebo infusion at week 56 in order to maintain blinding, and received infliximab infusions at the other time points. All infusions were administered over 2 hours. All physicians, patients, nurses, and other nonclinical members of the study team were blinded with

Van der Heidje 2006	Low Risk	Central telephone randomization	Low Risk	Central telephone randomization	Low Risk	Identical appearing injectable and oral test articles	Low Risk	Identical appearing injectable and oral test articles
Van der Heijde 2007	Unclear	No mention of the method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of concealment	Low Risk	"Throughout the 3-year duration of the study, both investigators and patients remained blinded to the study treatment."	Low Risk	"Throughout the 3-year duration of the study, both investigators and patients remained blinded to the study treatment."
Van der Heijde 2013	Low Risk	"Using interactive voice recognition system"	Low Risk	"Using interactive voice recognition system"	Low Risk	"Radiographs for each patient were scored by 2 independent readers who were blinded to patient randomization sequence and visit"	Low Risk	"Advanced in blinded manner"
Van der Kooij 2009	Unclear	"Patients were randomly allocated to 1 of 4 treatment groups by variable block randomization, stratified per center"	Unclear	"Patients were randomly allocated to 1 of 4 treatment groups by variable block randomization, stratified per center"	Unclear	"The DAS was measured every 3 months by a trained research nurse who remained blinded to the treatment received. Rheumatologists were not blinded for treatment strategy, but they relied on the DAS recommendations done by blinded research nurses to decide how to proceed with treatment, based on the treatment, based on the treatment protocol Every 3 months, patient-reported outcomes were assessed by the patients themselves, under supervision of and assisted by trained research nurses who were blinded to the allocated treatment group."		Non-blinded. "Because the BeSt study was designed as a single-blind trial, the outcomes of this study may have been influenced by patient expectations of certain treatment strategies."
Van Riel 2006	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	High Risk	Non-blinded	High Risk	Non-blinded
Van Riel 2008	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	High Risk	Non-blinded	High Risk	Non-blinded

Van Vollenhoven 2012a	Low Risk	"Randomisation was done with a computer-generated random list of assignments communicated by the Swefot coordinator to the investigator The statistician who generated the randomisation sequence was not otherwise involved in the trial."	Low Risk	"Randomisation was done with a computer-generated random list of assignments communicated by the Swefot coordinator to the investigator. The statistician who generated the randomisation sequence was not otherwise involved in the trial."	High Risk	Non-blinded	High Risk	Non-blinded
Van Vollenhoven 2012b	Low Risk	"All patients were taking background methotrexate and, by means of an interactive voice-response system, were randomly assigned"	Low Risk	"All patients were taking background methotrexate and, by means of an interactive voice- response system, were randomly assigned"	Unclear	The study is labeled double- blind but there is no mention of method of blinding	Unclear	The study is labeled double- blind but there is no mention of method of blinding
Weinblatt 1999	Unclear	No method of randomisation described	Unclear	No description of method used to conceal allocation	Low Risk	The placebo had the same ingredients except for the omission of etanercept	Low Risk	The placebo had the same ingredients except for the omission of etanercept; thus blinding of patients likely
Weinblatt 2003	Low Risk	Randomisation was done using blocks of 8	Low Risk	Central procedure	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Unclear	Unclear how blinded
Weinblatt 2006	Unclear	No mention of the method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of concealment	Unclear	Double-blind but unclear who was blinded	Unclear	Double-blind but unclear who was blinded
Weinblatt 2012	Low Risk	"Patients were randomized 4:1 via an interactive voice-response system and stratified by baseline MTX use"	Unclear	No mention of allocation concealment	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Unclear	Unclear how blinded
Weinblatt 2013a	Low Risk	"Patients enrolled in this multicentre, double-blind, placebo controlled study were randomly (2:1) assigned, via interactive voice response system, to receive intravenous golimumab 2 mg/ kg, or placebo infusions at weeks 0 and 4, and then every 8 weeks through week 100, followed by 12 weeks of additional safety follow-up."		"Patients enrolled in this multicentre, double-blind, placebo controlled study were randomly (2:1) assigned, via interactive voice response system, to receive intravenous golimumab 2 mg/ kg, or placebo infusions at weeks 0 and 4, and then q8 weeks through week 100, followed by 12 weeks of additional safety follow-up."		"Patients assigned to golimumab also received placebo infusions at weeks 16 and 20 to maintain the study blind regardless of EE status Joint evaluations were performed by an independent blinded assessor assigned to each study centre."	Unclear	"Patients assigned to golimumab also received placebo infusions at weeks 16 and 20 to maintain the study blind regardless of EE status Joint evaluations were performed by an independent blinded assessor assigned to each study centre."
Weinblatt 2013b	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"Clinical assessors were blinded with regard to each patient's treatment."	High Risk	Not blinded
Weisman 2003	Low Risk	"During the double-blind period, each patient package was assigned a number from 1 to 60. Randomization occurred centrally."		No mention of method of allocation concealment		"Dose levels were assigned randomly for the first 60 patients, and sets of 10 numbers were assigned to each of the 6 sites. For example, site 1 received patient packages 0001 to 0010, and patients were randomly assigned to receive adalimumab doses of 0.25, 0.5, 1, 3, or 5 mg/kg or placebo in a 3: 1 ratio of adalimumab to placebo recipients. Study drug was administered into a peripheral vein as a single infusion over 3 to 5 minutes using standard commercial tubing."		"Dose levels were assigned randomly for the first 60 patients, and sets of 10 numbers were assigned to each of the 6 sites. For example, site 1 received patient packages 0001 to 0010, and patients were randomly assigned to receive adalimumab doses of 0.25, 0.5, 1, 3, or 5 mg/kg or placebo in a 3: 1 ratio of adalimumab to placebo recipients. Study drug was administered into a peripheral vein as a single infusion over 3 to 5 minutes using standard commercial tubing."
Weisman 2007	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	Study is labeled double-blinded but there is no mention of method of blinding	Unclear	Study is labeled double- blinded but there is no mention of method of blinding
Westhovens 2006	Low Risk	"Patients were assigned to the treatment groups using adaptive allocation, with stratification according to the investigational site and concomitant oral corticosteroid use at baseline (none, up to and including 15 mg/day, or more than 15 mg/day of prednisone equivalent)."		No mention of method of allocation concealment		"Patients in group 3 continued to receive infusions of 10 mg/kg infliximab every 8 weeks through week 46 without any dose adjustment, with an infusion of placebo at week 26 to maintain the treatment blind Patients, investigators, and other study personnel, except for pharmacists, were blinded to the study treatment assignments."		"Patients in group 3 continued to receive infusions of 10 mg/kg infliximab every 8 weeks through week 46 without any dose adjustment, with an infusion of placebo at week 26 to maintain the treatment blind Patients, investigators, and other study personnel, except for pharmacists, were blinded to the study treatment assignments."
Yamamoto 2014a	Low risk	Randomization using random number table	Low risk	Ensured indistinguishability of study drug	Low risk	Blinding of participants and key study personnel ensured	Low risk	Outcome assessors were blinded
Yazici 2012	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	"The study management team, investigational staff and monitors remained blinded to individual patients' treatment assignments." Additionally, the study is labeled double-blinded but there is no mention of method of blinding.	Unclear	"The study management team, investigational staff and monitors remained blinded to individual patients' treatment assignments." Additionally, the study is labeled double- blinded but there is no mention of method of blinding.
Zhang 2006	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	The study is labeled double- blinded but there is no mention of method of blinding	Unclear	The study is labeled double- blinded but there is no mention of method of blinding