Study	Randomization	Randomization	Allocation Concealment	Allocation Concealment	Blinding of Personnel and Participants	Blinding of Personnel and Participants	Blinding of Assessor	Blinding of Assessor
	Judgement	Reason	Judgement	Reason	Judgement	Reason	Judgement	Reason
Abe 2006	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	Study is labeled double-blind and double-dummy but there is no mention of blinding method	Unclear	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."	Low Risk	"In order to match the viscosity of CZP and therefore maintain blinding..."
Cohen 2002	Unclear	Method of randomization was not reported	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."	Low Risk	"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."	Low Risk	"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."	Unclear	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	Low Risk	"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."	Low Risk	"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."	High Risk	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."	Low Risk	"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."	Low Risk	"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."	High Risk	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.	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."
Keystone 2004a	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Unclear	Unclear how blinded
Keystone 2004b	Unclear	"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	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."	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. 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 randomization	Unclear	No mention of allocation concealment	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Unclear	Unclear how blinded
Kim 2012	Unclear	"The randomization schedule was generated by Wyeth and implemented by the Clinical Operations Randomization Environment (CORE)."	Unclear	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."	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."	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)."	Unclear	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 (1:1:1:1:1), 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 (1:1:1:1:1), 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)."	Low Risk	"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.'	Low Risk	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."	High Risk	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 enrollment system	Unclear	Insufficient information	High Risk	No blinding	High Risk	No blinding
MacIsaac 2014	Unclear	Insufficient information	Unclear	Insufficient information	Low Risk	Blinding of participants and key study personnel ensured	Low Risk	Outcome assessors were blinded
Maini 1998	Low Risk	"Randomization was performed centrally"	Low Risk	Central procedure	Low Risk	"The coded study medications was not revealed to the patients or the assessors"	Low Risk	"The coded study medications was not revealed to the patients or the assessors"

Maini 2006	Low Risk	"Randomization was performed centrally. When a patient was eligible for randomization into the study, an interactive voice response system was used to allocate treatment, by determining inclusion into the group that would minimize any imbalances between MTX dose level at baseline and between patients from a center."	Low Risk	"Randomization was performed centrally. When a patient was eligible for randomization into the study, an interactive voice response system was used to allocate treatment, by determining inclusion into the group that would minimize any imbalances between MTX dose level at baseline and between patients from a center."	Low Risk	"All patients and investigators were blinded to the study treatments. Tocilizumab or placebo (an aqueous solution of sucrose and polysorbate 80, resembling the active treatment) was diluted in normal saline and administered by intravenous infusion over 1 hour. Pre-prepared capsules containing 10-mg, 12.5-mg, 15-mg, 17.5-mg, 20-mg, 22.5-mg, and 25-mg doses of MTX were blinded by over-capsulation using a lactose filler; the matching placebo capsules contained only filler."	Low Risk	"All patients and investigators were blinded to the study treatments. Tocilizumab or placebo (an aqueous solution of sucrose and polysorbate 80, resembling the active treatment) was diluted in normal saline and administered by intravenous infusion over 1 hour. Pre-prepared capsules containing 10-mg, 12.5-mg, 15-mg, 17.5-mg, 20-mg, 22.5-mg, and 25-mg doses of MTX were blinded by over-capsulation using a lactose filler; the matching placebo capsules contained only filler."
Moreland 2012	Unclear	Says it is randomized, but unclear as to how this was achieved	Low Risk	Treatment was allocated via a computerized data entry system at a 2:1 ratio for etanercept versus triple therapy, using a standard permuted block approach, by site, with block sizes of 6 or 12.'	Low Risk	All subjects…were blinded (for the length of the trial) to treatment assignment.'	Low Risk	Investigators…remained blinded to the treatment assignment until the end of year 2.'
Nishimoto 2009	Unclear	"The randomization was done by registering the patients to the patient registration center utilizing a centralized allocation method."	Unclear	"The randomization was done by registering the patients to the patient registration center utilizing a centralized allocation method."	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
O'Dell 2013	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of allocation concealment	Unclear	Unclear how blinded	Low Risk	"Blinded sulfasalazine and placebo tablets were purchased at a reduced price by..."
