

City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Garcia, V. R., Jobanputra, P., Burls, A., Cabello, J. B., Casasempere, P. V., Bort-Marti, S. & Kynaston-Pearson, F. J. B. (2014). Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults. The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2014(9), CD007649. doi: 10.1002/14651858.cd007649.pub3

This is the published version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/18164/

Link to published version: https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.cd007649.pub3

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. City Research Online: <u>http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/</u> <u>publications@city.ac.uk</u>



Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Ruiz Garcia V, Jobanputra P, Burls A, Cabello JB, Vela Casasempere P, Bort-Marti S, Kynaston-Pearson FJB

Ruiz Garcia V, Jobanputra P, Burls A, Cabello JB, Vela Casasempere P, Bort-Marti S, Kynaston-Pearson FJB. Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2014, Issue 9. Art. No.: CD007649. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007649.pub3.

www.cochranelibrary.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

HEADER	1
ABSTRACT	1
PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY	2
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE MAIN COMPARISON	4
BACKGROUND	7
OBJECTIVES	8
METHODS	8
RESULTS	11
Figure 1	12
Figure 2	14
Figure 3	15
Figure 4	20
DISCUSSION	22
AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS	23
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	24
REFERENCES	24
CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES	32
DATA AND ANALYSES	59
Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Efficacy at 12 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 ACR20	77
Analysis 1.2. Comparison 1 Efficacy at 12 weeks, any dose, Outcome 2 ACR50	79
Analysis 1.3. Comparison 1 Efficacy at 12 weeks, any dose, Outcome 3 ACR70	80
Analysis 2.1. Comparison 2 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab pegol, Outcome 1 ACR 20	81
Analysis 2.2. Comparison 2 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab pegol, Outcome 2 ACR 50	82
Analysis 2.3. Comparison 2 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab pegol, Outcome 3 ACR 70	83
Analysis 3.1. Comparison 3 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 ACR 20	84
Analysis 3.2. Comparison 3 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 2 ACR 50	85
Analysis 3.3. Comparison 3 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 3 ACR 70	86
Analysis 4.1. Comparison 4 Efficacy at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 ACR20	87
Analysis 4.2. Comparison 4 Efficacy at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 2 ACR50	88
Analysis 4.3. Comparison 4 Efficacy at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 3 ACR70	89
Analysis 5.1. Comparison 5 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 ACR 20	90
Analysis 5.2. Comparison 5 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 2 ACR 50	91
Analysis 5.3. Comparison 5 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 3 ACR 70	91
Analysis 6.1. Comparison 6 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 ACR 20	92
Analysis 6.2. Comparison 6 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 2 ACR 50	92
Analysis 6.3. Comparison 6 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 3 ACR 70	93
Analysis 7.1. Comparison 7 Efficacy at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 ACR20	94
Analysis 7.2. Comparison 7 Efficacy at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 2 ACR50	95
Analysis 7.3. Comparison 7 Efficacy at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 3 ACR70	96
Analysis 8.1. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 Any adverse event	97
Analysis 8.2. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 2 Adverse events Intensity mild	98
Analysis 8.3. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 3 Adverse events Intensity moderate.	99
Analysis 8.4. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 4 Adverse events Intensity severe.	100
Analysis 8.5. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 5 Adverse events related to study drug	101
Analysis 8.6. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 6 Serious Adverse Events (SAE)	102
Analysis 8.7. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 7 Serious Infections.	103
Analysis 8.8. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 8 Adverse events leading to death	104
Analysis 8.9. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 9 Adverse events leading to withdrawal	105
Analysis 8.10. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 10 Death	106
Analysis 8.11. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 11 Tuberculosis	107
Analysis 8.12. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 12 Malignancies included lymphoma.	108

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review) Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

i

Analysis 8.13. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 13 Injection site pain.	109
Analysis 8.14. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 14 Injection side reactions.	110
Analysis 8.15. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 15 Neutralising Anti-certolizumab pegol	
antibodies	111
Analysis 8.16. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 16 Systemic lupus erythematosus.	111
Analysis 8.17. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 17 Prolonged activated partial thromboplastin time	
(aPTT)	112
Analysis 8.18. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 18 Urinary tract infection.	113
Analysis 8.19. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 19 Upper respiratory tract infection.	114
Analysis 8 20 Comparison 8 Safety certolizumah 200 mg. Outcome 20 Lower respiratory tract infection/ lung	
infection	115
Analysis & 21 Comparison & Safety certalizumah 200 mg. Outcome 21 Headache	116
Analysis 8.22. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 22 Preductic.	117
Analysis 8.22. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 22 Dacteriuria.	11/
Analysis 8.25. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 25 Nasopharyngitis/Pharyngitis.	110
Analysis 8.24. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 24 Hypertension.	119
Analysis 8.25. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 25 Hematuria.	119
Analysis 8.26. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 26 Hepatic enzyme increased.	120
Analysis 8.27. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 27 AST increased.	121
Analysis 8.28. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 28 ALT increased.	121
Analysis 8.29. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 29 Back pain	122
Analysis 8.30. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 30 Herpes viral infection	122
Analysis 8.31. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 31 Bacterial peritonitis.	123
Analysis 8.32. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 32 Opportunistic infections	123
Analysis 8.33. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 33 Infections and infestations.	124
Analysis 8.34. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 34 Gastroenteritis.	125
Analysis 8.35. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 35 Hematologic abnormalities.	125
Analysis 8.36. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 36 Decreased haemoglobin.	126
Analysis 8.37. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 37 Increased platelet count.	127
Analysis 8.38. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 38 Pneumonia.	127
Analysis 8.39. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 39 Diarrhoea	128
Analysis 8 40 Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 40 Cerebral haemorrhage including subarachnoid	129
Analysis 8.41 Comparison 8 Safety certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 41 Nausea/vomiting	129
Analysis 8.42. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 42 Acute miccardial infarction	120
Analysis 8.42. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 42 Acute infocardial infaction.	130
Analysis 8.49. Comparison 8 Safety, certonizumab 200 mg, Outcome 49 Consupation	1.21
Analysis 8.44. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 44 Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders.	131
Analysis 8.45. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 45 Cough.	132
Analysis 8.46. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 46 Pruritus.	133
Analysis 8.4/. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 4/ Abdominal pain/discomfort/dyspepsia.	133
Analysis 8.48. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 48 Fatigue	134
Analysis 8.49. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 49 Periodontitis	134
Analysis 9.1. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 Any adverse events	135
Analysis 9.2. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 2 Adverse events Intensity mild.	136
Analysis 9.3. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 3 Adverse events Intensity moderate.	137
Analysis 9.4. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 4 Adverse events Intensity severe.	138
Analysis 9.5. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 5 Adverse events related to study drug	139
Analysis 9.6. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 6 Serious infections.	140
Analysis 9.7. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 7 3Serious Adverse Events (SAE).	141
Analysis 9.8. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 8 Adverse events leading to death.	142
Analysis 9.9. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 9 Adverse events leading to withdrawal.	143
Analysis 9.10. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 10 Death.	144
Analysis 9.11. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 11 Vomiting.	144
Analysis 9.12. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 12 Pneumonitis	145
Analysis 9.13 Comparison 9 Safety certalizumab 400 mg. Outcome 13 Tuberculosis	146
	140

ii

Analysis 9.14. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 14 Arthritis bacterial	146
Analysis 9.15. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 15 Mastitis.	147
Analysis 9.16. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 16 Benign Tumour	148
Analysis 9.17. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 17 Ischaemeic stroke.	148
Analysis 9.18. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 18 Dizziness postural.	149
Analysis 9.19. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 19 Menorrhagia.	149
Analysis 9.20. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 20 Malignancies included lymphoma.	150
Analysis 9.21. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 21 Injection site pain.	151
Analysis 9.22. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 22 Injection side reactions.	152
Analysis 9.23. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 23 Anti-certolizumab pegol antibodies.	153
Analysis 9.24 Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 24 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA)	153
Analysis 9.25. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg. Outcome 25 Prolonged activated partial thrombonlastin time	1)5
(aPTT)	154
Analysis 9.26 Comparison 9 Safety certalizumah 400 mg. Outcome 26 Urinary tract infection	154
Analysis 7.20. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 20 Ormary fract intection.	155
Analysis 7.27. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 27 Dack pant	156
Analysis 9.28. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 28 Opper respiratory tract infection.	1)0
Analysis 9.29. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 29 Lower respiratory tract infection/ lung	167
	15/
Analysis 9.30. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 30 Headache.	158
Analysis 9.31. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 31 Bacteriuria.	158
Analysis 9.32. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 32 Hypertension.	159
Analysis 9.33. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 33 Hematuria.	160
Analysis 9.34. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 34 Hepatic enzyme increased	160
Analysis 9.35. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 35 AST increased.	161
Analysis 9.36. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 36 ALT increased.	161
Analysis 9.37. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 37 Herpes viral infection	162
Analysis 9.38. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 38 Bacterial peritonitis.	162
Analysis 9.39. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 39 Opportunistic infections	163
Analysis 9.40. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 40 Infections and infestations.	163
Analysis 9.41. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 41 Nasopharyngitis/Pharyngitis.	164
Analysis 9.42. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 42 Gastrointestinal disorders.	165
Analysis 9.43. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 43 Hematologic abnormalities.	165
Analysis 9.44. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 44 Decreased Haemoglobin.	166
Analysis 9.45. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 45 Increased platelet count.	167
Analysis 9.46. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 46 Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders.	167
Analysis 9.47. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg. Outcome 47 Acute miocardial infarction.	168
Analysis 9.48. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 48 Corneal Perforation.	168
Analysis 9.49. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 49 Conjunctivitis allergic	169
Analysis 9.50. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 50 Periodontitis.	169
Analysis 9.51 Comparison 9 Safety certolizumab 400 mg. Outcome 51 Fatigue	170
Analysis 10.1 Comparison 10 Mean HAO-DI from baseline at week 12 Outcome 1 certolizumab negol 200 mg sc	170
Analysis 10.1. Comparison 10 Mean HAQ DI from baseline at week 24. Outcome 1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc.	171
Analysis 11.1. Comparison 11 Mean HAQ DI from baseline at week 24, Outcome 2 certolizumab /00 mg sc.	172
Analysis 11.2. Comparison 11 Mean TING-DI noin baseline at week 24, Outcome 2 certoinzuntab 400 mg se.	172
Analysis 12.1. Comparison 12 HAQ-DI at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.	174
Analysis 15.1. Comparison 15 FAQ-D1 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline	1/4
Anarysis 14.1. Comparison 14 5F-56 Filysical Component Summary (FCS), week 24, Outcome 1 certonzumab pegoi 200	175
$ \underset{\text{mg sc.}}{\text{mg sc.}} \underset{\text{mg sc.}}{$	1/5
Analysis 14.2. Comparison 14 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 24, Outcome 2 certolizumab pegol 400	17/
mg sc	1/6
Analysis 15.1. Comparison 15 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 24, Outcome 1 certolizumab pegol 200	1
mg sc	177
Analysis 15.2. Comparison 15 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 24, Outcome 2 certolizumab pegol 400	
mg sc	178

iii

 Sc	Analysis 16.1. Comparison 16 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 52, Outcome 1 certolizumab 200 mg	
 Analysis 16.2. Comparison 16 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 52, Outcome 2 certolizumab 400 mg analysis 17.1. Comparison 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52, Outcome 1 certolizumab pegel 00 mg sc. Analysis 17.2. Comparison 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52, Outcome 2 certolizumab pegel 00 mg sc. Analysis 19.1. Comparison 19 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 19.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 20.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 21 Siease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 72 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Ronalysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Ronalysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks cerolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.3. Compari	SC	178
 sc	Analysis 16.2. Comparison 16 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 52, Outcome 2 certolizumab 400 mg	
 Analysis 17.1. Comparison 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52, Outcome 1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc. Maalysis 17.2. Comparison 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52, Outcome 2 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc. Analysis 19.1. Comparison 18 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Manalysis 19.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Manalysis 20.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Manalysis 20.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Manalysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Manalysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Manalysis 24.1. Comparison 23 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Manalysis 24.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Manalysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 25 weeks. Manalysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Manalysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Manalysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Dise	SC	179
 mg sc. mg sc. Comparison 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52, Outcome 2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc. Analysis 18.1. Comparison 18 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 19.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 20.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Badysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Banalysis 21.1. Comparison 21 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks. Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 23.1. Comparison 23 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 24.1. Comparison 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6),	Analysis 17.1, Comparison 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52, Outcome 1 certolizumab pegol 200	
 Analysis 17.2. Comparison 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52, Outcome 2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc. Analysis 18.1. Comparison 18 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 20.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 21.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 24.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 25 weeks. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any ti	mg sc.	180
 Inacide Comparison 17 of 20 methan Component Summary (IPCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 18.1. Comparison 18 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (IPCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 10.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (IPCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (IPCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (IPCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 week, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 23.1. Comparison 23 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 26.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 26.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 26.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24	Analysis 17.2 Comparison 17.5E-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52, Outcome 2 cettolizumab negol 400	100
maysis B.1. Comparison 18 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 181 Analysis 19.1. Comparison 19 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 182 Analysis 20.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 183 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 184 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. 184 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 20 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1	ma se	180
 Marysis 10.1: Comparison 19 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (WCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 182 Analysis 19.1: Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (WCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 183 Analysis 21.1: Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (WCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 184 Analysis 21.1: Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (WCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 185 Analysis 21.1: Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (WCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. 186 Analysis 23.1: Comparison 23 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. 187 Analysis 24.1: Comparison 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. 188 Analysis 25.2: Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. 190 Analysis 25.4: Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. 191 Analysis 26.1: Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. 191 Analysis 27.1: Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks ce	Analysis 18.1 Comparison 18 SE 36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 24 any dose Outcome 1 Change from	100
 Dachne. 1917. Comparison 19 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 182 Analysis 20.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 183 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 184 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg	Analysis 18.1. Comparison 18 51-50 Thysical Component Summary (1 C5) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from	101
 Analysis 19.1. Comparison 19 SF-36 Mental Component summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 183 Analysis 20.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 184 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 185 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 186 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Analysis 25.2. Comparison 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 26.1. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 21.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg		101
 baseline. 182 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 183 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 184 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 22 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 23.1. Comparison 23 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. 186 Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 28.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome	Analysis 19.1. Comparison 19 SF-56 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome I Change from	
 Analysis 20.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 22.1. Comparison 22 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 23.1. Comparison 22 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 24.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 26 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 26 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 27 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of pat	baseline.	182
baseline. 183 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 184 Analysis 22.1. Comparison 22 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), at 12 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 23 weeks.	Analysis 20.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from	L
 Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 22.1. Comparison 22 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 23.1. Comparison 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Analysis 24.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 26 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 26.1. Comparison 27 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 28.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from basel	baseline	183
baseline. 184 Analysis 22.1. Comparison 22 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1	Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from	l
 Analysis 22.1. Comparison 22 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 24.1. Comparison 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 28.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline. Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, 000 mg. Analysis 31.1. Com	baseline	184
of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. 185 Analysis 23.1. Comparison 23 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1	Analysis 22.1. Comparison 22 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks, Outcome 1 Proportion	1
Analysis 23.1. Comparison 23 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1	of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg	185
Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks. 186 Analysis 24.1. Comparison 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1	Analysis 23.1. Comparison 23 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome 1	
Analysis 24.1. Comparison 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1	Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks.	186
Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks. 187 Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg.	Analysis 24.1. Comparison 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome 1	
 Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 26.1. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 28.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 33.1.	Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks	187
Analysis 25.1. Comparison 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. 188 Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg.	Analysis 25.1 Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (FSR) remission (< 2.6) any time Outcome 1 Proportion	10/
Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg.	of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certalizumah 200 mg	188
 Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.1. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Malysis 28.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Malysis 28.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline. Malysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Malysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Malysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.4. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.4. Compariso	Analysis 25.2 Comparison 25 Discoss Activity Score (DAS 28) (ESP) remission (2.2.6) any time Outcome 2 Proportion	100
 187 187 189 189 180 181 181 181 182 183 183 183 183 183 183 183 183 183 184 184 184 184 184 184 185 184 184 184 184 184 185 184 185 184 184	Analysis 2).2. Comparison 2) Disease Activity Scole (DAS-26) (ESR) femission (< 2.0), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion	100
 Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-26) (EDSR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 27.1. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Malysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Malysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline. Malysis 30.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Malysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Malysis 30.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Malysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. Malysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.4. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52,	Archevic 25 2 Companying 25 Disease Astronomy (DAS 28) (ESD) and internet (12.0) and internet 2 Disease 2 Disease (DAS 28)	189
 Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 27.1. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline. Malysis 28.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline. Malysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Malysis 33.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Malysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.4. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 33.4. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Malysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 	Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion	100
 Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. Analysis 26.1. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline. Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline. Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline. Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Out	of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 400 mg	190
of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg. 191 Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion	Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion	
 Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg	of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg	191
of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg. 191 Analysis 26.1. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 192 Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 192 Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 193 Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 193 Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 194 Analysis 20.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 194 Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 194 Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 196 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 197 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 198	Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion	
Analysis 26.1. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 192 Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 193 Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 193 Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 193 Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 194 Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 194 Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 196 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 196 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab	of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg	191
baseline.192Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline.193Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline.193Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline.193Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline.194Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.196Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.196Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline.197Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline.197Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.197Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.198Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.198Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.199Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.199Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES	Analysis 26.1. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from	
Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 193 Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 193 Analysis 28.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 193 Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 194 Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 194 Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 196 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 196 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52	baseline	192
baseline.193Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline.193Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline.194Analysis 29.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.194Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.196Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.196Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline.197Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline.197Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.197Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.198Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.199Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.199Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.199Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.199	Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from	
Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 193 Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 194 Analysis 20.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 194 Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 196 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change f	baseline	193
baseline.193Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline.194Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.194Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.196Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline.196Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline.197Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.197Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.198Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.199Analysis 33.4. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.199Analysis 33.4. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.199Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.199Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.199	Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from	
Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from 194 Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 195 Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 196 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 196 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change fr	baseline.	193
baseline. 194 Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 195 Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 196 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. 196 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 198 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 199	Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from	
Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 195 Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 196 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. 196 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 198 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 199	haseline	194
Analysis 30.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 196 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 196 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 198 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 199	Analysis 30.1 Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks any dose Outcome 1 Change from baseline	195
Analysis 31.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 92 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 197 Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline. 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 197 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 198 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 199	Analysis 30.1. Comparison 31 DAS 28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.	106
Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certonzumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESK) change from the baseline. 197 Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 197 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg. 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg. 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 200	Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 32 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change nonin basenne	190
baseline. 19/ Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 199	Analysis 52.1. Comparison 52 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from	107
Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 197 Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 200		19/
pegol 200 mg. 19/ Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 200	Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome I Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab	
Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 200	pegol 200 mg	197
pegol 400 mg. 198 Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 200	Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab)
Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 200	pegol 400 mg	198
pegol 200 mg. 1999 Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 1999 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 2000	Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab)
Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab 199 Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline. 200	pegol 200 mg	199
pegol 400 mg.199Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.200	Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab)
Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline 200	pegol 400 mg	199
	Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.	200

Analysis 35.1. Comparison 35 Erosion score (ES) at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.	201
Analysis 36.1. Comparison 36 Joint space narrowing (JSN), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean JSN 24 weeks,	
certolizumab pegol 200 mg	202
Analysis 36.2. Comparison 36 Joint space narrowing (JSN), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean JSN 24	202
Analysis 26.2 Comparison 26 Joint space paragraphing (ISN). Outcome 2 Change from the baseling mean ISN 52	202
Analysis 50.5. Comparison 50 joint space narrowing (J514), Outcome 5 Change from the baseline mean J514 52	202
Analysis 36 4 Comparison 36 Joint space performing (ISN) Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ISN 52 weeks	205
certalizumah pegal 400 mg	204
Analysis 37.1 Comparison 37 Joint space narrowing (ISN) at 24 weeks any dose Outcome 1 Change from baseline	204
Analysis 38.1. Comparison 38 Joint space narrowing (JSN) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.	205
Analysis 39.1. Comparison 39 Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from	200
haseline	207
Analysis 40.1. Comparison 40 Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS) at 52 weeks, any dose. Outcome 1 Change from	,
baseline	208
Analysis 41.1. Comparison 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm), Outcome 1 Mean change at	
24 weeks certolizumab pegol 200 mg.	209
Analysis 41.2. Comparison 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm), Outcome 2 Mean change at	
24 weeks certolizumab pegol 400 mg	209
Analysis 41.3. Comparison 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm), Outcome 3 Mean change at	
52 weeks certolizumab pegol 200 mg	210
Analysis 41.4. Comparison 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm), Outcome 4 Mean change at	
52 weeks certolizumab pegol 400 mg	211
Analysis 42.1. Comparison 42 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm) at 24 weeks, any dose,	
Outcome 1 Change from baseline.	212
Analysis 43.1. Comparison 43 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm) at 52 weeks, any dose,	
Outcome 1 Change from baseline.	213
Analysis 44.1. Comparison 44 Modified total Sharp scores (mTSS), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 24	/
weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.	214
Analysis 44.2. Comparison 44 Modified total Sharp scores (m1SS), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean m1SS 24	21/
weeks, certolizumab 400 mg. $(TSS) \cap (TSS) \cap $	214
Analysis 44.3. Comparison 44 Modified total Sharp scores (m1SS), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean m1SS 52	215
Analysis 44 4 Comparison 44 Modified total Sharp sources (mTSS). Outcome 4 Change from the headling mean mTSS 52	213
Marysis 44.4. Comparison 44 Modified total Sharp scores (in 155), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean in 155 52	216
Analysis /5 1 Comparison /5 Certalizumah negal 1mg/kg/day sc. Outcome 1 Headache	210
Analysis 45.2 Comparison 45 Certolizumab pegol 1mg/kg/day sc. Outcome 2 Lower respiratory tract infection	210
Analysis 15.2. Comparison 45 Certolizumab pegol 1mg/kg/day sc. Outcome 2 Lower respiratory fract interestion.	217
Analysis 15.9. Comparison 45 Certolizumab pegol 1mg/kg/day sc. Outcome 4 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA)	218
Analysis 45.5. Comparison 45 Certolizumab pegol 1mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 5 Urinary tract infection.	218
Analysis 46.1. Comparison 46 Certolizumab 5 mg/kg/day sc. Outcome 1 Lower respiratory tract infection.	219
Analysis 46.2. Comparison 46 Certolizumab 5 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 2 Urinary tract infection.	219
Analysis 47.1. Comparison 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 1 Headache.	220
Analysis 47.2. Comparison 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 2 Lower respiratory tract infection.	220
Analysis 47.3. Comparison 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 3 Death.	221
Analysis 47.4. Comparison 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 4 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA).	221
Analysis 47.5. Comparison 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 5 Urinary tract infection.	222
Analysis 48.1. Comparison 48 Withdrawals, Outcome 1 All Withdrawn: any doses any follow up	223
Analysis 48.2. Comparison 48 Withdrawals, Outcome 2 Withdrawn due to lack of efficacy: any doses any follow up.	224
Analysis 48.3. Comparison 48 Withdrawals, Outcome 3 Withdrawals due to adverse events	225
Analysis 49.1. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without	
MTX), Outcome 1 ACR 50 200 mg certolizumab 24 weeks.	226

Analysis 49.2. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without										
MTX), Outcome 2 HAQ change from baseline 200 mg certolizumab 24 weeks.	227									
Analysis 49.3. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without										
MTX), Outcome 3 Serious adverse events certolizumab 200 mg sc										
Analysis 49.4. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without										
MTX), Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg.	229									
Analysis 49.5. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without										
MTX), Outcome 5 Radiological changes: Erosion Scores (ES) certolizumab 200 mg sc.	230									
Analysis 49.6. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without										
MTX), Outcome 6 All Withdrawals:	231									
Analysis 49.7. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without										
MTX), Outcome 7 Withdrawals due to adverse events.	232									
Analysis 49.8. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without										
MTX), Outcome 8 Deaths.	233									
Analysis 49.9. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without										
MTX), Outcome 9 Tuberculosis.	235									
Analysis 49.10. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or										
without MTX), Outcome 10 Upper respiratory tract infections.	236									
Analysis 49.11. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or										
without MTX), Outcome 11 Lower respiratory tract infections.	237									
Analysis 49.12. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or										
without MTX), Outcome 12 Malignancies including lymphoma.	238									
Analysis 50.1. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 1 Doses.	239									
Analysis 50.2. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 2 Size.	240									
Analysis 50.3. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 3 Use of MTX.	242									
Analysis 50.4. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 4 Population.	243									
Analysis 50.5. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 5 Duration of previous disease.	244									
Analysis 50.6. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 6 Published vs unpublished studies.	245									
ADDITIONAL TABLES	245									
APPENDICES	257									
WHAT'S NEW	261									
HISTORY	261									
CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS	261									
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	262									
SOURCES OF SUPPORT	262									
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW	263									
INDEX TERMS	263									

[Intervention Review]

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Vicente Ruiz Garcia¹, Paresh Jobanputra², Amanda Burls³, Juan B Cabello⁴, Paloma Vela Casasempere⁵, Sylvia Bort-Marti⁶, Francis JB Kynaston-Pearson⁷

¹Unidad de Hospitalización a Domicilio Torre C planta 1 Despacho nº 5 & CASP Spain, Hospital Universitari i Politècnic La Fe, Valencia, Spain. ²Department of Rheumatology, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK. ³School of Health Sciences, City University London, London, UK. ⁴Department of Cardiology & CASP Spain, Hospital General Universitario de Alicante, Alicante, Spain. ⁵Department of Rheumatology, Hospital General Universitario Alicante, Alicante, Spain. ⁶Intellectual Property Department, University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain. ⁷Department of Rheumatology, Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Contact address: Vicente Ruiz Garcia, Unidad de Hospitalización a Domicilio Torre C planta 1 Despacho nº 5 & CASP Spain, Hospital Universitari i Politècnic La Fe, Avinguda de Fernando Abril Martorell nº 106, Valencia, Valencia, 46026, Spain. vicenteruizgarcia@gmail.com.

Editorial group: Cochrane Musculoskeletal Group. **Publication status and date:** New search for studies and content updated (no change to conclusions), published in Issue 9, 2014.

Citation: Ruiz Garcia V, Jobanputra P, Burls A, Cabello JB, Vela Casasempere P, Bort-Marti S, Kynaston-Pearson FJB. Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2014, Issue 9. Art. No.: CD007649. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007649.pub3.

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ABSTRACT

Background

Tumour necrosis factor (TNF)-alpha inhibitors are beneficial for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) in terms of reducing the risk of joint damage, improving physical function and improving quality of life. This Cochrane review is an update of a review of the treatment of RA with certolizumab pegol that was first published in 2011.

Objectives

To assess the clinical benefits and harms of certolizumab pegol (CDP870) in patients with RA who have not responded well to conventional disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (DMARDs).

Search methods

We searched the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (*The Cochrane Library* 2014, Issue 5), MEDLINE, EMBASE, Scopus, TOXLINE, Web of Knowledge; websites of the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and European Medicines Evaluation Agency (EMEA); reference lists of articles; and searched http/clinicaltrials.gov. The searches were updated from 2009 (date of last search for the original review) to 5 June 2014.

Selection criteria

Randomised controlled trials that compared certolizumab pegol with any other agent including placebo or methotrexate (MTX) in adult patients with active RA despite current or prior treatment with conventional disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (DMARDs), such as MTX.

Data collection and analysis

Two authors independently assessed search results, trial quality and extracted data. Disagreements were resolved by discussion or referral to a third author.

Main results

Eleven trials were included in this update. Ten (4324 patients) were included in the pooled analysis for benefits, five more than previously, and 10 (3711 patients) in the pooled analysis for harms, four more trials (1930 patients) than previously. The duration of follow-up varied from 12 to 52 weeks and the range of doses of certolizumab pegol varied from 50 to 400 mg given subcutaneously (sc). In phase III trials, the control was placebo plus MTX in five trials and placebo in four trials. The risk of bias of the included studies was assessed as low but there may have been a risk of attrition bias.

Statistically significant improvements were observed at 24 weeks with the approved dose of 200 mg certolizumab pegol every other week, in 1) American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 50% improvement: 27% absolute improvement (95% CI 20% to 33%), NNT of 4 (95% CI 3 to 8), risk ratio (RR) 3.80 (95% CI 2.42 to 5.95); 2) the Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ): -12% absolute improvement (95% CI -9% to -14%), NNT of 6 (95% CI 5 to 8), mean difference (MD) - 0.35 (95% CI -0.43 to -0.26) (scale 0 to 3); 3) Disease Activity Score (DAS) remission improvement: absolute improvement 11% (95% CI 8% to 15%), NNT of 9 (95% CI 4 to 20), RR 8.47 (95% CI 4.15-17.28); and 4) radiological changes: erosion score (ES) absolute improvement -0.29% (95% CI -0.42% to -0.17%), NNT of 6 (95% CI 4 to 10), MD -0.67 (95% CI -0.96 to -0.38) (scale 0 to 230). Serious adverse events were statistically significantly more frequent for certolizumab pegol (200 mg every other week) with an absolute rate difference of 4% (95% CI 2% to 6%), NNTH of 32 (95% CI 17 to 88), Peto odds ratio (OR) 1.77 (95% CI 1.27 to 2.46). There was a statistically significant increase in all withdrawals in the placebo groups (for all doses and all follow-up) with an absolute rate difference of -34% (95% CI -18% to -50%), NNTH of 4 (95% CI 3 to 5), NNTH of 4 (95% CI 3 to 5), RR 0.42 (95% CI 0.36 to 0.50); and there was a statistically significant increase in all withdrawals due to adverse events in the certolizumab groups (for all doses and all follow-up) with an absolute rate difference of 2% (95% CI 1% to 3%), NNTH of 55 (95% CI 27 to 238), Peto OR 1.66 (95% CI 1.15 to 2.37).

The risk of bias was low and the quality of evidence was downgraded to moderate because of high rates of dropouts (> 20%) in most of the trials. We did not find any problems with inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision or publication bias.

Authors' conclusions

The results and conclusions did not change from the previous review. There is moderate-level evidence from randomised controlled trials that certolizumab pegol alone or combined with methotrexate is beneficial in the treatment of RA. Adverse events were more frequent with active treatment. We found a potential risk of serious adverse events.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Certolizumab pegol for treating adults with rheumatoid arthritis

We conducted an updated review of the effect of certolizumab pegol for adults with RA. We searched all relevant studies until June 2014 and found 11 studies with 4324 people.

In people with rheumatoid arthritis:

- certolizumab pegol probably improved the American College of Rheumatology ACR50 (pain, function and other symptoms of RA), health-related quality of life, and the chance of remission of RA,

- certolizumab pegol probably reduced joint damage as seen on the x-ray,

- certolizumab pegol probably increased serious adverse events,
- with certolizumab pegol fewer people stopped taking their treatment, but most of these people stopped due to serious adverse events.

What is rheumatoid arthritis and what is certolizumab pegol?

When you have RA your immune system becomes overactive and attacks the lining of your joints. This makes your joints swollen, stiff and painful. There is no cure for RA at present, so the treatments aim is to relieve pain and stiffness and improve your ability to move. Certolizumab pegol works by blocking a substance produced by the body known as tumour necrosis factor alpha (TNF). Certolizumab pegol is given by injections under the skin, either by patients themselves or someone else.

What happens to people with rheumatoid arthritis who take certolizumab pegol 200 mg every other week after six months?

ACR50 (a 50% improvement in the number of tender or swollen joints and other outcomes such as pain and disability):

- 27 more people out of 100 experienced improvement in the symptoms of their rheumatoid arthritis after six months with certolizumab pegol (absolute improvement 27%),

- 36 people out of 100 who took certolizumab pegol experienced improvement compared to 9 people out of 100 who took a placebo (a fake injection).

Health-related quality of life (Health Assessment Questionnaire):

- the additional benefit on this questionnaire for people who took certolizumab pegol was a change of -0.35 units on a scale 0 to 3 units (with 3 indicating a worse health state, therefore a negative change indicates improvement) (absolute improvement 12%),

- people on certolizumab pegol who completed the Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ) had a change of -0.48 points on a scale of 0 to 3 compared to a change of -0.13 points on a scale of 0 to 3 for people who took a placebo.

Remission (absence of clinical signs of inflammation):

- 11 more people out of 100 experienced remission with certolizumab pegol (absolute improvement 11%),

- 13 people out of 100 who took certolizumab pegol experienced remission compared to 2 people out of 100 who took a placebo.

Radiological changes (x-rays of the joints):

- the joint damage in people who took certolizumab pegol was 0.07 units less on a scale of 0 to 230 units (absolute improvement - 0.29%),

- the damage to joints in people who took certolizumab pegol was 0.04 units less on a scale of 0 to 230 units compared to people who took a placebo whose joint damage was 0.7 units more on a scale of 0 to 230 units.

Serious adverse events:

- 4 more people out of 100 experienced serious adverse events with certolizumab pegol (4% absolute harm),

- 8 people out of 100 who took certolizumab pegol experienced serious adverse events compared to 4 people out of 100 who took a placebo.

What happens after 52 weeks to people with rheumatoid arthritis who take certolizumab pegol 200 mg and certolizumab 400 mg?

All withdrawals:

- 33 less people out of 100 stopped taking their treatment after 52 weeks with certolizumab pegol compared with placebo (absolute improvement 34%),

- 23 people out of 100 who took certolizumab pegol stopped taking their treatment compared to 56 people out of 100 who took placebo.

Withdrawals due to adverse events:

- 2 more people out of 100 stopped taking their treatment due to adverse events after 52 weeks with certolizumab pegol compared with placebo (absolute improvement 2%),

- 5 people out of 100 who took certolizumab pegol stopped taking their treatment due to adverse events compared to 3 people out of 100 who took placebo.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE MAIN COMPARISON [Explanation]

Certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Patient or population: patients with rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Settings: adults (18 years old or more) who have persistent disease activity despite current or previous use of conventional disease modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (DMARDs) Intervention: certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% Cl)	No of participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments	
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk					
	Control	Summary of find- ings certolizumab pe- gol 200 mg sc (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or with- out MTX)					
ACR 50% improvement Follow-up: mean 24 weeks	87 per 1000	359 per 1000 (328 to 391)	RR 3.80 (2.42 to 5.95)	1445 (5 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ^{1,}	Absolute risk differ- ence = $27\% (95\% Cl 20\%)$ to 33%). Relative per cent change = 280% (142% to 495%). NNT = 4 (3 to 8)	
HAQ change from baseline Scale from: 0 to 3. Follow-up: mean 24 weeks	The mean HAQ change from baseline in the control groups was 0.04	The mean HAQ change from baseline in the in- tervention groups was 0.35 lower (0.43 to 0.26 lower)	MD -0.35 (-0.43 to -0. 26)	1268 (4 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ²	Absolute risk differ- ence = -12% (95% Cl - 9% to -14%). Relative per cent change = -21% (-15% to -25%). NNT = 6 (5 to 8)	

Proportion of patients achieving DAS <2.6 (remission) Follow-up: mean 24 weeks	16 per 1000	126 per 1000 (104 to 149)	RR 8.47 (4.15 to 17.28)	1381 (4 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ³	Absolute risk differ- ence = 11% (95% Cl 8% to 15%). Relative per cent change = 747% (315% to 1628%) NNT = 9 (4 to 20)
Radiological changes: Erosion Scores (ES) Scale from: 0 to 230. Follow-up: 24 weeks	The mean radiologi- cal changes: Erosion Scores (ES) in the con- trol groups was 23.1	The mean Radiologi- cal changes: Erosion Scores (ES) in the inter- vention groups was 0.67 lower (0.96 to 0.38 lower)	MD -0.67 (-0.96 to -0. 38)	859 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ⁴	Absolute risk differ- ence = -0.29% (95% Cl - 0.42% to -0.17%). Relative per cent change = -2.90% (- 4.16% to -1.65%) NNT = 6 (4 to 10)
Serious adverse events Follow-up: 12 to 24 weeks	45 per 1000	78 per 1000 (66 to 90)	Peto OR 1.77 (1.27 to 2.46)	2729 (7 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate⁵	Absolute risk differ- ence = 4% (95% Cl 2% to 6%). Relative per cent change = 77% (27% to 146%). NNTH = 32 (17 to 88)
All Withdrawals: All doses of cer- tolizumab pegol vs placebo Follow-up: 0 to 52 weeks	561 per 1000	226 per 1000 (211 to 241)	RR 0.42 (0.36 to 0.50)	3962 (10 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ⁶	Absolute risk differ- ence = -34% (95% Cl - 18% to -50%). Relative per cent change= -58% (-50% to -64%). NNTH = 4 (3 to 5)
Withdrawals due to ad- verse events All doses of cer- tolizumab pegol versus placebo	29 per 1000	46 per 1000 (39 to 54)	Peto OR 1.66 (1.15 to 2.37)	3998 (9 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ⁷	Absolute risk differ- ence = 2% (95% Cl 1% to 3%). Relative

ы

lizumab peg ight © 2014 ⁻	Follow-up: 0 to 52 weeks	2	per cent change = 66% (15% to 137%). NNTH = 55 (27 to 238)
ol (CDP870)	*The basis for the ass	sumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk acro	oss studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is at of the intervention (and its 95% CI).
The Cochrar	based on the assumed	I risk in the comparison group and the relative effec	

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate. Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.

¹ High risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate in 4 out 5 trials. ² High risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate in 3 out 4 trials. ³ High risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate in 2 out 2 trials. ⁵ High risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate in 6 out 7 trials. ⁶ High risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate in 7 out 10 trials. ⁷ High risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate in 8 out 9 trials.

•

BACKGROUND

Description of the condition

Rheumatoid arthritis (RA) is a chronic inflammatory disease affecting the synovium of joints and other structures like tendon sheaths and bursas. RA typically causes a symmetrical polyarticular arthritis with pain, swelling and stiffness of the affected joints. If disease is not controlled early, damage may become permanent leading to significant disability. Patients commonly experience fatigue and show changes in the blood, such as anaemia due to chronic inflammation, and an acute phase reaction. In some patients organs such as the skin (as rheumatoid nodules), lungs (pleural inflammation and alveolitis), heart (pericarditis), blood vessels (vasculitis) and the eyes (dry eyes or inflammation) may be affected (Tureson 2013). RA is also associated with reduced life expectancy, which is particularly due to cardiovascular disease (Meune 2009) but in the early years also due to pulmonary disease and lymphoma (Young 2007).

Important genetic influences are recognised, in particular genes linked to activation of the immune system (Barton 2009), however environmental factors such as an urban versus a rural environment and smoking are also associated with an increased risk of RA (Edwards 2005). People of all ages are affected but the disease begins most commonly between the ages of 40 and 70 years and the incidence rises with increasing age (Doran 2002). Three times as many women as men are affected and the population prevalence in Western countries is between 0.5% and 1%. Significant functional limitations occur in 15% of patients five years after disease onset and around a third of those in paid work experience work disability (Young 2000). In Spain, RA causes around 10% of total disability and 5% of transitory disability (Carmona 2002) including occupational disability (Doeglas 1995). Moreover, rapid induction of remission translates into maintenance of work capacity (Puolakka 2005).

Description of the intervention

The management of RA has undergone dramatic changes during the last decade. The European League Against Rheumatism has recently released updated recommendations for the management of RA (Smolen 2014). The goal of treatment is to induce remission, defined as the absence of signs and symptoms of significant inflammatory disease activity (Felson 2011). This applies particularly to patients with newer onset RA, whereas in long-standing and refractory disease low disease activity may be acceptable. To meet these objectives, and according to the latest guidance, treatment with disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (DMARDs) should be initiated as soon as a diagnosis of RA is made, and methotrexate (MTX) has been considered (Lopez Olivo 2014) the mainstay of treatment of RA (Singh 2012). The application of new treatment strategies, such as tight control using composite measures of disease activity and appropriate switching of drug treatment when the objectives are not reached, are also highly beneficial approaches (Smolen 2010).

Not infrequently people do not respond to or are unable to tolerate DMARDs (Yee 2003). The newer biological drugs that have been introduced and approved for the treatment of RA in recent decades have been associated with clinical outcome improvement (Singh 2009) but also with higher rates of adverse events (Singh 2011).