Ohta 2014	Unclear	Insufficient information	Unclear	Insufficient information	high risk	Incomplete blinding	high risk	No blinding - open label study
Pavelka 2009	Unclear	"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..."	Unclear	The study is labeled double-blind 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
Pope 2014	Unclear	Insufficient information	Unclear	Insufficient information	High risk	No blinding	High risk	No blinding
Rau 2004	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
Rubbert-Roth 2010	Low 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, allocation to dose and repeat treatment regimen was blinded."	Low 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, allocation to dose and repeat treatment regimen was blinded."	Unclear	"The sponsor, investigators and patients were blinded to the treatment allocation up to the time of the Week 48 analysis. Treatment assignments were unblinded to the sponsor at this time for the purpose of the data analysis."	Unclear	"The sponsor, investigators and patients were blinded to the treatment allocation up to the time of the Week 48 analysis. Treatment assignments were unblinded to the sponsor at this time for the purpose of the data analysis."
Schiff 2008	Unclear	Not stated in published article	Unclear	Not stated in published article	Low Risk	Additional information from BMS: "Subjects and clinical assessor(s) were blinded to treatment assignment".	Low Risk	Additional information from BMS: "Subjects and clinical assessor(s) were blinded to treatment assignment". "In order to maintain the blind, study drug was administered intravenously (IV) on Days 1, 15, 29, 43, 57, 85, 113, 141, 169, 197, 225, 253, 281, 309, and 337 as described below. Because the dosing regimens for abatacept and infliximab were different, subjects received normal saline (NS) at some dosing visits to maintain the integrity of the blind."
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
Smolen 2008	Low 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 randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"	Low 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 randomisation list provided by the study sponsor"	Low 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 had no access to patient data. A physician blinded to patient's treatment made all treatment decisions on the basis of the patient's clinical response and safety data."	Unclear	"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 had no access to patient data. A physician blinded to patient's treatment made all treatment decisions on the basis of the patient's clinical response and safety data."
Smolen 2009	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	High Risk	Non-blinded	High Risk	Non-blinded

Smolen 2013	Low Risk	"Allocation of patients to treatment groups was done with the ICOPhone interactive voice response system on the basis of information supplied by the investigator or the study staff ."	Low Risk	"Allocation of patients to treatment groups was done with the ICOPhone interactive voice response system on the basis of information supplied by the investigator or the study staff ."	High Risk	"In the double-blind period, patients received their assigned weekly subcutaneous injections and the dose of methotrexate they had received in the last 8 weeks of the open-label stage. Methotrexate was supplied as open label, repackaged commercial blisters of 2·5 mg tablets during both stages."	High Risk	"In the double-blind period, patients received their assigned weekly subcutaneous injections and the dose of methotrexate they had received in the last 8 weeks of the open-label stage. Methotrexate was supplied as open label, repackaged commercial blisters of 2·5 mg tablets during both stages."
Smolen 2015	Unclear	“Patients were randomized (1:1:1)” (additional file 1). Comment: Method of sequence generation not mentioned.	Unclear	Comment: Allocation concealment not mentioned	Low Risk	“Patients and investigators were blinded to treatment assignment” (additional file 1)	Unclear	Patients and investigators were blinded to treatment assignment” (additional file 1). Comment: Are outcome assessors considered investigators?
Strand 2006	Unclear	No mention of method of randomization	Unclear	No mention of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"Patients and investigators remained blinded to treatment assignments during the 2-year follow-up period."	Low Risk	"Patients and investigators remained blinded to treatment assignments during the 2-year follow-up period."
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 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
Tanaka 2012	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
Taylor 2004	Unclear	"A pharmacist who did not participate in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2 treatment groups."	Unclear	"A pharmacist who did not participate in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2 treatment groups."	Unclear	"Half of the patients received infliximab at 5 mg/kg, and the other half received placebo infusions (normal saline) at weeks 0, 2, and 6, and then every 8 weeks until week 46. 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 being administered."	Unclear	"Half of the patients received infliximab at 5 mg/kg, and the other half received placebo infusions (normal saline) at weeks 0, 2, and 6, and then every 8 weeks until week 46. 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 being administered."
Taylor 2006	Unclear	"A pharmacist who did not participate in evaluating patient response randomly assigned patients to 1 of 2 treatment groups"	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	"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 the first year."	Unclear	"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 the first year."
Van der Heijde 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 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."	High Risk	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."	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 q8 weeks through week 100, followed by 12 weeks of additional safety follow-up."	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."	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."	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Unclear	"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."	Unclear	"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)."	Unclear	No mention of method of allocation concealment	Low Risk	"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."	Low Risk	"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