How the intervention might work

RA is characterised by immunological activation of many cell types and a network of cytokines, particularly tumour necrosis factor alpha (TNF-alpha) (Brennan 2008). Inhibitors of TNFalpha have been a major development in the treatment of RA. Randomised trials have shown that these drugs are highly beneficial in patients with RA who have not responded well to conventional DMARDs. TNF-alpha inhibitors have been shown to reduce the risk of joint damage, improve physical function and quality of life (Chen 2006). Five TNF-alpha inhibitors are currently licensed for use in RA in Europe and the US. These are adalimumab (Navarro Sarabia 2005), etanercept (Lethaby 2013), golimumab (Singh 2010), infliximab (Lethaby 2013) and certolizumab pegol (Ruiz Garcia 2011). Comparative efficacy studies to evaluate the potential differences between anti-TNF and non-antiTNF biologics have shown little difference between them (Navarro Millan 2013). One pragmatic, open-label, controlled trial has directly compared etanercept and adalimumab and reported similar persistence rates and efficacy and safety over two years of treatment (Jobanputra 2012). Similar results have been obtained with certolizumab pegol in extension studies, the American College of Rheumatology ACR20 57% and ACR50 27% at 8 years (NCT00160693) and ACR20 81% and ACR50 58% at 7 years (NCT00175877). An important limitation of the wider use of TNF inhibitors is the high cost, between USD 10,000 and USD 25,000 per patient a year.

A systematic review of infliximab and adalimumab showed that the risks of malignancy and serious infection were increased, with odds ratios of 3.3 (95% confidence interval (CI) 1.2 to 9.1) and 2.0 (95% CI 1.3 to 3.1) respectively (Bongartz 2006). However, more recent data showed that therapy with anti-TNF is not related to an increased risk of malignancies (skin cancer, melanoma, lymphoma or solid tumours) (Lopez Olivo 2012). A second review of nine biologic drugs (the five TNF inhibitors etanercept, adalimumab, infliximab, golimumab and certolizumab pegol; the interleukin (IL)-1 antagonist anakinra; the IL-6 antagonist tocilizumab; the anti-CD28 abatacept; and anti-B cell rituximab) showed that biologics as a group were associated with a statistically significant higher rate of total adverse events (odds ratio (OR) 1.28, 95% credible index (CrI) 1.09 to 1.50) and withdrawals due to adverse events (OR 1.47, 95% CrI 1.20 to 1.86), and an increased risk of

tuberculosis (TB) reactivation (OR 4.68, 95% CrI 1.18 to 18.60) compared to control (Singh 2011).

Certolizumab pegol is an anti-TNF consisting of a humanised immunoglobulin fragment (Fab) conjugated to polyethylene glycol (PEG), also termed pegylation. This unique molecular structure yields a longer half-life and reduces the need for frequent dosing (Choy 2002). Certolizumab pegol in combination with methotrexate (MTX) is indicated for the treatment of moderate to severe active RA in adult patients when the response to DMARDs including MTX has been inadequate. It also can be given as monotherapy in the case of intolerance, side effects or contraindications to MTX. The drug has been shown to reduce the rate of progression of joint damage as measured by x-ray and to improve physical function. Long-term studies also show persistence rates of 88.9% at two years with 46.7% of patients in low disease activity (Keystone 2012).

Why it is important to do this review

Biological treatment has led to a radical change in the prognosis and quality of life of patients with RA, however clinicians need to take into account the potential risks associated with their use. This review summarises the current data available on the benefits and harms of certolizumab pegol, on its own and in combination with MTX, for the treatment of RA. New evidences concerning efficacy, safety and long-term persistence have become available since the previous review update. It is important to be sure that clinicians choose the treatment for people with RA appropriately using the best medical evidence available.

OBJECTIVES

To assess the clinical benefits and harms of certolizumab pegol (CDP870) in patients with RA who have not responded well to conventional disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (DMARDs).

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

Randomised controlled trials (RCTs).

Types of participants

Adults (18 years of age and older) with RA who have persistent disease activity despite current or previous use of conventional DMARDs.

Patients with RA were defined as those meeting the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 1987 revised criteria (Arnett 1988) for RA. That is to say, they had to have an active form of the disease as demonstrated by at least two of the following symptoms:

1. three or more tender joint areas as observed by a physician;

- 2. three or more swollen joint areas as observed by a physician;
- 3. early morning stiffness with a duration > 30 minutes;
- 4. acute phase reactants such as a Westergren erythrocyte

sedimentation rate (ESR) more than 30 mm/hour or C-reactive protein (CRP) more than 10 mg/mL.

Types of interventions

The intervention was certolizumab pegol (CDP870) at any dose. The comparators were placebo or any DMARD including other biologic agents used to treat RA.

Types of outcome measures

Major outcomes

- The proportion of patients achieving an ACR50
- Health-related quality of life, such as the Health Assessment
- Questionnaire (HAQ) or Short Form Health Survey (SF-36)
 - Disease Activity Score (DAS28 or other versions of DAS)

• Radiological changes (erosion score (ES), modified total Sharp score, joint space narrowing)

- Serious adverse events
- All withdrawals
- Withdrawals due to adverse events

The ACR50 is defined as a 50% improvement in the number of tender and swollen joints and a 50% improvement in at least three of the following items: observer evaluation of overall disease activity, patient evaluation of overall disease activity, patient evaluation of pain, a score of physical disability, or improvements in blood acute-phase responses.

Scores in the HAQ range from 0 to 3, with 3 indicating a worse health state, therefore a negative change indicates improvement. The SF-36 is a scale from 0 to 100 where 0 is the worst and 100 the best health state.

Serious adverse effects were defined as malignancies and all infections, especially tuberculosis and death.

All causes of withdrawals from the medication were sought.

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright $\ensuremath{\textcircled{O}}$ 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Minor outcomes

- ACR20 and ACR70 (a 20% or 70% improvement
- respectively in the parameters described above)
 - Frequency of adverse events

The following adverse events were sought: headache, fever, blood disorders, laboratory disorders, abdominal pain, nasopharyngitis, nausea, respiratory tract infections, urinary tract infections, neck pain, congestive heart failure, pruritus and anaphylaxis.

Search methods for identification of studies

Electronic searches

The search strategy used the revision of the Cochrane highly sensitive search strategy (HSSS) for PubMed (Glanville 2006), the best sensitivity filter developed by the Hedges Team (Wong 2006a; Wong 2006b) and followed the Cochrane Musculoskeletal Review Group (CMSG) recommendations. Searches included both MeSH headings and text terms for CDP870 and rheumatoid arthritis. The searches were done by Ms Tamara Rader, Trial Search Co-ordinator of the CMSG. These searches included: Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR) and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), HTA, DARE, NHS EED (*The Cochrane Library*) (Appendix 4); MEDLINE (Appendix 1); EMBASE (Appendix 2); CINAHL (Appendix 3); SCOPUS (Appendix 5); TOXLINE (TOXNET) (Appendix 6).

Safety data were obtained from clinical trials.

We updated the searches in CENTRAL (*The Cochrane Library* 2014, Issue 5), MEDLINE (2009 to 5 June 2014), EMBASE (2009 to 5 June 2014), SCOPUS (2009 to 5 June 2014), TOX-LINE (2009 to 5 June 2014), Web of Knowledge (2009 to 5 June 2014) and the websites of the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and European Medicines Evaluation Agency (EMEA) (2009 to 5 June 2014).

Searching other resources

1. We examined the information made available by the main researchers and sponsors in www.clinicaltrials.org

2. We reviewed information on the clinical trial meta-register database (www.controlled-trials.com/mrct/)

3. We looked for health technology assessment reports from the European, Canadian, North American and Australian national agencies to identify further trials

4. The reference lists of all identified studies were inspected for more trials

5. When published data were missing, incomplete, or inconsistent with the trial protocols, further information was sought from the authors and manufacturers (UCB)

Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies

Two authors independently assessed search results for potential studies that met the inclusion criteria and disagreements were resolved by discussion or referral to a third author.

Inclusion criteria

1. RCTs that compared certolizumab pegol with any other agent including placebo in adult RA patients with active RA despite current or prior treatment with DMARDs

2. Trials that were fully published as a paper or available as a complete trial report. Where published only as abstracts the trial reports were requested from the manufacturers

3. Studies having at least three months of follow-up to assess benefits

To assess harms we also sought studies having a suboptimal length of follow-up, from eight weeks.

Exclusion criteria

1. Trials of certolizumab pegol in juvenile arthritis, Crohn's disease, psoriatic arthritis and other forms of spondyloarthritis

2. Trials of certolizumab pegol comparing different doses or routes of administration without another active or placebo control group (except for assessing harm outcomes)

3. Studies reporting solely on laboratory measures aimed at investigating disease or treatment mechanisms and which did not report relevant clinical outcomes

4. Observational studies of certolizumab pegol

5. Interim results of trials

Data extraction and management

Two review authors independently reviewed titles and abstracts of studies identified in the search to assess which studies might potentially meet the inclusion criteria; where there was doubt, the full article was acquired for further inspection. Potential studies identified by this process were then obtained and two authors independently screened them to see if they met the review criteria using a Web interface. A final table was produced in Excel. We did not need to resolve any disagreements through discussion.

Data were extracted, when possible for intention-to-treat populations, as raw numbers plus any summary measures with the standard deviations, confidence intervals and P values of the outcomes reported. These were compiled in an Excel spreadsheet. Differences of opinion and data discrepancies were to be resolved by reference to a third review author (Sylvia Bort) but that did not happen.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

According to the recommendations in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011), the risk of bias was assessed by creating a 'risk of bias' table for each study. A summary is presented below as a risk of bias graph.

The main criteria used to assess the risk of bias included: blinding of participants, allocation concealment, random sequence generation, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting of outcomes, and other biases (such as fraud or imbalance in the groups, or the sponsor either owns the data or needed to approve the manuscript). The risk of bias in each study was explicitly judged on the basis of each criterion using the following: low risk of bias, high risk of bias, unclear risk of bias (either lack of information or uncertainty over the potential bias). These criteria were included in the tables. Disagreements were resolved by discussion between the two review authors. If needed a third review author was available for discussion, but there were no disagreements.

Measures of treatment effect

The risk difference was used to quantify the number needed to treat (NNT) (Laupacis 1988). We calculated the NNT from the risk ratio according to the formula NNT = 1/ACR*(1 - RR), where ACR = assumed control risk and RR = risk ratio. When events were very rare (< 10%) we used the Peto odds ratio (Peto OR). For continuous data we used mean differences (MDs) when the results were measured in the same way in the different studies. We used standardised mean differences (SMDs) when the results obtained were conceptually the same but used different measurement scales. The central estimate (mean) and standard deviation were recorded. Where these were not directly stated they were calculated from the standard error or the different means and their respective confidence intervals (CIs) or P values. When medians and interquartile ranges were the only data provided, the median was used as a proxy measure of the mean and the difference between the first and third interguartile was considered equivalent to 1.35 of the SD.

Unit of analysis issues

Most of the clinical trials had a simple parallel group design with participants individually randomised to one of two intervention groups. The unit of analysis was not an issue in this review.

Dealing with missing data

We carried out an intention-to-treat analysis. Every individual allocated to the intervention was counted whether they completed the follow-up or not. We have assumed that those who dropped out had no change in their outcome. This rule is conservative for the response to treatment because it assumes that those discontinuing the studies would not have responded. It is not conservative for adverse effects. However, assuming that all those leaving early had developed side effects could overestimate risk.

When published data were missing, incomplete or inconsistent with the RCT protocols or meeting abstracts, we asked for further information from the authors and manufacturers. We only excluded abstracts of studies that were interim reports of studies that had not yet finished recruiting.

Assessment of heterogeneity

We have explored heterogeneity between the trials using the Chi 2 test for heterogeneity, with a 10% level of significance, and the I² statistic. We interpreted the ranges of I² according to the recommendations in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*: 0% to 40% might not be important; 30% to 60% may represent moderate heterogeneity; 50% to 90% may represent substantial heterogeneity; and 75% to 100% considerable heterogeneity (Higgins 2011).

Assessment of reporting biases

We planned to explore reporting bias using funnel plots when doing a meta-analysis for 10 or more studies.

Data synthesis

The need to pool the results according to a fixed-effect or randomeffects model analysis was explored (Laird 1990). We planned to use the fixed-effect model to pool the data because statistical heterogeneity in our preview review was not high. However, finally we decided to perform a random-effects model despite the I² values being low. Although it was the same drug, there was a clear clinical heterogeneity (different doses, allowing MTX or not, different follow-up, different duration of RA, etc.).

The number needed to treat to benefit (NNTB) and the number needed treat to harm (NNTH) were calculated. The mean difference was used to calculate the benefit (absolute change expressed as both a percentage and in its original units) for continuous outcomes such as HAQ, SF-36 and radiological changes.

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

Subgroup analyses were planned for the duration of the illness (approximately three years evolution), patients' sex, drug dose and administration, and methodological quality. If heterogeneity had been detected then a subgroup analysis (Yusuf 1991), or a meta-regression (Thompson 1999), would have been carried out to see if it could be explained.

Sensitivity analysis

We a priori planned the following sensitivity analyses in order to explore effect size differences and the robustness of conclusions.

1. Effect of study quality, dened as blinding of participants, allocation concealment, random sequence generation, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting and other sources of bias.

2. Effect of imputation, size of trials, use of concomitant methotrexate, and doses of certolizumab pegol.

Summary of findings table

We used the 'Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation' developed by the GRADE working group to provide an overall grading of the quality of the evidence by outcome. The GRADE approach specifies four levels of quality. The highest quality rating is for RCT. Review authors can, however, downgrade randomised trial evidence from 'high' to 'moderate', 'low' or even 'very low' quality evidence depending on the presence of specific factors: design or implementation, imprecision, inconsistency, indirectness, or reporting bias (see *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Chapter XII (section 12.2) (Higgins 2011)).

RESULTS

Description of studies

Results of the search

See the flow chart (Figure 1) and 'Results of searches' in Appendix 8.



Figure I. Study flow diagram.

In this update we found 1703 records identified through database searching on 12 February 2013. Five more trials were identified through other sources. Finally we assessed 118 papers and 7 fulltext articles for eligibility. As a result five new trials were included for analysis in this updated review.

According to the Cochrane MECIR standards, CMSG updated the searches on 5 June 2014. However, no more trials were found, only two proceedings of two Japanese trials that we found in clinicaltrials.org, with all of their results. The results, therefore, remained unchanged. The description and the results of this second search are in Appendix 9.

Included studies

In total 11 trials were included: 10 of them involving 4324 people were included in the beneficial assessment (CDP870-004 2001; CDP870-014 2009; CERTAIN 2008; FAST4WARD 2005; NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00791999 JRAPID; NCT00993317; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; REALISTIC 2008) and 10 trials with 3711 people in the assessment of harm (CDP870-014 2009; CERTAIN 2008; Choy 2002; FAST4WARD 2005; NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00791999 IRAPID; NCT00993317; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; REALISTIC 2008). See the Characteristics of included studies and the demographics and flow of patients in Table 1 and Table 2 for details. Only Choy 2002 and CDP870-004 2001 were phase II studies. We found a third phase II study (Kaushik 2005) but we were advised by UCB that: "this publication refers to the 2 previous phase II". All phase III studies were used to assess both benefits and harms. CDP870-004 2001 only contributed data on benefits as it did not report any data on harms. Due to the short followup for assessing benefits, Choy 2002 was only included for safety data. The data from the two phase II studies (CDP870-004 2001; Choy 2002) were not pooled with the rest of the studies due to the different follow-ups and doses used.

We retrieved nine phase III trials (CDP870-014 2009; CERTAIN 2008; FAST4WARD 2005; NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00791999 JRAPID; NCT00993317; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; REALISTIC 2008). All trials were funded by UCB. Data from CDP870-014 2009 were provided by UCB from the clinical study summary (www.clinicalstudyresults.org/documents/company-study⁴348⁶.pdf) and the EMEA 2009 reports; they were finally published in 2012 (the study was completed in 2004).

Table 1 shows the demographic and baseline characteristics for the phase III trials: age, gender, rheumatoid factor (RF) positivity, MTX concomitant dose, number of previous DMARDs, basal HAQ and basal DAS28 among other outcomes. Table 2 provides the flow chart of patients in the phase III studies.

Excluded studies

The main reasons for exclusion were: 1) reviews, 2) different drugs, and 3) another outcome reported. See the table Characteristics of excluded studies.

Risk of bias in included studies

The judgements about each risk of bias item were presented as percentages across all included studies (Figure 2). Most of the trials were rated as low risk of bias. The overall possibility of bias seemed to be low.





Allocation

All studies but CDP870-004 2001 reported adequate methods of randomisation and allocation concealment. Six studies (CDP870-014 2009; CERTAIN 2008; FAST4WARD 2005; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; REALISTIC 2008) used the interactive voice response system (IVRS) method of allocation concealment. The Asian trials (NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00791999 JRAPID; NCT00993317) were described as: "External central of randomisation. Randomization by blocks"; so the risk of bias seemed to be low.

Blinding

All studies but CDP870-004 2001 reported adequate blinding. Refer to Figure 3.

	Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Blinding (performance bias and detection bias): ACR50	Blinding (performance bias and detection bias): All outcomes	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias): ACR50	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias): All outcomes	Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Other bias	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
CDP870-004 2001	•	?	•	•	•	•	•	?	•	•
CDP870-014 2009	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•
CERTAIN 2008	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Choy 2002	•	•	•	•	+	•	•	•	•	•
FAST4WARD 2005	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•
NCT00791921 HIKARI	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•
NCT00791999 JRAPID	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
NCT00993317	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
RAPID1 2005	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
RAPID2 2007	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
REALISTIC 2008	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Figure 3. Risk of bias summary: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study.

Phase II:

• CDP870-004 2001 did not disclose the methods of blinding and finally UCB explained to us: "CPD-870 and the placebo utilized in this study (saline) did not have the same viscosity therefore full blinding was not possible. Study drug was to be prepared by a pharmacist having no other involvement in the study; injections of study medications were given by a nurse or physician who had no other involvement in the study...";

• Choy 2002 disclosed the methods of blinding: "Placebo (sodium acetate buffer) was given similarly as a single intravenous infusion of 100 ml over 60 min". It was unlikely that the blinding could have been broken. UCB explained to us: "all data were entered and Database locked after completion of the clinical phase for the first study period and before ESR and CRP were entered into the database. ESR and CRP data were withheld from investigator and sponsor study personal during the course of the study because knowledge of patient's profile could potentially unblind the study..., auto AB, anti CZP level, TNFalpha, IL6 and IL1b were transferred into the database after Database lock."

Phase III:

• UCB told us, "in FAST4WARD 2005, CDP870-014 2009, RAPID1 2005, RAPID2 2007, CERTAIN 2008, REALISTIC 2008, all the study staff with the exception of the unblinded dispenser, was blind to the treatment. Each study center was required to have a written blinding plan in place signed by the Principal Investigator, which detailed the study center's steps for ensuring that the double blind nature of the study was maintained. All the studies were monitored by two different independent teams from the sponsor, one devoted to blind data and one devoted to possibly unblinded information (such as study medications related topics) and completely separate documentation/filing systems were maintained for the duration of the trials";

• RAPID1 2005, "Radiographs were read at a central location by 3 independent readers. Readers were blinded as to the patient's identity, clinical data, treatment, and time point (sequence) at which the radiograph was taken";

• RAPID2 2007, "Radiographs were read centrally and blinded (for treatment, visit and patient identification) and independently by two experienced readers";

• FAST4WARD 2005 disclosed methods of blinding, "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".

• in the Japanese and Korean trials (NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00791999 JRAPID; NCT00993317) "All study staff with the exception of the unblinded dispenser were blind to the treatment, ... These unblinded personnel were not allowed to engage in any other study activities".

For these reasons we rated the risk of bias for blinding as low.

Incomplete outcome data

All studies except the small phase II trial (CDP870-004 2001) reported adequate methods of handling missing outcome data. All other studies had a full account of all withdrawals and reasons for withdrawals. Where possible, we extracted data to allow an intention-to-treat analysis in CDP870-014 2009; FAST4WARD 2005; NCT00993317. We considered a less than 80% completion rate in the treatment group as a high risk of bias; 8 out of 11 studies reported less than 80% completion rates.

The completion rates in the certolizumab pegol group ranged from 68% in FAST4WARD 2005 to 90% in REALISTIC 2008. In all trials, fewer patients in the placebo-treated group completed the trial compared to the treatment arm. More patients who were treated with placebo withdrew due to lack of efficacy. The percentage of those completing the trial in the placebo group ranged from 15% in the 12-month results of NCT00791921 HIKARI to 86% in the 12-weeks results of REALISTIC 2008. Missing data were imputed using last observation carried forward in most trials. The risk of bias appeared to be high. Refer to Figure 3.

Selective reporting

All studies showed planned outcomes, except NCT00791999 JRAPID. Finally ACR20/50/70 was reported by UCB as a figure as well as providing the DAS, but we could not pool DAS data and we had no information about the modified Total Sharp Score (mTTS) for radiographic progression.

We changed the assessment of the bias in FAST4WARD 2005 because all the primary outcomes were described in the paper.

In our previous systematic review the trial CDP870-014 2009 only reported ACR20, but the ACR50, HAQ disability index and acute phase reactant (CRP) are now available so we have changed our likelihood of bias assessment to low.

In summary, we think the risk of reporting bias in this update is low. Refer to Figure 3.

Other potential sources of bias

We did not detect potential threats to validity, such as fraud or imbalance in the groups (relating to the baseline characteristics). All studies included in this review were sponsored by the manufacturer of certolizumab pegol. There is evidence that industrysponsored trials may overestimate the treatment effect (Bhandari 2004) and there is also evidence that most of the authors of published trials have a conflict of interest. However, there is a lack of

consensus on whether these conflicts result in reduced quality of the trials and, in view of this, we have decided to rate the risk of bias of this domain as low.

We searched for more trials as well as for more information regarding those trials that we had found as unpublished trials during the search (see Characteristics of ongoing studies table), but no information was available either from the sponsors or from any publication. UCB explained to us that the papers for these trials have been accepted and are expected to be published.

In summary, we think the risk of other potential sources of bias is low in this update. Refer to Figure 3.

Summary assessment of risk of bias by outcomes

Figure 2 and Figure 3 provide a graphical summary of the results of the risk of bias assessments for the 11 included studies.

The main major outcomes

ACR 50 response at six months: the five studies included in the meta-analysis were rated well in terms of adequate allocation concealment, blinding and reporting of appropriate outcomes. However, there was a concern about bias in terms of incomplete outcome data due to the high dropout rates in four of the five studies. Another concern was that all studies were sponsored by the manufacturer of certolizumab pegol.

HAQ change from baseline, response at six months: the four studies included in the meta-analysis were rated well in terms of adequate allocation concealment, blinding and reporting of appropriate outcomes. However, there was a concern about bias in terms of incomplete outcome data due to the high dropout rates in three of the four studies. Another concern was that all studies were sponsored by the manufacturer of certolizumab pegol.

Serious adverse events with certolizumab pegol 200 mg at any time of follow-up: the seven studies included in the meta-analysis were rated well in terms of adequate allocation concealment, blinding and reporting of appropriate outcomes. All of them were analysed with ITT for all randomised patients who received at least one dose, but in two out of seven studies the analysis was per protocol: in RAPID2 2007 "two patients in the placebo group received certolizumab pegol 200 mg and were included in the certolizumab pegol 200 mg group for safety evaluations", and in REALISTIC 2008 nine patients less were analysed in the certolizumab pegol arm and three patients less in the placebo group. Another concern was that all studies were sponsored by the manufacturer of certolizumab pegol.

Effects of interventions

See: Summary of findings for the main comparison Certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults The analysis was performed depending on the drug exposure time for subcutaneous (sc) doses of 200 mg and 400 mg, the doses used in the trials. For 400 mg the most common was at fourweek intervals and for 200 mg sc the most frequently used was every other week, but in some trials like RAPID1 and RAPID2 the interval was every two weeks for the 400 mg dose as well. As we had two periods of follow-up (six months and one year) in one study, we could not pool them thus we pooled each outcome at each follow-up. Moreover, we had studies with more than one dose so we split the placebo arm to obtain pooled results. We did not find strong differences that could justify not combining the results for benefits and harms. We decided to perform a random-effects model in spite of the low values of I². Although it was the same drug, there is clear clinical heterogeneity (different doses, allowing MTX or not, different follow-up, different duration of RA, etc.).

Major outcomes

ACR50

Significant improvements were observed for all doses at any given time for the ACR50 compared to placebo (see 'Benefits' tables, ACR Table 3, Data and analyses).

The ACR50 with 200 mg certolizumab pegol showed, at 24 weeks, a RR of 3.80 (95% CI 2.42 to 5.95), 5 out of 10 studies, involving 1445 patients (Analysis 2.2); and at 52 weeks a RR of 5.03 (95% CI 3.04 to 8.32), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 592 patients (Analysis 5.2).

The ACR50 with 400 mg certolizumab pegol showed, at 24 weeks, a RR of 4.65 (95% CI 3.09 to 6.99), 5 out of 10 studies, involving 1591 patients (Analysis 3.2). The ACR50 with 400 mg certolizumab pegol showed, at 52 weeks, a RR of 5.27 (95% CI 3.19 to 8.71), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 589 patients (Analysis 6.2).

The NNT was close to 4 for all the subanalyses (Table 3).

Health-related quality of life

An improvement in physical function and quality of life measured as the HAQ and SF-36 (in the mental and physical components) at all times of follow-up (see 'Health-related quality of life' tables, Table 4) was seen with certolizumab pegol compared to placebo. HAQ, 24 weeks, 200 mg: MD -0.35 (95% CI -0.43 to -0.26), 4 out of 10 studies, involving 1268 patients (Analysis 11.1); HAQ, 24 weeks, 400 mg: MD -0.38 (95% CI -0.48 to -0.28), 4 out of 10 studies, involving 1425 patients (Analysis 11.2).

HAQ disability index (HAQ-DI), 24 weeks, any dose: MD -0.36 (95% CI -0.43 to -0.29), 5 out of 10 studies, involving 2246 patients (Analysis 12.1); HAQ-Di, 52 weeks, any dose: MD - 0.43 (95% CI -0.52 to -0.35), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 982 patients (Analysis 13.1).

SF-36 physical component summary (PCS), 24 weeks, any dose: MD 5.29 (95% CI 4.37 to 6.21), 3 out of 10 studies, involving 1765 patients (Analysis 18.1); SF-36 PCS, 52 weeks, any dose: MD 6.47 (95% CI 5.13 to 7.81), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 982 patients (Analysis 20.1).

SF-36 mental component summary (MCS), 24 weeks, any dose: MD 4.01 (95% CI 2.94 to 5.08), 4 out of 10 studies, involving 2012 patients (Analysis 19.1); SF-36 MCS, 52 weeks, any dose: MD 4.30 (95% CI 2.57 to 6.03), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 982 patients (Analysis 21.1).

DAS-28

Significant improvements were observed for all doses and at any given time compared to placebo.

The RR for patients achieving remission (DAS < 2.6) with 100 mg certolizumab pegol at 24 weeks was 2.82 (95% CI 1.6 to 5), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 1063 patients (Analysis 25.1).

The proportion of patients achieving remission (< 2.6) was higher in the 200 mg certolizumab pegol group than in the placebo group (RR 8.47, 95% CI 4.15 to 17.28) at 24 weeks, 4 out of 10 studies, involving 1381 patients (Analysis 25.2); and RR of 10.36 (95% CI 3.29 to 32.58) at 52 weeks, 1 out of 10 studies, involving 587 patients (Analysis 25.4).

The RR for patients achieving remission (< 2.6) with 400 mg certolizumab pegol was 7.18 (95% CI 3.12 to 16.50) at 24 weeks, 3 out of 10 studies, involving 1201 patients (Analysis 25.3); and at 52 weeks the RR was 12.49 (95% CI 3.99 to 39.12), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 583 patients (Analysis 25.5).

Radiological changes

Radiological changes were expressed as modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS), the erosion score (ES) and joint space narrowing (JSN). All certolizumab pegol groups showed improvements compared to placebo in the mean changes from baseline. There was a clear radiological benefit, regardless of the dose, that was associated with drug exposure time (see 'Radiological changes', Table 5).

Erosion score (ES), 200 mg, 24 weeks: MD -0.67 (95% CI -0.96 to -0.38), 2 out of 10 studies, involving 859 patients (Analysis 33.1).

Erosion score (ES), any dose, 24 weeks: MD -0.70 (95% CI -0.98 to -0.42), 2 out of 10 studies, involving 1437 patients (Analysis 34.1).

Erosion score (ES), any dose, 52 weeks: MD -1.45 (95% CI -2.11 to -0.79), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 908 patients (Analysis 35.1).

Joint space narrowing (JSN), any dose, 24 weeks: MD -0.50 (95% CI -0.79 to -0.21), 2 out of 10 studies, involving 1439 patients (Analysis 37.1).

Joint space narrowing (JSN), any dose, 52 weeks: MD -1.10 (95% CI -1.88 to -0.33), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 911 patients (Analysis 38.1).

Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS), any dose, 24 weeks: MD - 1.18 (95% CI -1.67 to -0.69), 2 out of 10 studies, involving 1437 patients (Analysis 39.1).

Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS), any dose, 52 weeks: MD - 2.50 (95% CI -3.70 to -1.30), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 908 patients (Analysis 40.1).

Serious adverse events (SAEs) as defined in the studies

The clinical study summary of CDP870-004 2001 did not define SAEs. All the new trials that were added in this update reported on SAEs.

We reported adverse events depending on the doses:

SAE for certolizumab pegol 200 mg and any follow-up Peto OR 1.77 (95% CI 1.27 to 2.46), 7 out of 9 studies, involving 2729 patients (Analysis 8.6);

SAE for certolizumab pegol 400 mg and any follow-up Peto OR 1.98 (95% CI 1.36 to 2.90), 5 out of 9 studies, involving 1584 patients (Analysis 9.7); 240 events were reported in the certolizumab pegol groups versus 69 events in the control groups.

All withdrawals

There were more withdrawals "at any dose and at any follow-up" in placebo groups (56%) versus the certolizumab pegol groups (23%) (Analysis 48.1).

There were more withdrawals "due to lack of efficacy" in placebo groups (61%) versus the certolizumab pegol groups (19%) (Analysis 48.2).

Withdrawals at any dose and at any follow-up: RR 0.42 (95% CI 0.36 to 0.50), 10 out of 10 studies, involving 3962 patients (Analysis 48.1).

Withdrawals at any dose and at any follow-up due to lack of efficacy: RR 0.30 (95% CI 0.25 to 0.37), 5 out of 10 studies, involving 2195 patients (Analysis 48.2).

Withdrawals due to adverse events

There were more withdrawals "at any dose and at any followup due to adverse events" in the certolizumab pegol groups (5%) versus placebo groups (3%).

Withdrawals at any dose and at any follow-up due to adverse events: Peto OR 1.66 (95% CI 1.15 to 2.37), 9 out of 10 studies, involving 3998 patients (Analysis 48.3).

We have included all results in Summary of findings for the main comparison.

Minor outcomes

ACR20 and ACR70

We saw an improvement in ACR20 and ACR70 compared to placebo for all doses and at any time.

ACR20 for any dose at 24 weeks: RR 2.76 (95% CI 2.29 to 3.33), 8 out of 10 studies, involving 2935 patients (Analysis 4.1); ACR20 for any dose at 52 weeks: RR 2.06 (95% CI 1.61 to 2.62), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 982 patients (Analysis 7.1).

ACR70 for any dose at 24 weeks: RR 4.15 (95% CI 2.68 to 6.42), 7 out of 10 studies, involving 2705 patients (Analysis 4.3); ACR70 for any dose at 52 weeks: RR 3.14 (95% CI 1.86 to 5.29), 1 out of 10 studies, involving 982 patients (Analysis 7.3).

Adverse events

We reported all adverse events in Data and analyses but not all of them were commented on in the present section, only those that we thought were the most interesting (see Table 6).

Any adverse event

We pooled the data for any adverse event from nine trials: 200 mg certolizumab pegol RR 1.18 (95% CI 1.10 to 1.27), 7 out of 9 studies, involving 2739 patients (Analysis 8.1); and 400 mg certolizumab pegol RR 1.21 (95% CI 1.11 to 1.31), 5 out of 9 studies, involving 1584 patients (Analysis 9.1).

We excluded Choy's study because it showed more events than patients in the certolizumab pegol group (62 events in 24 patients) as well as in the placebo group (19 events in 12 patients). Thus the RR could not be estimated.

Adverse events: severe intensity as defined in the studies

There were no differences in the number of SAEs between patients treated with 200 mg (Peto OR 1.14, 95% CI 0.78 to 1.65), 4 out of 9 studies, involving 2249 patients; and patients treated with 400 mg of certolizumab pegol (Peto OR 1.23, 95% CI 0.83 to 1.81), 4 out of 9 studies involving 1422 patients. See more details in Analysis 8.4; Analysis 9.4.

Adverse events leading to death as defined in the studies

We did not find statistically significant differences in the number of adverse events leading to death between the placebo and certolizumab pegol-treated groups. Eleven deaths due to adverse events in the certolizumab pegol groups were reported versus one death in the control groups: 200 mg certolizumab pegol Peto OR 2.34 (95% CI 0.46 to 11.84), 5 out of 9 studies involving 2443 patients (Analysis 8.8); 400 mg certolizumab pegol Peto OR 2.16 (95% CI 0.40 to 11.79), 3 out of 9 studies, involving 1179 patients (Analysis 9.8).

Death

In RAPID1 2005, in the placebo-treated group one patient died of myocardial infarction. In the 200 mg certolizumab pegol-treated group one patient died of hepatic neoplasm, another died of peritonitis and cirrhosis, and one died during the post-treatment period (> 84 days after the last injection). In the 400 mg certolizumab pegol-treated group one died of cerebral stroke, one of myocardial necrosis, one of cardiac arrest and one of atrial fibrillation.

In RAPID2 2007, in the 200 mg certolizumab pegol-treated group one patient died of myocardial infarction; one patient died during the study in the 400 mg certolizumab pegol-treated group (fracture, shock), which was assessed as unlikely to be related to the study medication.

In Choy 2002, in the open phase one patient in the certolizumab pegol-treated group (20 mg/kg CDP870) died from complications following rapid drainage of a large, chronic rheumatoid pericardial effusion. In the opinion of the investigator this event was unrelated to treatment with CDP870.

In REALISTIC 2008, one patient died of sigmoid diverticulitis and one of necrotizing pneumonia; both deaths were ruled out as possibly related to certolizumab pegol.

In NCT00791921 HIKARI, one patient died of a rupture of a dissecting aortic aneurysm in the thoracic region, but UCB considered that unlikely to have been related to the study medication. CDP870-014 2009; CERTAIN 2008; FAST4WARD 2005; NCT00791999 JRAPID did not report any deaths.

Overall certolizumab pegol deaths: Peto OR 2.56 (95% CI 0.72 to 9.07), 9 out of 9 studies, involving 3866 patients (Analysis 49.8; Figure 4).

Figure 4. Forest plot of comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), outcome: 49.8 Deaths.

	Certolizumab	pegol	Place	bo	Peto Odds Ratio		Peto Odds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl	Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl			
49.8.1 Certolizumab pegol 200 mg										
CERTAIN 2008	0	96	0	98		Not estimable				
NCT00791921 HIKARI (1)	1	116	0	114	10.4%	7.26 [0.14, 366.07]				
NCT00791999 JRAPID	0	82	0	25		Not estimable				
RAPID1 2005 (2)	3	392	1	100	26.8%	0.75 [0.07, 8.60]				
RAPID2 2007 (3)	1	246	0	63	6.8%	3.51 [0.03, 455.29]				
REALISTIC 2008 (4)	2	846	0	209	13.2%	3.48 [0.11, 112.96]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		1778		609	57.2%	1.94 [0.36, 10.32]				
Total events	7		1							
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.19, c	if = 3 (P = 0.76);	I ² = 0%								
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.7	78 (P = 0.44)									
49.8.2 Certolizumab pegol 4	100 mg									
CDP870-014 2009	0	124	0	119		Not estimable				
FAST4WARD 2005	0	111	0	109		Not estimable				
NCT00791999 JRAPID	0	65	0	25		Not estimable				
RAPID1 2005 (5)	4	389	0	99	26.8%	3.53 [0.31, 40.72]				
RAPID2 2007 (6)	1	246	0	62	6.7%	3.50 [0.03, 464.09]				
Subtotal (95% CI)	_	935		414	33.5%	3.53 [0.40, 31.39]				
Total events	5		U							
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, c	f = 1 (P = 1.00);	I* = 0%								
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.1$	3 (P = 0.26)									
49.8.3 Other doses										
Choy 2002	1	24	n	12	0.3%	A 48 IO 07 - 286 AQI				
NCT00791999 IRAPID	, 0	72	0	22	3.570	Not ectimable				
Subtotal (95% Cl)	0	96		34	9.3%	4.48 [0.07, 286,49]				
Total events	1		n							
Heterogeneity: Not applicabl	Io		, v							
Test for varial affect $7 - 0.71$ ($P = 0.48$)										
	1 (1 = 0.40)									
Total (95% CI)		2809		1057	100.0%	2.56 [0.72, 9.07]				
Total events	13		1							
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.45. d	if = 6 (P = 0.96);	I² = 0%								
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.4	46 (P = 0.15)						U.UUZ U.1 1 1U 500			
Test for subgroup difference	s: Chi ² = 0.26. 0	f= 2 (P =	= 0.88). l ^a	2 = 0%			Favours centolizumab pego Favours control			

Footnotes

(1) 1 patient died of a rupture of a dissecting aortic aneurysm in the thoracic region, but UCB considered that in unlikely to have beeen related to study... (2) Two deaths: one patient (hepatic neoplasm), and the other (cardiac arrest). One more died (peritonitis, cirrhosis, and general deterioration of physical...

(3) 1 patient died by myocardial infarction

(4) Two deaths in the CZP group: one case of sigmoid diverticulitis in a 73-year-old man with pancreatitis, and one of necrotizing pneumonia, both deaths...

(5) Four deaths: 1 patient (cerebral stroke, 1 myocardial necrosis, 1 by cardiac arrest and 1 more by atrial fibrillation)

(6) 1 patient died by fracture and shock

Serious adverse infections (SAI)

Tuberculosis

This composite outcome included any severe events of infections, infestations and tuberculous (disseminated tuberculosis, peritoneal tuberculosis, pulmonary tuberculosis, lymph node tuberculosis, tuberculosis), lower respiratory tract infection, and obstructive chronic bronchitis with acute exacerbation. More SAIs were reported in the 200 mg certolizumab pegol-treated group (Peto OR 3.30, 95% CI 1.45 to 7.51), 2 out of 9 studies, involving 964 patients; and in the 400 mg certolizumab pegol-treated group (Peto OR 3.25, 95% CI 1.65 to 6.39), 4 out of 9 studies, involving 1422 patients; 58 events were reported in the certolizumab pegol groups versus six events in the control groups. There were no differences between the rates of SAIs in the 200 mg and 400 mg certolizumab pegol groups. See more details in Analysis 8.7; Analysis 9.6.

A significant increase in the number of cases of tuberculosis was observed in both of the certolizumab pegol-treated groups: seven patients (0.8%) in the certolizumab pegol 200 mg group and five patients (0.7%) in the certolizumab pegol 400 mg group versus no cases in either placebo group: 200 mg certolizumab pegol Peto OR 4.53 (95% CI 0.94 to 21.85), 5 out of 9 studies, involving 2340 patients (Analysis 8.11); 400 mg certolizumab pegol Peto OR 4.55 (95% CI 0.71 to 29.11), 4 out of 9 studies, involving 1364 patients (Analysis 9.13). The overall analysis with both doses (200 and 400 mg) did not reach statistical significance: Peto OR 3.71 (95% CI 0.94 to 14.61), 6 out of 9 studies, involving 3195 patients (Analysis 49.9). In RAPID2 2007, five patients in the certolizumab pegol arms (three in certolizumab pegol 200 mg and two in 400 mg) developed tuberculosis (three from Russia, one each from Poland and Latvia). In NCT00993317 (200 mg

certolizumab pegol) two patients developed tuberculosis.

Other infections

The types of different infections reported (pneumonitis, bacterial arthritis, mastitis, urinary tract infection, herpes viral, bacterial peritonitis, and opportunistic infection) are presented in 'Data and analyses'.

Upper respiratory tract infection was more frequent with 200 mg certolizumab pegol than in the placebo group (Peto OR 1.51, 95% CI 1.08 to 2.09), 7 out of 9 studies, involving 2729 patients (Analysis 8.19); and 400 mg certolizumab pegol (Peto OR 1.42, 95% CI 0.77 2 to 2.61), 4 out of 9 studies, involving 1364 patients (Analysis 9.28).

Nasopharyngitis was more frequent with both doses of certolizumab pegol than in the placebo group: 200 mg certolizumab pegol Peto OR 1.46 (95% CI 1.02 to 2.09) (Analysis 8.23), 6 out of 9 studies, involving 1674 patients; and 400 mg certolizumab pegol Peto OR 1.98 (95% CI 1.26 to 3.11), 4 out of 9 studies, involving 1364 patients (Analysis 9.41). However, neither upper nor lower respiratory tract infections were more frequent compared to placebo with both doses of certolizumab pegol: 200 mg (Peto OR 1.17, 95% CI 0.86 to 1.59), 8 out of 9 studies, involving 3692 patients; and 400 mg (Peto OR 1.66, 95% CI 0.77 to 3.58), 7 out of 9 studies, involving 3073 patients (Analysis 49.10; Analysis 49.11).

Pain

Pain at the site of injection was not statistically significant compared with placebo: in the 200 mg certolizumab pegol-treated group (Peto OR 1.85, 95% CI 0.49 to 6.92), 3 out of 9 studies, involving 1091 patients (Analysis 8.13); and the 400 mg certolizumab pegol-treated group (Peto OR 1.74, 95% CI 0.41 to 7.42), 3 out of 9 studies, involving 1179 patients (Analysis 9.21). The wide CIs were due to the fact that pain was not observed in any placebo group, surprisingly. Similar data were observed for local reactions at the injection site.

Patients' assessment of arthritis pain (visual analogue scale (VAS) score 0 to 100 mm) improved at all doses and at all times. At week 24, the overall mean difference (MD) was -21.07 (95% CI -23.59 to -18.55), 4 out of 9 studies, involving 2064 patients (Analysis 42.1); and at week 52 the MD was -23.48 (95% CI -27.09 to -19.88), 1 out of 9 studies, involving 982 patients (Analysis 43.1).

Other adverse events

Hypertension was more frequent with both doses of certolizumab pegol than with placebo: 200 mg certolizumab pegol Peto OR of 3.09 (95% CI 1.64 to 5.84), 4 out of 9 studies, involving 1353 patients (Analysis 8.24); 400 mg certolizumab pegol Peto OR of 3.35 (95% CI 1.80 to 6.20), 3 out of 9 studies, involving 1121 patients (Analysis 9.32). The secondary events for headache, fever, blood

disorders, laboratory disorders, abdominal pain, nasopharyngitis, nausea, urinary tract infections, neck pain, congestive heart failure, pruritus and anaphylaxis are described in detail in Data and analyses.

Despite the report from the EMEA (http://www.ema.europa.eu/ docs/en⁻GB/document⁻library/EPAR⁻-

'Public'assessment'report/human/001037/

WC500069735.pdf), we could not extract more data on adverse events because these data were disclosed as combined data without the number of events in each trial. Moreover, the adverse events were grouped by 'primary system organ class': cardiac disorders, endocrine disorders, neoplasms benign, malignant and unspecified (excluding cysts and polyps).

Assessment of heterogeneity

When we analysed the ACR50 (Analysis 4.2) we found a low probability of statistical heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$). When we reviewed the demographics of phase III studies (Table 1) we found similar proportions of females and males, similar mean ages, and similar baseline HAQ-Di. We only found differences in the mean disease duration in FAST4WARD 2005 and CDP870-014 2009, around 9.4 years compared with around 6 years in most arms of the other studies where data were available (with low heterogeneity, I^2 = 13 %). Disease duration was not available for CERTAIN 2008; NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00791999 JRAPID (I² = 6%, and an overall $I^2 = 7\%$) (Analysis 50.5). Rheumatoid factor (RF) positivity varied from around 74% in the certolizumab pegol-treated patients in REALISTIC 2008 up to 100% in FAST4WARD 2005. Similarly disease activity measures such as CRP and swollen joint counts, but not DAS-28 and HAQ-D1, were generally lower in REALISTIC 2008.

However, despite these differences there were no compelling reasons for not combining the trial data for the most important variables.

Although 11 trials were included in this update no more than seven trials were analysed in each forest plot, so a funnel plot was not produced.

Subgroup analysis

Subgroup analyses were planned for the duration of the illness (approximately three years evolution), patients' sex, drug dose, administration and methodological quality, but only subgroup analysis regarding the dose of certolizumab pegol was performed. All phase III trials were performed in patients with a high mean duration of RA (from 6.1 to 9.5 years) and we could not obtain any data categorized by sex. All phase III trials allowed previous DMARD treatment (mean from 1.2 to 2 years). All phase III trials included in the meta-analysis were rated as high quality, and so we did not perform more subgroup analysis.

Sensitivity analysis

We have done a sensitivity analysis with the major outcome ACR50. In our previous systematic review we re-analysed quality (adequate sequence generation, good allocation concealment, adequate blinding, etc.) and did not show any changes. In this update we have more information about the quality of the trials from UCB and most trials were rated as high quality trials, so a sensitivity analysis based on quality was not done. However, we sought heterogeneity by analysing for doses of certolizumab pegol, size, use of concomitant MTX, different populations (Japanese and Korean trials versus other populations) and by published versus unpublished trials, but found no statistical heterogeneity (Analysis 50.1; Analysis 50.2; Analysis 50.3; Analysis 50.4; Analysis 50.6).

DISCUSSION

Summary of main results

Certolizumab pegol was FDA approved in 2008 for the treatment of Crohn's disease in adult patients with moderate to severe active disease and who had an inadequate response to conventional therapy. In 2009 the FDA approved certolizumab pegol for adult patients suffering from moderate to severe rheumatoid arthritis.

The drug has been shown to reduce the rate of progression of joint damage, as measured by X-ray, and to improve physical function. Long-term follow-up studies of commercially sponsored RCTs show persistence rates of 88.9% at two years, with 46.7% of patients having low disease activity (Keystone 2012). Whether such rates can be replicated in routine care remains to be seen.

The purpose of this systematic review was to evaluate the benefits and harms of certolizumab pegol for the treatment of people with RA when compared to placebo. We only included RCTs with at least three months of follow-up to assess benefits.

The duration of follow-up was from 12 to 52 weeks and the range of doses of certolizumab pegol varied from 50 to 400 mg given subcutaneously (sc).

Important differences between placebo and certolizumab pegol were observed for measures of disease activity, in favour of certolizumab pegol. The differences were both statistically significant and clinically important for the patient-reported outcomes ACR50, HAQ, and SF-36 (physical (PCS) and mental (MCS) component summary scores), and for structural damage measures. Mean changes in HAQ that are > -0.22 are clinically meaningful, although recent papers show that the cut-off could be higher (-0.37) (Ward 2014). In addition, the results with SF-36 (physical and mental components) can be considered relevant because in patients with RA improvements in the SF-36 PCS and HAQ Disability Index (HAQ-DI) are associated with improved work productivity and reduced long-term disability, healthcare utilization, costs and mortality (Hazes 2010). All certolizumab pegol groups showed improvements in radiological outcomes compared to placebo, measured as the mean changes from baseline. There was a clear radiological benefit although it should be borne in mind that radiographic changes occur in a relatively small proportion of patients in RA over the duration of research studies.

Serious adverse events were more frequent in the certolizumab pegol groups.

Statistically significant differences were observed in the overall number of withdrawals. Patients in the placebo group were statistically significantly more likely to discontinue treatment, probably due to lack of beneficial effect, but more patients withdrew due to adverse reactions in the certolizumab pegol group. The most frequent side effects were infections, nasopharyngitis and hypertension. Tuberculosis and mortality were increased with certolizumab pegol. These differences did not achieve statistical significance but it should be noted that there was only one death in the placebo group compared with 13 in the certolizumab pegol group. Similarly, there were no cases of tuberculosis in the placebo group. These cases of tuberculosis occurred despite precautions to screen patients for tuberculosis before treatment.

In our previous review we stated we would compare our data with data from the European Medicines Agency (EMEA) documents. We requested access to the drug company submissions to the EMEA for marketing authorisation of certolizumab pegol. Our request was denied despite an appeal. The EMEA stated that "..in the course of emerging legal proceedings before the General Court of the European Union, the Agency has been ordered to suspend the implementation of the certain decisions granting access to documents submitted by marketing authorisation holders of medicinal products".

No new or unexpected adverse events were associated with certolizumab pegol in the long-term analysis of harms. Among the included trials the incidence rate (IR) of deaths was 0.84/100 patients-years (PY) in the certolizumab pegol-treated patients compared to an IR of 0.27/100 PY in the placebo-treated patients. Across all the trials and the open-label extensions, the IR was 0.63/ 100 PY. Death was primarily related to cardiovascular events (IR 0.18/100 PY) (Bykerk 2013). No data regarding hypertension was disclosed in Bykerk 2013. We observed an increase in the number of patients with hypertension among the certolizumab pegoltreated patients (both 200 and 400 mg of certolizumab pegol). This observation may be relevant to an increased rate of cardiovascular events and deaths with certolizumab pegol. The described deaths appear to be largely due to vascular disease and do not appear to be related to infection or immune suppression. Anti-TNFs have been reported to reduce the risk of cardiovascular events in patients with RA (Dixon 2007).

We found an increased risk of serious infections with certolizumab pegol. This risk is recognised with anti-TNFs, both in randomised trials and observational studies (FDA 2013). We did not find an increased risk of malignancies or lymphoma, neither for 200 mg

nor for 400 mg of certolizumab pegol, as shown in a previous systematic review of anti-TNFs (Lopez Olivo 2012).

Overall completeness and applicability of evidence

We have included all available RCTs for certolizumab pegol in patients with RA, with a June 2014 search date. This updated review provides confirmatory evidence of the benefit of certolizumab pegol for patients with RA.

It is important to state that only one study had a follow-up of 52 weeks. Thus there are important uncertainties about sustained benefits and harms in a disease with a lifelong course and the need for therapy over many years. An additional note of caution relates to the population selection in terms of significant co-morbidities and exclusion of patients with previous malignancy, for example. In all trials except the CERTAIN 2008 trial (without a clear definition of its inclusion and exclusion criteria in clinical trials.org), patients with previous neoplasia, any risk of infectious disease, or previous tuberculosis, or prior treatment with any TNF-alpha inhibitor were excluded. In the NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00791999 JRAPID and NCT00993317 trials, patients with New York Heart Association (NYHA) class III or IV heart failure were also excluded. Moreover, in the RAPID1 2005 "Patients who, in the investigator's opinion, were at a high risk of infection were excluded, as were patients who had a history of malignancy, demyelinating disease, blood dyscrasias, or severe, progressive, and/or uncontrolled renal, hepatic, hematologic, gastrointestinal, endocrine, pulmonary, cardiac, neurologic, or cerebral disease". Thus, whilst it is clear that certolizumab pegol is beneficial and has an acceptable safety profile in patients selected for clinical trials, careful clinical judgement is needed to ensure benefits in routine care particularly in patients susceptible to infections such as those patients with chronic respiratory diseases.

Quality of the evidence

The quality of the evidence found in the trials included in this review was high. Studies had high standards for treatment allocation, concealment and blinding, but there may have been a risk of attrition bias. The quality of the evidence was downgraded for all outcomes for this reason. However, other GRADE considerations for downgrading, that is imprecision, indirectness and inconsistency, were rated as 'no', and publication bias was 'undetected'. Despite differences in the importance of the outcomes (higher for ACR50 and DAS remission, and lower for radiological changes) we rated the quality of the evidence as moderate for all the outcomes.

Outcome measures in favour of certolizumab pegol were statistically significant in both random-effects and fixed-effect models. We chose to apply a random-effects model although statistical heterogeneity was low. Clinical heterogeneity, however, was substantial (for example with varying follow-up times, doses, use of methotrexate) and, as expected, pooling resulted in large confidence intervals.

Potential biases in the review process

This updated systematic review has fewer limitations than our earlier review primarily because key data from a greater number of studies, including key study quality data, were available either as published reports or directly from the pharmaceutical company. From 11 included trials, 10 with over 4300 patients reported benefits and 10 trials reported harms, indicating a substantial evidence base. We lacked detail that may have been available in submissions to the EMEA as part of this drug's marketing authorisation and we also did not have access to study protocols, so we were not able to judge whether there was a concern about selective reporting. Lack of availability of detailed study reports with individual patient data denied us the opportunity of presenting a richer description of adverse effects, particularly serious adverse reactions.

Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews

The NICE 2009 and EMEA 2009 reports, performed as systematic reviews, have shown results quite similar to those in our review. The beneficial effects (ACR50s) of other anti-TNF agents (golimumab (Singh 2010), infliximab (Blumenauer 2002), etanercept (Chen 2006; Lethaby 2013) and adalimumab (Navarro Sarabia 2005)) are also quite similar to that of certolizumab pegol. The meta-analysis by Singh 2011 described the adverse effects of nine biologics and included randomised controlled trials (RCTs), controlled clinical trials (CCTs) and open-label extensions (OLEs) in any indication (with the exception of HIV/AIDS) showing similar overall results. Moreover, this study found similar results with certolizumab pegol for serious adverse events and serious infections but failed to find an increased rate of withdrawals due to adverse events. In this study the risk of serious infections was about four times higher for certolizumab pegol and the authors performed sensitivity analyses using different models to explain the results. However, the significant differences between certolizumab pegol and five other biologics as determined in the standard dose model (main model) persisted in the unadjusted and dose-adjusted models for each comparison with one minor exception of certolizumab pegol versus golimumab. Indirect comparisons between the biologics suggested some differences in adverse events between drugs. The authors concluded that there is a need for head-to-head trials to verify these differences.

AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS

Implications for practice

Certolizumab pegol was the first pegylated anti-TNF agent approved by the FDA for the treatment of adult patients with moderate to severe active RA. Our review confirms that the drug is clinically beneficial, including a reduced risk of radiographic damage compared with placebo. Adverse events were more frequent with the active treatment. A potential risk of serious adverse events, hypertension and tuberculosis in susceptible individuals needs to be borne in mind when considering certolizumab pegol or other anti-TNF drugs for active RA.

Implications for research

Treatment options for RA have expanded considerably in recent years and include biologic agents targeting a variety of elements of the inflammatory process. Once efficacy is established it is important that studies focus on comparing agents in clinically relevant populations. New agents continue to be targeted at patients who have failed to respond to methotrexate, yet there are now many established agents available for this population. Therefore, ethics review boards need to consider whether studies which compare agents with placebo or, at best, with background methotrexate and active disease despite this therapy are justifiable. In this situation initial shorter-term studies may be justifiable to establish efficacy, followed by longer-term studies looking at comparative beneficial effects against drugs with known efficacy. Longer-term randomised studies and observational data are clearly important for the assessment of drug toxicity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Tamara Rader who performed the updated searches. Thanks to Elizabeth Tanjong Ghogomu for providing editorial comments and to Jordi Pardo, a good friend who is always taking care of us from Canada. Thanks also to Kent Johnson who provided comments in the peer review process. Thanks to Marc Longueville, Catherine Ludwig, David Harland, Pablo Talavera and Carlos Cara from UCB who sent us additional data and explanations about how the trials were done.

REFERENCES

References to studies included in this review

CDP870-004 2001 {published and unpublished data}

Anonymous. Assessment report for Cimzia. Procedure No EMEA/H/C/001037. www.emea.europa.eu/humandocs/ PDFs/EPAR/cimzia/H-1037-en6.pd. London, 2009:1–47. [Procedure No.EMEA/H/C/001037]

Emery P, Smolen J, Choy E, et al. CDP870 a novel, humanised tumour necrosis factor alpha inhibitor improves HRQOL. Late breaking abstract. European League Against Rheumatism Annual Conference. 2002.

Keystone E, Choy E, Kalden J, Klareskog, Sany J, Smolen J, et al. CDP870, A novel pegylated, humanized TNF-alpha inhibitor, is effective in treating the signs and symptoms of rheumatoid arthritis (RA). Abstract to Rheumatology annual scientific meeting [abstract # LB-3]. 2001.

CDP870-014 2009 {published data only}

Choy E, McKenna F, Vencovsky J, Valente R, Goel N, Vanlunen B, et al. Certolizumab pegol plus MTX administered every 4 weeks is effective in patients with RA who are partial responders to MTX. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2012;**51**:1226–34.

UCB. Clinical Study Summary Study No.: CDP870-014. http://www.clinicalstudyresults.org/documents/companystudy 4348 0.pdf 2008.

CERTAIN 2008 {published data only}

* Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA) Moderate to Low Disease Activity Study (CERTAIN). http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/ show/results/NCT00674362?term=NCT00674362&rank= 1 2013.

Smolen JS, Emery P, Ferracioli GF, Samborski W, Berenbaum F, Davies OR, et al. Certolizumab pegol in rheumatoid arthritis patients with low to moderate activity: the CERTAIN double-blind, randomised, placebocontrolled trial. Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases 2014: doi:10.1136/annrheumdis–2013-204632.

Choy 2002 {published data only}

Choy EH, Hazleman B, Smith M, Moss K, Lisi L, Scott DG, et al. Efficacy of a novel pegylated humanized anti-TNF fragment (CDP870) in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a phase II double-blinded, randomized, doseescalating trial. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2002;**41**(10): 1133–7.

FAST4WARD 2005 {published data only}

Fleischmann D, Mason D, Cohen S. Efficacy and safety of certolizumab pegol monotherapy in patients with rheumatoid arthritis failing previous DMARD therapy. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2007;**66 Suppl II**:169. Fleischmann R, Keininger DL, Tahiri-Fitzgerald E, Mease P. Certolizumab pegol monotherapy 400mg every 4 weeks improves physical functioning and reduces pain in patients with rheumatoid arthritis Who have previously failed DMARD therapy. Program and abstracts of the European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) Annual Meeting; Barcelona, Spain 13-16 June [Abstract #0148]. 2007. Fleischmann R, Vencovsky J, van Vollenhoven RF, Borenstein D, Box J, Coteur G, et al. Efficacy and safety of certolizumab pegol monotherapy every 4 weeks in patients

with rheumatoid arthritis failing previous disease modifying antirheumatic therapy: the FAST4WARDstudy. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2009;**68**:805–11.

Keystone E, Mason D, Roy Fleischmann R. Certolizumab pegol 400 mg every 4 weeks as monotherapy rapidly reduces disease activity in active rheumatoid arthritis. Program and abstracts of the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 71st Annual Meeting; November 6-11; Boston, Massachusetts. [Abstract #277]. 2007.

Strand V, Brown M, Purcaru O, Richard L. Certolizumab pegol monotherapy improves productivity in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis: results from a phase III randomized controlled trial. Program and abstracts of the European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) Annual Meeting; Barcelona, Spain 13-16 June [Abstract #0478]. 2007.

Strand V, Keininger D, Tahiri-Fitzgerald E, Fleischmann R. Certolizumab pegol monotherapy 400mg every 4 weeks improves health-related quality of life and relieves fatigue in patients with rheumatoid arthritis who have previously failed DMARD therapy. Program and abstracts of the European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) Annual Meeting; Barcelona, Spain 13-16 June [Abstract #0205]. 2007.

NCT00791921 HIKARI {unpublished data only}

Yamamoto K. Efficacy Confirmation Trial of CDP870 Without Coadministration of Methotrexate (MTX) in Japanese Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA). http:// clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT00791921 2012. Yamanaka H, Yamamoto K, Takeuchi T, Ishiguro N, Tanaka Y, Eguchi K, et al. AB0469. Improved physical function, pain, and health related quality of life with certolizumab pegol in Japanese rheumatoid arthritis patients without methotrexate co-administration:results from the Hikari study. *Annals of the Rheumaic Diseases* 2013;**71 Suppl 3**: 664.

* Yamanaka H, Yamamoto K, Takeuchi T, Ishiguro N, Tanaka Y, Eguchi K, et al. Certolizumab pegol improved physical function and heath related quality of life in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis who could not be treated with methotrexate: results form HIKARI study. *Modern Rheumatology* 2012;**22 Suppl II**:S83.

NCT00791999 JRAPID {published data only}

Saito K. Efficacy Confirmation Trial of CDP870 as addon Medication to Methotrexate (MTX) in Japanese Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA). http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/ show/study/NCT00791999?term=NCT00791999&rank= 1 2012.

Yamamoto K, Takeuchi T, Yamanaka H, Ishiguro N, Tanaka Y, Eguchi K, et al. Efficacy and safety of certolizumab pegol plus methotrexate in Japanese rheumatoid arthritis patients with an inadequate response to methotrexate: the J-RAPID randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Modern Rheumatology 2013 Dec 9 [Epub ahead of print]:doi: 10.3109/14397595.2013.864224. Yamanaka H, Yamamoto K, Takeuchi T, Ishiguro N, Tanaka Y, Eguchi K, et al. AB0468 Improved physical function, pain, and health related quality of life with certolizumab pegol in japanese rheumatoid arthritis patients with an inadequate response to methotrexate: Results from the JRapid study. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2013;71 **Suppl 3**:664. [DOI: 10.1136/ annrheumdis-2012-eular.468]

Yamanaka H, Yamamoto K, Takeuchi T, Ishiguro N, Tanaka Y, Eguchi K, et al. Certolizumab pegol improved physical function and heath related quality of life in patients with active Rheumatoid Arthritis despite treatment with methotrexate: results form the JRAPID study. *Modern Rheumatology* 2012;**22 Suppl II**:S83.

NCT00993317 {published data only}

* Eun Young Cho. A study of CDP870 as add-on medication to methotrexate (MTX) in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/ study/NCT00993317 2012.

Marc de Longueville on behalf of the UCB Team. Eun Young Cho. A study of CDP870 as add-on medication to methotrexate (MTX) in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. private e-mail 2012.

RAPID1 2005 {published data only}

Curtis JR, Chen L, Luijtens K, Navarro-Millan I, Goel N, Gervitz L, Weinblatt M. Dose escalation of certolizumab pegol from 200 mg to 400 mg every other week provides no additional efficacy in rheumatoid arthritis: an analysis of individual patient-level data. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2011;**63**:2203–8.

Curtis JR, Luijtens K, Kavanaugh A. Predicting future response to certolizumab pegol in rheumatoid arthritis patients: features at 12 weeks associated with low disease activity at 1 year. *Arthritis Care Research (Hoboken)* 2012; **64**:658–67.

Keystone E, Heijde D, Mason D Jr, Landewe R, Vollenhoven RV, Combe B, et al. Certolizumab pegol plus methotrexate is significantly more effective than placebo plus methotrexate in active rheumatoid arthritis: findings of a fifty-two-week, phase III, multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group study. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2008;**58**:3319–29.

Keystone E, Mason D, Combe B. The anti-TNF certolizumab pegol in combination with methotrexate is significantly more effective than methotrexate alone in the treatment of patients with active rheumatoid arthritis: 1-year results from the RAPID 1 study. Program and abstracts of the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 71st Annual Meeting; November 6-11; Boston, Massachusetts. [Abstract #700]. 2007.

Strand V, Keininger DL, Tahiri-Fizgerald E. Certolizumab pegol results in clinically meaningful improvements in physical function and health-related quality of life in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis despite treatment with methotrexate. Program and abstracts of the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 71st Annual Meeting; November 6-11; Boston, Massachusetts. [Abstract #946].

2007.

Strand V, Mease P, Burmester G, Nikai E, Coteur G, Vollenhoven R, et al. Rapid and sustained improvements in health-related quality of life, fatigue, and other patientreported outcomes in rheumatoid arthritis patients treated with certolizumab pegol plus methotrexate over 1 year: results from the RAPID 1 randomized controlled trial. Arthritis Research & Therapy 2009; Vol. 11:R170. UCB. Preliminary results suggest certolizumab pegol plus methotrexate is effective in reducing signs and symptoms of rheumatoid arthritis in patients refractory to methotrexate. Results from the RAPID 1 Study. Abstract number: OPO016. EULAR 2007. 2007.

van der Heijde D, Keystone EC, Curtis JR, Landewé RB, Schiff MH, Khanna D, et al. Timing and magnitude of initial change in disease activity score 28 predicts the likelihood of achieving low disease activity at 1 year in rheumatoid arthritis patients treated with certolizumab pegol: a post-hoc analysis of the RAPID 1 trial. *Journal of Rheumatology* 2012;**39**:1326–33.

van der Heijde D, Strand V, Keystone E, Landewé R. Inhibition of Radiographic Progression by Lyophilized certolizumab Pegol Added to Methotrexate in Comparison with Methotrexate Alone in Patients with Rheumatoid Arthritis: The RAPID 1 Trial. Program and abstracts of the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 71st Annual Meeting; November 6-11; Boston, Massachusetts. [Abstract #940]. 2007.

van der Heijde D, Weinblatt M, Landewe R Goel N, Wells A, Fleischmann R. Inhibition of progression of structural damage by week 16 with certolizumab pegol: Results from the RAPID trials. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2008;**58**(9 Suppl):529–30.

RAPID2 2007 {published data only}

Kavanaugh A, Smolen JS, Emery P, Purcaru O, Keystone E, Richard L, et al. Effect of certolizumab pegol with methotrexate on home and work place productivity and social activities in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2009;**61**:1592–600. Landewé R, Strand V, Smolen J, Van der Heijde D. Liquid formulation certolizumab pegol with methotrexate decreases progression of structural joint damage in rheumatoid arthritis patients: the RAPID 2 study. Program and abstracts of the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 71st Annual Meeting; November 6-11; Boston, Massachusetts. [Abstract #696]. 2007.

Mease P, Mason D, Kavanaugh A, Smolen J. Efficacy and rapid response of certolizumab pegol liquid formulation in combination with methotrexate (MTX) in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis despite MTX therapy: results from the RAPID 2 study. Program and abstracts of the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 71st Annual Meeting; November 6-11; Boston, Massachusetts. [Abstract #941]. 2007.

Schiff M, Keininger DL, Tahiri-Fitzgerald E. Certolizumab pegol added onto methotrexate improves physical functioning and reduces pain in patients with rheumatoid arthritis who have an incomplete response to methotrexate: data from rapid 2. Program and abstracts of the European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) Annual Meeting; Barcelona, Spain 13-16 June [Abstract #0200]. 2007. Smolen J, Brzezicki J, Mason D, Kavanaugh A. Efficacy and safety of certolizumab pegol in combination with methotrexate (mtx) in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis despite MTX therapy: results from the rapid 2 study. Program and abstracts of the European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) Annual Meeting; Barcelona, Spain 13-16 June [Abstract #0202]. 2007. Smolen JS, Landewe RB, Mease PJ, BrzezickiJ, Mason

D, Luijtens K, et al. Efficacy and safety of certolizumab pegol plus methotrexate in active rheumatoid arthritis: the RAPID 2 study. A randomised controlled trial. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2009;**68**:797–804. Strand V, Keininger DL, Tahiri-Fizgerald E. Certolizumab

pegol results in clinically meaningful improvements in physical function and health-related quality of life in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis despite treatment with methotrexate. Program and abstracts of the European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) Annual Meeting; Barcelona, Spain 13-16 June [Abstract #0335]. 2007. Strand V, Smolen JS, van Vollenhoven RF, Mease P, Burmester GR, Hiepe F, et al. Certolizumab pegol plus methotrexate provides broad relief from the burden of rheumatoid arthritis: analysis of patient-reported outcomes from the RAPID 2 trial. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2011;**70**:996–1002.

REALISTIC 2008 {published data only}

Weinblatt ME, Fleischmann R, Huizinga TW, Emery P, Pope J, Massarotti EM, et al. Efficacy and safety of certolizumab pegol in a broad population of patients with active rheumatoid arthritis: results from the REALISTIC phase IIIb study. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2012;**51**:2204–14.

References to studies excluded from this review

Aaltonen 2012 {published data only}

Aaltonen KJ, Virkki LM, Malmivaara A, Konttinen YT, Nordstrom DC, Blom M. Systematic review and metaanalysis of the efficacy and safety of existing TNF blocking agents in treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *PloS ONE* 2012;7:e30275.

Alten 2013 {published and unpublished data}

Alten R, Fleischmann R, van Vollenhoven R, Vencovsky J, Davies O, Stach C, et al. Long term tolerability and efficacy of a 4-week-administration of certolizumab pegol as monotherapy and combination therapie in rheumatoid arthritis-5-year-data of an open extension study. *Zeitschrift Fur Rheumatologie* 2013;**72**:111.

Andreakos 2003 {published data only}

Andreakos E. Targeting cytokines in autoimmunity: New approaches, new promise. *Expert Opinion on Biological Therapy* 2003;**3**(3):435–47.

Anonymous 2003 {published data only}

Anonymous. CDP 571: anti-TNF monoclonal antibody, BAY 103356, BAY W 3356, Humicade. *Drugs in R&D* 2003;4:174–8.

Audrey 2010 {published data only}

Audrey P, Nahema I, Thomas B, Christophe R, Thierry S. Clinical and radiological efficacy of biologics in rheumatoid arthritis patients naive or inadequate responders to methotrexate: A metanalysis. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2010;**62**:2267.

Bain 2003 {published data only}

Bain B, Brazil M. Adalimumab. *Nature Reviews. Drug Discovery* 2003;**2**(9):693–4.

Bansback 2005 {published data only}

Bansback N, Brennan A, Anis AH. A pharmacoeconomic review of adalimumab in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research* 2005;**5**(5):519–29.

Barnes 2007 {published data only}

Barnes T, Moots R. Targeting nanomedicines in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis: Focus on certolizumab pegol. *International Journal of Nanomedicine* 2007;**2**(1): 3–7.

Baugh 2001 {published data only}

Baugh JA, Bucala R. Mechanisms for modulating TNFα in immune and inflammatory disease. *Current Opinion in Drug Discovery and Development* 2001;**4**(5):635–50.

Bayes M 2006 {published data only}

Bayes M, RabassedaX, Prous JR. Gateways to clinical trials. *Methods and Findings in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology* 2006;**28**(1):719–40.

Chang 2006 {published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}

* Chang JT, Lichtenstein GR. Drug insight: antagonists of tumor-necrosis factor-alpha in the treatment of inflammatory bowel disease. *Nature Clinical Practice. Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 2006;**3**:220–8.

Chikanza 2000a {published data only}

Chikanza IC, Kuis W, Heijnen CJ. The influence of the hormonal system on pediatric rheumatic diseases. *Rheumatic Diseases Clinics of North America* 2000;**26**: 911–25.

Chikanza 2000b {published data only}

Chikanza IC, Grossman AB. Reciprocal interactions between the neuroendocrine and immune systems during inflammation. *Rheumatic Diseases Clinics of North America* 2000;**26**:693–711.

Deeks 2013 {published data only}

Deeks ED. Certolizumab pegol: a review of its use in the management of rheumatoid arthritis. *Drugs* 2013;73: 75–97.

Dose Flex 2007 {published data only}

Dosing Flexibility Study in Patients With Rheumatoid Arthritis (DoseFlex). http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/ results/NCT00580840.

Evans 2003 {published data only}

Evans R. Anti-Arthritic Agents - SMi Conference: Trapping cytokines 28-29 April 2003, London, UK. *Drugs* 2003;**6** (6):548–51.

Fanet-Goguet 2004 {published data only}

Fanet-Goguet M, Martin S, Fernandez C, Fautrel B, Bourgeois P. Focus on biological agents in rheumatoid arthritis: Newer treatments and therapeutic strategies. *Therapie* 2004;**59**(4):451–61.

Fleischmann 2005 {published data only}

Fleischmann RM. Is there a need for new therapies for rheumatoid arthritis?. *Journal of Rheumatology* 2005;**32**(73 Suppl):3–7.

Fleischmann 2013 {published data only}

Fleischmann R, van Vollenhoven R, Vencovsky J, Alten R, Davies O, Stach C, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of 4weekly certolizumab pegol monotherapy and combination therapy in rheumatoid arthritis: 5-year results from an open-label extension study. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2013;**72**:435.

Gabay 2002 {published data only}

Gabay C. Cytokine inhibitors in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Expert Opinion on Biological Therapy* 2002;**2**(2):135–49.

Garber 2005 {published data only}

Garber K. First-in-class biologic to enter rheumatoid arthritis fray. *Nature Biotechnology* 2005;**23**(11):1323-4.

Genovese 2005 {published data only}

Genovese MC. Biologic therapies in clinical development for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Journal of Clinical Rheumatology* 2005;**11**(3 Suppl):45–54.

Goldblatt 2005 {published data only}

Goldblatt F, Isenberg DA. New therapies for rheumatoid arthritis. *Clinical and Experimental Immunology* 2005;**140** (2):195–204.

Graninger 2002 {published data only}

Graninger W, Smolen J. Treatment of rheumatoid arthritis by TNF-blocking agents. *International Archives of Allergy and Immunology* 2002;**127**(1):10–4.

Ingham 2010 {published data only}

Ingham M, Carter C. Meta-analysis and biologics comparing apples to apples: An example using radiographic outcomes in rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2010;**62**:76.

Janssen 2012 {published data only}

Janssen KJ, Medic G, Broglio K, Bergman G, Berry S, Sabater FJ, et al. Comparing the efficacy and safety of biologics for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis patients: A network meta-analysis. *Value in Health* 2012;**15** (7): A439.

Kathmann 2005 {published data only}

Kathmann W. Early and aggressive treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift* 2005;**130 Suppl 1**(Report):58–9.
Kaushik 2005 {published data only}

Kaushik VV, Moots RJ. CDP-870 (certolizumab) in rheumatoid arthritis. *Expert Opinion on Biological Therapy* 2005;**5**:601–6.

Kavanaugh 2013 {published data only}

Kavanaugh A, Smolen JS, Emery P, Keystone E, Strand V, Purcaru O, et al. Long-term benefits over more than 4 years of certolizumab pegol combination therapy on workplace and household productivity, and participation in social activities in rheumatoid arthritis: Results from the openlabel extension study. *Value in Health* 2013;**16**:A570.

Kavanaugh A {published data only}

Kavanaugh A, Smolen J, Emery P, Purcaru O, Keystone E, Richard L, et al. Effect of certolizumab pegol with methotrexate on home and work place. Productivity and social activities in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2009;**61**:1592–600.

Keystone 2013 {published data only}

Keystone E, Landewe R, van Vollenhoven R, Combe B, Strand V, Mease P, et al. 5-Year results from the RAPID 1 trial and open-label extension: long-term safety and efficacy of certolizumab pegol in combination with methotrexate in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2013;**72**:A228–9. [10.1136/ annrheumdis–2013–203695. [Epub ahead of print]]

Keystone 2013a {published data only}

Keystone E, Landewe R, van Vollenhoven R, Combe B, Strand V, Mease P, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of certolizumab pegol in combination with methotrexate in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis: 5-year results from the RAPID 1 trial and open-label extension. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2013;**65**:S988–9. [PUBMED: 23918037]

Kochbati 2004 {published data only}

Kochbati S, Boussema F, Ben Miled M, Ktari S, Daoud L, Ben Rhouma S, et al. The TNF alfa in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Tunisie Medicale* 2004;**82**(10): 893–904.

Launois 2011 {published data only}

Launois R, Avouac B, Berenbaum F, Blin O, Bru I, Fautrel B, et al. Comparison of certolizumab pegol with other anticytokine agents for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis: a multiple-treatment Bayesian metaanalysis. *Journal of Rheumatology* 2011;**38**:835–45.

Launois 2011a {published data only}

Launois R, Avouac B, Berenbaum F, Blin O, Bru I, Fautrel B, et al. Comparison of certolizumab pegol with other anticytokine agents for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis: A multiple-treatment Bayesian metaanalysis. *Journal of Rheumatology* 2011;**38**:835–45.

Le 2010 {published data only}

Le Blay P, Mouterde G, Barnetche T, Combe BG. Risk of malignancy during anti-TNF alfa therapy in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: Systematic review and meta-analysis of registries, long-term extension studies and randomized controlled trials. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2010;**62**:408.

Le 2012 {published data only}

Le Blay P, Mouterde G, Barnetche T, Morel J, Combe B. Short-term risk of total malignancy and nonmelanoma skin cancers with certolizumab and golimumab in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: Metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of Rheumatology* 2012;**39**:712–5.

LE Blay P {published data only}

Le Blay P, Mouterde G, Barnetche T, Morel J, Combe B. Short-term risk of total malignancy and nonmelanoma skin cancers with certolizumab and golimumab in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of Rheumatology* 2012;**39**:712–5.

Lopez-Olivo 2012 {published data only}

Lopez-Olivo MA, Tayar JH, Martinez-Lopez JA, Pollono EN, Cueto JP, Gonzales-Crespo MR, et al. Risk of malignancies in patients with rheumatoid arthritis treated with biologic therapy: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2012;**308**: 896–908.

Mealy 2005 {published data only}

Mealy NE, Bayes M. Treatment of gastrointestinal disorders: certolizumab pegol. *Drugs of the Future* 2005;**30**(6):600–1.

Mok 2004 {published data only}

Mok CC, Mak A. Therapeutic advances in rheumatoid arthritis. APLAR Journal of Rheumatology 2004;7(1):62-70.

Moulis 2012 {published data only}

Moulis G, Sommet A, Bene J, Montastruc F, Sailler L, Montastruc JL, et al. Cancer risk of anti-TNF-alpha at recommended doses in adult rheumatoid arthritis: A metaanalysis with intention to treat and per protocol analyses. *PLoS ONE* 2012;7:e48991.

Mount 2005 {published data only}

Mount C, Featherstone J. Rheumatoid arthritis market. *Nature Reviews. Drug Discovery* 2005;**4**(1):11–2.

NCT00160641 {published data only}

A Study of the Safety and Effectiveness of Liquid Certolizumab Pegol in the Treatment of Signs and Symptoms of Rheumatoid Arthritis and in Prevention of Joint Damage in Patients With Active Rheumatoid Arthritis. http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00160641?term= NCT00160641&crank=1 2013.

NCT00160693 {published data only}

* Open Label Long-Term Safety Study of Certolizumab Pegol (CZP) for Patients With Rheumatoid Arthritis. http:/ /clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00160693.

NCT00175877 {published data only}

Keystone EC, Combe B, Smolen J, Strand V, Goel N, van Vollenhoven R, et al. Sustained efficacy of certolizumab pegol added to methotrexate in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis: 2-year results from the RAPID 1 trial. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2012;**51**:1628–38. van der Heijde D, Keystone EC, Curtis JR, Landewé RB, Schiff MH, Khanna D, et al. Timing and magnitude of initial change in disease activity score 28 predicts the likelihood of achieving low disease activity at 1 year in rheumatoid arthritis patients treated with certolizumab

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review) Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 28

pegol: a post-hoc analysis of the RAPID 1 trial. *Journal of Rheumatology* 2012;**39**:1326–33.

NCT00753454 {published data only}

Open Label Extension for Patients Coming From the Dosing Flexibility Study in Patients With Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA) (Dose Flex II). http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/ show/NCT00753454?term=NCT00753454&rank=1 2012.

NCT00843778 {published data only}

Follow-up of Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA) Moderate to Low Disease Activity Study (CERTAIN 2). http: //clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00843778?term= NCT00843778&rank=1 2013.

NCT00993668 {unpublished data only}

Assessing the Use of Certolizumab Pegol in Adult Subjects With Rheumatoid Arthritis on the Antibody Response When Receiving Influenza Virus and Pneumococcal Vaccines. http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/results/ NCT00993668?term=NCT00993668&rank=1 2012.

Osbourn 2003 {published data only}

Osbourn J, Jermutus L, Duncan A. Current methods for the generation of human antibodies for the treatment of autoimmune diseases. *Drug Discovery Today* 2003;**8**(18): 845–51.

Paleolog 2003 {published data only}

Paleolog E. The therapeutic potential of TNF- α blockade in rheumatoid arthritis. *Expert Opinion on Investigational Drugs* 2003;**12**(7):1087–95.

Pearce 2001 {published data only}

Pearce GJ, Chikanza LC. Targeting tumour necrosis factor in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *BioDrugs* 2001;**15** (3):139–49.

Pierreisnard 2012 {published data only}

Pierreisnard A, Issa N, Barnetche T, Richez C, Schaeverbeke T. Meta-analysis of clinical and radiological efficacy of biologics in rheumatoid arthritis patients naive or inadequately responsive to methotrexate. *Joint, Bone, Spine* 2013;**80**:386–92.

Rose-John 2003 {published data only}

Rose-John S, Schooltink H. CDP-870. Celltech/Pfizer. *Current Opinion in Investigational Drugs* 2003;**4**(1472-4472 (Print), 5):588–92.

Russo 2005 {published data only}

Russo C, Polosa R. TNF- α as a promising therapeutic target in chronic asthma: A lesson from rheumatoid arthritis. *Clinical Science* 2005:**109**(2):135–42.

Sandborn 2003 {published data only}

Sandborn WJ. Strategies for targeting tumour necrosis factor in IBD. *Best Practice & Research. Clinical Gastroenterology* 2003;**17**(1):105–17.

Schreiber {published data only}

Schreiber S, Khaliq-Kareemi M, Lawrance IC, Thomsen OØ, Hanauer SB, McColm J, et al. PRECISE 2 Study Investigators. Maintenance therapy with certolizumab pegol for Crohn's disease. *The New England Journal Medicine* 2007;**357**:239–50.

Smolen 2013 {published data only}

Smolen JS, Emery P, Ferraccioli G, Samborski W, Berenbaum F, Davies O, et al. Maintenance of remission in rheumatoid arthritis patients with low-moderate disease activity following withdrawal of certolizumab PEGOL treatment: Week 52 results from the certain study. *Annals of the Rheumatic Disease* 2013;**71 Suppl 3**:361.

Sorbera 2005 {published data only}

Sorbera LA, Leeson PA. Certolizumab pegol: Treatment of rheumatoid arthritis treatment of Crohn's disease human anti-TNF-(alpha) monoclonal antibody. *Drugs of the Future* 2005;**30**(11):1087–91.

Takeuchi 2005 {published data only}

Takeuchi T, Amano K, Kameda H, Abe T. Anti-TNF biological agents in rheumatoid arthritis and other inflammatory diseases. *Allergology International* 2005;**54**(2): 191–202.

Tanaka 2013 {published data only}

Tanaka Y, Yamamoto K, Takeuchi T, Yamanaka H, Ishiguro N, Eguchi K, et al. Long-term efficacy and safety of certolizumab pegol in Japanese rheumatoid arthritis patients who could not receive methotrexate: 52-week results from an open-label extension of the HIKARI study. Modern Rheumatology 2013:DOI:10.3109/ 14397595.2013.865822.

Taylor 2003 {published data only}

Taylor PC. Anti-cytokines and cytokines in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Current Pharmaceutical Design* 2003;**9** (14):1095–106.

Taylor 2003a {published data only}

Taylor PC. Anti-TNF α therapy for rheumatoid arthritis: An update. *Internal Medicine* 2003;**42**(1):15–20.

Toussirot 2004 {published data only}

Toussirot E, Wendling D. The use of TNF-alpha blocking agents in rheumatoid arthritis: an overview. *Expert Opinion on Pharmacotherapy* 2004;**5**(3):581–94.

Toussirot 2007 {published data only}

Toussirot E, Wendling D. The use of TNF-alpha blocking agents in rheumatoid arthritis: an update. *Expert Opinion on Pharmacotherapy* 2007;**8**:2089–107.

Wang 2013 {published data only}

Wang Y, Zhu R, Sun J, Su Z, Davis JC, Mandema JW, et al. Model-based meta-analysis in rheumatoid arthritis: Correlations between short-term and long-term treatment effects. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 2013;**93**: S101.

Yamanaka {published data only}

Yamanaka H, Yamamoto K, Takeuchi T, Ishiguro N, Tanaka Y, Eguchi K, et al. Improved physical function, pain and health related quality of life with certolizumab pegol in Japanese rheumatoid arthritis patients with an inadequate response to methotrexate. Results from the JRapid Study. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2013;**72 Suppl 3**:664.

Yamanaka a {published data only}

Yamanaka H, Yamamoto K, Takeuchi T, Ishiguro N, Tanaka Y, Eguchi K, et al. Improved physical function, pain and

health related quality of life with certolizumab pegol in Japanese rheumatoid arthritis patients without methotrexate co-administration. Results from the HIKARI Study. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2013;**72 Suppl 3**:664.

Zhu 2013 {published data only}

Zhu R, Wang Y, Sun J, Su Z, Davis JC, Mandema JW, et al. Model-based meta-analysis in rheumatoid arthritis: Correlation of DAS28 and ACR50 treatment effects. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 2013;**93**:S101.

Zwerina 2005 {published data only}

Zwerina J, Redlich K, Schett G, Smolen JS. Pathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis: Targeting cytokines. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 2005;**1051**:716–29.

References to ongoing studies

NCT00850343 {published data only}

Long-term Treatment Study of CDP870 Without Coadministration of MTX in Japanese Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA) Patients. Ongoing study Mar 2009; expected completed date: Mar 2012.

NCT00851318 {published data only}

Long-term Treatment Study of CDP870 as Add-on Medication to MTX in Japanese Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA) Patients. Ongoing study Mar 2009; expected completion Mar 2011.

NCT01451203 {published data only}

A Multicenter, Double-blind, Randomized, Placebocontrolled, Parallel-group Study to Assess the Efficacy and Safety of CDP870 in Early MTX-naive Rheumatoid Arthritis Patients With Poor Prognosis. Ongoing study October 2011.

Additional references

Arnett 1988

Arnett FC, Edworthy SM, Bloch DA, McShane DJ, Fries JF, Cooper NS, et al. The American Rheumatism Association 1987 revised criteria for the classification of rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 1988;**31**:315–24.

Barton 2009

Barton A, Worthington J. Genetic susceptibility to rheumatoid arthritis: an emerging picture. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2009;**61**:1441–6.

Bhandari 2004

Bhandari M, Busse JW, Jackowski D, Montori VM, Schunemann H, Sprague S, et al. Association between industry funding and statistically significant pro-industry findings in medical and surgical randomized trials. *Canadian Medical Association Journal 2004* 2004;**170**: 477–80.

Blumenauer 2002

Blumenauer B, Judd M, Wells G, Burls A, Cranney A, Hochberg M, Tugwell P. Infliximab for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2002, Issue 3. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD003785]

Bongartz 2006

Bongartz T, Sutton AJ, Sweeting MJ, Buchan I, Matteson EL, Montori V. Anti-TNF antibody therapy in rheumatoid arthritis and the risk of serious infections and malignancies: systematic review and meta-analysis of rare harmful effects in randomized controlled trials. *JAMA* 2006;**295**:2275–85.

Brennan 2008

Brennan FM, McInnes IB. Evidence that cytokines play a role in rheumatoid arthritis. *The Journal of Clinical Investigation* 2008;**118**:3537–45.

Bykerk 2013

Bykerk VP, Cush J, Winthrop K, Calabrese L, Lortholary O, de Longueville M, et al. Update on the safety profile of certolizumab pegol in rheumatoid arthritis: an integrated analysis from clinical trials. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2013:doi: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2013-203660. [Epub ahead of print]. [DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2013-203660]

Carmona 2002

Carmona L, Villaverde V, Hernández-García C, Ballina J, Gabriel R, Laffon A. The prevalence of rheumatoid arthritis in the general population of Spain. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2002;**41**:88–95.

Chen 2006

Chen YF, Jobanputra P, Barton P, Jowett S, Bryan S, Clark W, et al. A systematic review of the effectiveness of adalimumab, etanercept and infliximab for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis in adults and an economic evaluation of their cost-effectiveness. Health Technology Assessment 2006; Vol. 10, issue 42:1–235.

Dixon 2007

Dixon WG, Watson KD, Lunt M, Hyrich KL, Silman AJ, et al. Reduction in the incidence of myocardial infarction in patients with rheumatoid arthritis who respond to antitumor necrosis factor alpha therapy: results from the British Society of Rheumatology Biologics Register. *Arthritis & Rheumatism* 2007;**56**:2905–12.

Doeglas 1995

Doeglas D, Suurmeijer T, Krol B, Sanderman R, van Leeuwen M, van Rijswijk M. Work disability in early rheumatoid arthritis. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 1995; **54**:455–60.

Doran 2002

Doran MF, Pond GR, Crowson CS, O'Fallon WM, Gabriel SE. Trends in incidence and mortality in rheumatoid arthritis in Rochester, Minnesota, over a forty-year period. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2002;**46**:625–31.

Edwards 2005

Edwards CJ, Cooper C. Early environmental factors and rheumatoid arthritis. *Clinical and Experimental Immunology* 2005;**143**:1–5.

EMEA 2009

Anonymous. Assessment report for Cimzia. Procedure No EMEA/H/C/001037. www.emea.europa.eu/humandocs/ PDFs/EPAR/cimzia/H-1037-en6.pd. London, 2009:1–47. [Procedure No.EMEA/H/C/001037]

FDA 2013

Center for Drug Evaluation and Research. Postmarket Drug Safety Information for Patients and Providers - Information for Healthcare Professionals: Cimzia (certolizumab pegol), Enbrel (etanercept), Humira (adalimumab), and Remicade (infliximab). www.fda.gov/drugs/drugsafety/ postmarketdrugsafetyinformationforpatientsandproviders/ ucm124185.htm (accessed 7 Jul 2014).

Felson 2011

Felson DT, Smolen JS, Wells G, Zhang B, van Tuyl LH, Funovits J, et al. American College of Rheumatology, European League Against Rheumatism. Provisional definition of remission in rheumatoid arthritis for clinical trials. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2011;**63**:573–86.

Glanville 2006

Glanville JM, Lefebvre C, Miles JN, Camosso-Stefinovic J. How to identify randomized controlled trials in MEDLINE: ten years on. *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 2006; **94**:130–6.

Hazes 2010

Hazes JM, Taylor P, Strand V, Purcaru O, Coteur G, Mease P. Physical function improvements and relief from fatigue and pain are associated with increased productivity at work and at home in rheumatoid arthritis patients treated with certolizumab pegol. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2010;**49**: 1900–10.

Higgins 2011

Higgins JPL, Green S, editors. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated March 201]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2008. Available from www.cochrane-handbook.org.

Jobanputra 2012

Jobanputra P, Maggs F, Deeming A, Carruthers D, et al. A randomised efficacy and discontinuation study of etanercept versus adalimumab (RED SEA) for rheumatoid arthritis: a pragmatic, unblinded, non inferiority study of first TNF inhibitor use: outcomes over 2 years. *BMJ Open* 2012;2: e001395.

Keystone 2012

Keystone EC, Combe B, Smolen J, Strand V, Goel N, van Vollenhoven R, et al. Sustained efficacy of certolizumab pegol added to methotrexate in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis: 2-year results from the RAPID 1 trial. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2012;**51**:1628–38.

Laird 1990

Laird NM, Wang F. Estimating rates of change in randomized clinical trials. *Controlled Clinical Trials* 1990; **11**:405–19.

Laupacis 1988

Laupacis A, Sackett DL, Roberts RS. An assessment of clinically useful measures of the consequences of treatment. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 1988;**318**:1728–33.

Lethaby 2013

Lethaby A, Lopez-OlivoMA, Maxwell L, Burls A, Tugwell P, WellsGA. Etanercept for the treatment of rheumatoid

arthritis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013, Issue 5. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004525.pub2]

Lopez Olivo 2012

Lopez-Olivo MA, Tayar JH, Martinez-Lopez JA, Pollono EN, Cueto JP, Gonzales-Crespo MR, et al. Risk of malignancies in patients with rheumatoid arthritis treated with biologic therapy: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2012;**308**: 898–908.

Lopez Olivo 2014

Lopez-Olivo MA, Siddhanamatha HR, Shea B, Tugwell P, Wells GA, Suarez-Almazor ME. Methotrexate for treating rheumatoid arthritis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2014, Issue 6. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000957.pub2]

Meune 2009

Meune C, Touze E, Trinquart L, Allanmore Y. Trends in cardiovascular mortality in patients with rheumatoid arthritis over 50 years: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. *Rheumatology* 2009;**48**:1309–13.

Navarro Millan 2013

Navarro-Millan I, Curtis JR. Newest clinical trial results with antitumor necrosis factor and non antitumor necrosis factor biologics for rheumatoid arthritis. *Current Opinion in Rheumatology* 2013;**25**:384-90.

Navarro Sarabia 2005

Navarro-Sarabia F, Ariza-Ariza R, Hernandez-Cruz B, Villanueva I. Adalimumab for treating rheumatoid arthritis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2005, Issue 3. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD005113.pub2]

NICE 2009

UCB. Certolizumab pegol (CIMZIA©) for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. Single technology appraisal (STA) manufacturer submission to NICE. NICE June 22nd 2009: 1–180.

Puolakka 2005

Puolakka K, Kautiainen H, Möttönen T, Hannonen P, Korpela M, Hakala M, et al. FIN-RACo Trial Group. Early suppression of disease activity is essential for maintenance of work capacity in patients with recent-onset rheumatoid arthritis: five-year experience from the FIN-RACo trial. *Arthritis and Rheumatology* 2005;**52**:36–4.

Singh 2009

Singh JA, Christensen R, Wells GA, Suarez-Almazor ME, Buchbinder R, Lopez-Olivo MA, et al. Biologics for rheumatoid arthritis: an overview of Cochrane reviews. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009, Issue 4. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007848.pub2]

Singh 2010

Singh JA, Noorbaloochi S, Singh G. Golimumab for rheumatoid arthritis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2010, Issue 1. [DOI: 10.1002/ 14651858.CD008341]

Singh 2011

Singh JA, Wells GA, Christensen R, Tanjong Ghogomu E, Maxwell L, MacDonald JK, et al. Adverse effects of

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright $\ensuremath{\textcircled{O}}$ 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

biologics: a network meta-analysis and Cochrane overview. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011, Issue 2. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD008794.pub2]

Singh 2012

Singh JA, Furst DE, Bharat A, Curtis JR, Kavanaugh AF, Kremer JM, et al. 2012 update of the 2008 American College of Rheumatology recommendations for the use of disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs and biologic agents in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis Care and Research* 2012;**64**:625–39.

Smolen 2010

Smolen JS, Aletaha D, Bijlsma JW, Breedveld FC, Boumpas D, Burmester G, et al. Treating rheumatoid arthritis to target: recommendations of an international task force. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2010;**69**:631–7.

Smolen 2014

Smolen JS, Landewé R, Breedveld FC, Buch M, Burmester G, Dougados M, et al. EULAR recommendations for the management of rheumatoid arthritis with synthetic and biological disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs: 2013 update. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2014;**73**(3): 492–509.

Thompson 1999

Thompson SG, Sharp SJ. Explaining heterogeneity in metaanalysis: a comparison of methods. *Statistics in Medicine* 1999;**18**:2693–708.

Tureson 2013

Turesson C. Extra-articular rheumatoid arthritis. *Current Opinion in Rheumatology* 2013;23:360-6.

Ward 2014

Ward MM, Guthrie LC, Alba MI. Clinically important changes in individual and composite measures of rheumatoid arthritis activity: thresholds applicable in clinical trials. Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases 2014 May 1:DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis–2013-205079. [DOI: 10.1136/ annrheumdis-2013-205079; PUBMED: 24794149]

Wong 2006a

Wong SS, Wilczynski NL, Haynes RB. Developing optimal search strategies for detecting clinically sound treatment studies in EMBASE. *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 2006;**94**:41–7.

Wong 2006b

Wong SS, Wilczynski NL, Haynes RB. Optimal CINAHL search strategies for identifying therapy studies and review articles. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* 2006;**38**:194–9.

Yee 2003

Yee CS, Filer A, Pace A, Douglas K, Situnayake D, Rowe IF. West Midlands Rheumatology Services and Training Committee. The prevalence of patients with rheumatoid arthritis in the West Midlands fulfilling the BSR criteria for anti-tumour necrosis factor therapy: an out-patient study. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2003;**42**:856–9.

Young 2000

Young A, Dixey J, Cox N, Davies P, Devlin J, Emery P, et al. How does functional disability in early rheumatoid arthritis affect patients and their lives? Results of 5 years of follow-up in 732 patients from the early RA study (ERAS). *Rheumatology* 2000;**39**:603–11.

Young 2007

Young A, Koduri G, Batley M, Kulinskaya E, Gough A, Norton S, et al. Mortality in rheumatoid arthritis. Increased in the early course of disease, in ischaemic heart disease and in pulmonary fibrosis. *Rheumatology* 2007;**46**:350–7.

Yusuf 1991

Yusuf S, Wittes J, Probstfield J, Tyroler HA. Analysis and interpretation of treatment effects in subgroups of patients in randomized clinical trials. *Journal American Medical Association* 1991;**266**:93–8.

References to other published versions of this review

Ruiz Garcia 2011

Ruiz Garcia V, Jobanputra P, Burls A, Cabello JB, Gálvez Muñoz JG, Saiz Cuenca ESC, Fry-Smith A. Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011, Issue 2. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007649.pub2]

* Indicates the major publication for the study

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES

Characteristics of included studies [ordered by study ID]

CDP870-004 2001

Methods	Double-blind, multiple dose, 12-week, placebo-controlled dose-ranging study
Participants	326 subjects with a history of inadequate response or intolerance to at least one DMARD and active RA at screening
Interventions	Patients received placebo, 50, 100, 200, 400, 600 and 800 mg sc q4w in two dose groups, panel 1 and panel 2
Outcomes	ACR20, ACR50, ACR70, subset of the ACR criterion, DAS responder rates at week 12 Follow-up 12 weeks
Notes	We only have data from ACR20 at week 12 Funding sources: no data Conflict of interest: no data

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	UCB reported: "Randomized code gener- ated by Pharmaceutical Packaging Service and based on instruction of the randomi- sation procedure prepared by Celltech R& D statistic"
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	UCB reported: "Patients were randomly assigned to treatment groups during the DB phase (week 0_12) and received either placebo or CDP-870 SC"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	High risk	UCB reported as blinded but they ex- plained to us: "CPD-870 and the placebo utilized in this study (saline) did not have the same viscosity therefore full blinding was not possible. Study drug was to be pre- pared by a pharmacist having no other in- volvement in the study; injections of study medications were given by a nurse or physi- cian who had no other involvement in the study"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	See above

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Risk of bias

CDP870-004 2001 (Continued)

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	High risk	Data were not available
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	Data were not available
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Efficacy was defined as ACR improvement in disease activity at week 12 and was de- scribed
Other bias	Unclear risk	There were so few data that was impossible to judge it
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	See above
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	See above

CDP870-014 2009

Methods	Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial
Participants	Patients with rheumatoid arthritis (RA) who are partial responders to MTX. RA defined by the ACR classification criteria who had received MTX for ≥ 6 months (with at a stable dose of ≥ 15 mg/week) before baseline were included. At inclusion, patients had to have active disease as defined by: Active disease was defined as ≥ 9 tender and 9 swollen joints at screening and at baseline, with either an erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR; Westergen) ≥ 30 mm/hour or a C-reactive protein (CRP) level ≥ 15 mg/litre. Other DMARDs had to be discontinued at least 28 days before baseline or five half- lives, whatever longer, prior to first dose of study drug. We do not have more exclusion criteria in the files reported from UCB but probably were similar to another Phase III trial It was a 24 weeks, phase III, double-blind, randomised, multicenter, placebo-controlled study. 250 patients were randomised to one of two regimens of subcutaneous cer- tolizumab pegol 400 mg or placebo sc every 4 weeks for a total of 6 injections. Methotrex- ate treatment continue during the study taken prior to enrolment in the study. Subjects who completed the current study or who withdrew on or after the Week 12 visit were eligible to participate in the open-label safety study (CDP870-015) The primary objective of this study was to compare the efficacy of certolizumab pegol (CDP870 or CZP) in combination with methotrexate (MTX) to MTX alone in treating the signs and symptoms of subjects with rheumatoid arthritis (RA) who are partial responders to MTX. The study included 250 patients aged over 18 years with RA. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were identical to RAPID1, but were discontinued all DMARD at least 28 days or five half-lives, whatever longer, prior to first dose of study drug. The primary endpoint was ACR20 response at week 24 and safety. Secondary

CDP870-014 2009 (Continued)

	efficacy endpoints at week 24 included ACR50, ACR70
Interventions	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg plus MTX or placebo sc plus MTX every 4 weeks for a total of 6 injections
Outcomes	Primary: ACR20 and safety at 24 weeks. Secondary endpoints: Subject's assessment of pain (VAS), Subject's global assessment of arthritis, Physician's global assessment of arthritis, Subject's assessment of physical function by Health Assessment Questionnaire - disability index (HAQ-DI), acute phase reactant value (only CRP for this study) Follow-up 24 weeks
Notes	NCT00544154. Clinical study summary provided by UCB Funding sources : UCB Conflict of interest : J.V. was a speaker at the meeting organized by UCB and is a member of a UCB advisory board. E.C. has received grants/research support from Ab- bott Laboratories, Allergan, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chelsea Therapeutics, GSK, Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Merrimack Pharmaceutical, MSD, Pfizer, Pierre Fabre Medicament, Roche, Chugai and Wyeth and UCB Pharma. E.C. has also received consultancy fees from Abbott Laboratories, Allergan, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chelsea Therapeutics, Eli Lilly, GSK, Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Merrimack Pharmaceutical, MSD, Pfizer, Pierre Fabre Medicament, Roche, Schering Plough, Synovate, Chugai, MedImmune and Wyeth and UCB Pharma. E.C. is a member of a Speaker's Bureau for Abbott Laboratories, Aller- gan, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chelsea Therapeutics, Eli Lilly, GSK, Jazz Pharmaceutical, MSD, Pfizer, Pierre Fabre Medicament, Roche, Schering Plough, Chugai and Wyeth and UCB Pharma. B.V. is a UCB Pharma employee and has been granted UCB Pharma stock appreciation rights. N.G. is a former employee of UCB Pharma, and is currently an employee of Array Biopharma, Inc. N.G. owns UCB Pharma stock. O.D. is an employee of UCB Pharma and holds stock options. R.A. has received research grants from Abbott, BMS, Merck Pharma GmbH, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche and UCB Pharma. R.A. is a member of a speaker's bureau for Abbott Laboratories, BMS, Horizon Pharma, Merck Pharma GmbH, Novartis, Roche, and has received consulting fees from Abbott Laboratories, Horizon Pharma, Merck Pharma GmbH, Novartis and Roche. R.A. has held non-remunerative positions of influence for Abbott Laboratories, BMS, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation and Roche. All other authors have declared no conflicts of interest

Risk of bias		Risk of bias	
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	The randomisation code was generated by an independent group following instruc- tion of the randomisation procedures, pre- pared by the project statistician (EMEA re- port for the Phase III trial)	
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Via Interactive voice recognition system (IVRS)	

CDP870-014 2009	(Continued)
-----------------	-------------

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	Low risk	UCB explained us that: "All the study staff with the exception of the unblinded dis- penser, was blind to the treatment". "Each study center was required to have a written blinding plan in place signed by the prin- cipal investigator, which detailed the study center's steps for ensuring that the double blind nature of the study was maintained"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	High risk	Full account of all withdrawals and reasons for withdrawals 77.8% of certolizumab pegol group and 53.7% of placebo completed 6 months of treatment. Missing data were imputed for analysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 6 months in the treat- ment group
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Analysis per protocol for HAQ and safety, quote: "Of the 247 patients randomised, 124 patients in the CZP plus MTX group (98%) and 119 in the placebo plus MTX group (98%) received at least one injection (243 total)"
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All the pre-specified outcomes were studied
Other bias	Low risk	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph. "To preserve the blind to clinical research staff, the study site pharmacist labelled clinical supplies (study medication syringes), and a sorbitol placebo was used to match the viscosity of CZP"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph

CERTAIN 2008

Methods	A phase IIIB, multi-centre, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel group study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of certolizumab pegol, administered with DMARD
Participants	Patients with low to moderate disease activity rheumatoid arthritis on DMARDs therapy for at least six months
Interventions	Two 200 mg subcutaneous injections at Week 0, Week 2, and Week 4 followed by 200 mg injections every 2 weeks until the last drug administration (Week 22) versus placebo
Outcomes	Investigation of certolizumab pegol clinical efficacy in achieving clinical remission in patients with moderate to low disease activity rheumatoid arthritis both week 20 and week 24 Follow-up 24 weeks
Notes	http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00674362?term=NCT00674362&rank=1 Funding sources: UCB Conflict of interest: This study is not published. Despite this, paragraph was on the web, "Principal Investigators are NOT employed by the organization sponsoring the study"

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Well done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Allocation by IVRS; so done remotely and therefore concealment satisfactory
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	Low risk	UCB stated: "All the study staff with the exception of the unblinded dispenser, was blind to the treatment. Each study center was required to have a written blinding plan in place signed by the principal investigator, which detailed the study center's steps for ensuring that the double blind nature of the study was maintained"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	Low risk	Full account of all withdrawals and reasons for withdrawals 87.5% of certolizumab pegol group and 81% of placebo completed 6 months of treatment. Missing data were imputed for analysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to >

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review) Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

37

Risk of bias

CERTAIN 2008 (Continued)

		20% dropout rate at 6 months in the treat- ment group
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	85% in SF-36, 84% in Pain VAS, and 94% in HAQ of certolizumab pegol group com- pleted 24 months of treatment. Missing data were imputed for analysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 24 months in the treatment group ITT in safety analysis
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All the pre-specified outcomes were studied
Other bias	Low risk	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"Subject, caregiver, investigator and out- come assessor"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"Subject, caregiver, investigator and out- come assessor"

Choy 2002

Methods	Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial
Participants	36 patients with rheumatoid arthritis defined by the American College for Rheumatology (ACR) classification criteria. Patients with active diseased defined as having 3 or the following 4 criteria: tender joint count (TJC) \geq 6, swollen joint count (SJC) \geq 3 (based on 28 joint counts), morning stiffness of \geq 45 minutes, and ESR \geq 28 mm/H. Patients had to have failed treatment with at least one DMARD and have been off treatment for at least 4 weeks
Interventions	Ascending-dose group study of a single intravenous infusion of placebo ($n = 12$) or 1, 5 or 20 mg/kg of certolizumab pegol (each $n = 8$) for 8 weeks
Outcomes	ACR20, ACR50, ACR70, Pain score (0-10 cm), Disease Activity Score (DAS), TJC, SJC, Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ), C-reactive protein (CRP) Follow-up 8 weeks
Notes	This study was only considered to assess safety because follow-up was less than 8 weeks Following the blinded dosing period of 8 weeks, 32 patients received a single open-label infusion of either 5 or 20 mg/kg of certolizumab pegol In the open phase, one patient who received 20 mg/kg died from complications following rapid drainage of a large, chronic rheumatoid pericardial effusion. No infective agent was isolated from either the pericardial fluid or peripheral blood. In the opinion of the

investigator, this event was unrelated to treatment Funding sources: no stated, but UCB had all the data and sent us details of how was
done Conflict of interest: One author, DA Isenberg, worked for Celltech Research and Development, Slough, UK

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Patients were divided into 4 groups. In each group of 12 patients 8 received active treat- ment and 4 received placebo. UCB explain to us: "Methods for sequence generation was randomised, DB, sequential ascending dose"
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Central allocation
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	Low risk	The study was blinded and UCB explained to us: "all data were entered and Database locked after completion of the clinical phase for the first study period and be- fore ESR and CRP were entered into the database. ESR and CRP data were with- held from investigator and sponsor study personal during the course of the study be- cause knowledge of patient's profile could potentially unblind the study, auto AB, anti CZP level, TNFalpha, IL6 and IL1b were transferred into the database after DB lock"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	Low risk	Reasons for withdrawals were disclosed 92% of certolizumab pegol group and 50% of placebo completed 8 weeks of treatment. Missing data were imputed for analysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 8 weeks in the treatment group
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Safety analysis was also imputing missing data

Choy 2002 (Continued)

Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All the outcomes were available in the clin- ical study report as figures
Other bias	Low risk	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	UCB explained to us: " the study pharma- cist prepared for infusion the study medi- cation and diluent, the pharmacy covered the solution with an opaque material and labelled it with "130mL CDP870 Engi- neered Fab' Conjugated to PEG or sodium acetate placebo diluent" "For IV use only", administration details, the patient number, patient initials, date and time to use the medication by and name of investigator."
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above

FAST4WARD 2005

Methods	Randomised double-blind trial	
Participants	220 patients aged between 18 and 75 years and with RA defined by the ACR classification criteria who had previously failed at least one disease modifying anti-rheumatic drug (DMARD) were included. Patients previously treated with a TNF inhibitor were excluded. Patients had to have a TJC of \geq 9 (out of 68), SJC of \geq 9 (out of 66) and one of the following: morning stiffness of \geq 45 minutes; ESR \geq 28 mm/H; or CRP > 10 mg/L. Patients with a previous history of a serious or life threatening infection were excluded. Patients with a history of tuberculosis (TB), or evidence of TB on a chest radiograph, or those with a positive reaction to purified protein derivative (PPD) reaction were also excluded. Patients on concurrent corticosteroids were allowed entry provided the dose was the equivalent of 10 mg or less of prednisolone. Parenteral corticosteroids were not permitted	
Interventions	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc every four weeks (n=111) or placebo (n=109) for 24 weeks	
Outcomes	ACR20, 50, 70, HAQ-DI, Pain (VAS) and modified Brief Pain Inventory (mBPI), DAS- 28, fatigue, and SF-36 Follow-up 24 weeks	
Notes	CPD870 011 Funding sources: UCB Conflict of interest: JV has received a fee from UCB for speaking at a National Congress; RFvV has received consulting fees from UCB; DB has received	

FAST4WARD 2005 (Continued)

reimbursement from UCB for attending a symposium and funds for research; JB has received reimbursement from UCB for attending a symposium and funds for research; GC is a full time employee of and holds stocks in UCB; AI is a full time employee at UCB and has shares in the company; NG is a full time employee of UCB and has shares and stock options in the company; VS has worked as an independent biopharmaceutical consultant in clinical development and regulatory affairs since September 1991 and is currently a consultant to various companies, but has not and does not now hold stock in any company. RF has received consulting fees and funds for clinical research from UCB

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Code list prepared by independent group
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Via interactive voice mail response (IVRS)
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	Low risk	UCB stated: "All the study staff with the exception of the unblinded dispenser, was blind to the treat- ment". "Each study center was required to have a writ- ten blinding plan in place signed by the principal in- vestigator, which detailed the study center's steps for ensuring that the double blind nature of the study was maintained"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	High risk	68.5% of certolizumab pegol group and $25.7%$ of placebo completed 6 months of treatment. Missing data were imputed for analysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 6 months in the treatment group
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	Full account of all withdrawals and reasons for with- drawals Quote: "All efficacy analyses were performed on the modified intent to treat (mITT) population (all ran- domised patients who had taken >1 dose of study med- ication). The actual number of subjects in the sum- maries varies slightly from the mITT numbers due to non-imputable missing data for each parameter. For the primary analysis, patients were considered "re- sponders" if they achieved an ACR20 response vs base- line at week 24. Patients who withdrew for any reason were considered non responders." The safety analysis was based on the last observation

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

FAST4WARD 2005 (Continued)

		carried forward approach
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All the outcomes were available
Other bias	Low risk	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph

NCT00791921 HIKARI

Methods	Treatment, randomised, double-blind	
Participants	 Inclusion criteria: Subjects must have a diagnosis of adult-onset RA of at least 6 months but not longer than 15 years in duration as defined by the 1987 American College of Rheumatology classification criteria Subjects must have active RA disease as defined by:At least 6 tender joints and 6 swollen jointsESR of 28 mm/hour or CRP of 2.0 mg/dL Subjects who have failed to respond or have been resistant to at least one DMARD (including MTX) Subjects in whom MTX cannot be administered for any of the reasons (incomplete response/safety concerns Exclusion criteria: Patients who have a diagnosis of any other inflammatory arthritisPatients who have a secondary, non-inflammatory type of arthritis (e.g., osteoarthritis, fibromyalgia) Patients who currently have, or who have a history of, a demyelinating or convulsive disease of the central nervous system (e.g., multiple sclerosis, epilepsy) Patients who ave a high risk of infection (with a current infectious disease, a chronic infectious disease, a history of serious infectious disease) Patients who are breastfeeding or pregnant, who are of childbearing potential Patients who previously received treatment with 1 or more anti-TNFα drugs or who previously failed to respond to treatment with 1 or more anti-TNFα drugs Less than 10 % of the patients were exposed to a previous a TNF with a wash-out period of minimum of 3 months for etanercept or 6 months for other biologics 	
Interventions	Patients received induction doses of 400 mg in weeks 0, 2 and 4 and thereafter 200mg CDP870 given every 2 weeks until week 22 subcutaneously versus placebo	

NCT00791921 HIKARI (Continued)

Outcomes	Primary outcome ACR20 at week 12; Secondary outcome ACR20 at week 24 Follow-up 24 weeks
Notes	http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00791921?term=00791921&rank=1 Funding sources: Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. and UCB Japan Conflict of interest: This study is already not published. Despite these paragraphs were in the web: "Principal Investigators are NOT employed by the organization sponsoring the study. There is NOT an agreement between Principal Investigators and the Sponsor (or its agents) that restricts the PI's rights to discuss or publish trial results after the trial is completed"

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	External central of randomisation. Randomiza- tion by blocks
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	The allocation sequence was generate using uniform random numbers from SAS RANUNI function
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	Low risk	"All study staff with the exception of the un- blinded dispenser were blind to the treatment, . These unblinded personnel were not allowed to engage in any other study activities"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	High risk	71% of certolizumab pegol group and 15% of placebo completed 6 months of treatment. Missing data were imputed for analysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 6 months in the treatment group
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Full account of all withdrawals and reasons for withdrawals ITT analysis. Quote: "Of the 230 subjects in the Full Analysis Set (FAS), 230 are included in the adverse event reporting based upon the Safety Set (SS) population. The Safety Set in- cludes all subjects randomised who received at least 1 dosing"
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	The study protocol is available and all of the study's pre-specified (primary and secondary)

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review) Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Risk of bias

NCT00791921 HIKARI (Continued)

		outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specified way
Other bias	Low risk	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Without any details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above

NCT00791999 JRAPID

Methods	Treatment, randomised, double-blind (subject, caregiver, investigator, outcomes assessor) , dose comparison, parallel assignment, safety/efficacy study
Participants	
Interventions	Drug: CDP870 400mg Drug: CDP870 200mg Drug: CDP870 100mg Drug: placebo of CDP870
Outcomes	Primary outcome measures: ACR20 responder rate (Time Frame: Week 12, 24) (Designated as safety issue: Yes) Secondary outcome measures: ACR20/50/70 responder rate (Time Frame: Week 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16, 20, 24) DAS-28 (ESR) (Time Frame: Week 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16, 20, 24) Modified Total Sharp Score (Time Frame: Week 24) Follow-up 24 weeks
Notes	http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00791999?term=NCT00791999&rank=1 Funding sources: Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd; UCB Japan Co. Ltd Conflict of interest: "Principal Investigators are NOT employed by the organization sponsoring the study". "There is NOT an agreement between Principal Investigators and the Sponsor (or its agents) that restricts the PI's rights to discuss or publish trial results after the trial is completed"
Risk of bias	Ri

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	External central of randomisation. Ran- domization by blocks

NCT00791999 JRAPID (Continued)

Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	The allocation sequence was generate using uniform random numbers from SAS RA- NUNI function
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	Low risk	"All study staff with the exception of the unblinded dispenser were blind to the treat- ment, These unblinded personnel were not allowed to engage in any other study activities"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	High risk	66% of certolizumab pegol 100 mg, 80% of certolizumab pegol 200 mg and 76% of certolizumab pegol 400 mg group (overall 74% in certolizumab pegol groups) and 32% of placebo completed 6 months of treatment. Missing data were imputed for analysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 6 months in the treatment group
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Safety, quote: "Of the 316 subjects in the Full Analysis Set (FAS), 316 are included in the adverse event reporting based upon the Safety Set (SS) population. The Safety Set includes all subjects randomised who received at least 1 dosing"
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Subjects were recruited in Japan between 2008 and 2010. In 2008, DAS28 (ESR) and Modified Total Sharp Score were sec- ondary outcomes. In 2012 these outcomes were deleted from http://clinicaltrials.gov/ ct2/show/record/NCT00791999? term=NCT00791999&rank=1& sect=X0125
Other bias	Low risk	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	No details available

NCT00791999 JRAPID (Continued)

Blinding of outcome assessment (detection	Low risk	See above
bias)		
All outcomes		

NCT00993317

Methods	Treatment, randomised, double-blind (subject, investigator, outcomes assessor), placebo- controlled, parallel assignment, safety/efficacy study
Participants	Adult-onset RA of at least 6 months but not longer than 15 years in duration as defined by the 1987 ARA criteria, with active disease
Interventions	Drug: CDP870 200mg, 400mg CDP870 given at Week 0, 2, 4 and thereafter 200mg CDP870 given every 2 weeks until week 22 (sc) plus MTX versus placebo plus MTX with the same intervention
Outcomes	ACR20 responder rate Follow-up 24 weeks
Notes	See http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT00993317 Funding sources: Korea Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co Ltd Conflict of interest: "Principal Investigators are NOT employed by the organization sponsoring the study". "There is NOT an agreement between Principal Investigators and the Sponsor (or its agents) that restricts the PI's rights to discuss or publish trial results after the trial is completed"

Risk of bias

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	External central randomisation
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	The allocation sequence was generate using uniform random numbers from SAS RA- NUNI function
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	Low risk	"All study staff with the exception of the unblinded dispenser were blind to the treat- ment, These unblinded personnel were not allowed to engage in any other study activities"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above

NCT00993317 (Continued)

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	High risk	70% of certolizumab pegol group and 50% of placebo completed 6 months of treat- ment. Missing data were imputed for anal- ysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 6 months in the treat- ment group
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Full account of all withdrawals and reasons for withdrawals Raw data Per protocol analysis in change in (HAQ- DI) 95% of certolizumab pegol group and 95% of placebo were imputed for analysis Safety: ITT Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 24 months in the treatment group
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	The study protocol is available and all of the study's pre-specified (primary and sec- ondary) outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-spec- ified way
Other bias	Low risk	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above

RAPID1 2005

Methods	Randomised double-blind trial
Participants	982 patients aged over 18 years and with RA defined by the ACR classification criteria who had received MTX for ≥ 6 months (with at a stable dose of ≥ 10 mg/week for at least 2 months) before baseline were included. Patients with a disease duration of >15 years were excluded. Patients previously treated with a TNF inhibitor were also excluded if they had previously failed to respond to treatment. Other DMARDs had to be discontinued at least 28 days before baseline. At inclusion, patients had to have active disease as defined by: Active disease was defined as ≥ 9 tender and 9 swollen joints at screening and at baseline, with either an erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR; Westergen) ≥ 30 mm/hour or a C-reactive protein (CRP) level ≥ 15 mg/L

RAPID1 2005 (Continued)

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement		
Risk of bias			Risk of bias	
Notes	Patients with a history of tubere tuberculosis or those with a positi were also excluded Funding sources: UCB Conflict of interest: Dr. Keyston honoraria from Abbott, Amgen, Plough, and Bristol-Myers Squibt ceived consulting fees, speaking f UCB, Roche, Schering-Plough, a Landewe' has received consultin Amgen, Bristol-Myers Squibb, C \$10,000 each). Dr. van Vollenh or honoraria from UCB (more th speaking fees, and/or honoraria Dohme, Roche, Schering, UCB received consulting fees from UC fees (her primary source of incom Pharma, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Ba Cypress Bioscience, Dianippon Sumitomo, Euro-Diagnostica, Genome Sciences, Idera, Incyte, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Noxxo ter & Gamble, Rigel, RiGEN, R SKK, UCB, VLST, Wyeth, XDx receives fees as a member of the ac Bristol-Myers Squibb, Can-Fite, Idera, Incyte, Jazz, Novartis, Pfi UCB, XDx, and Wyeth (less than speaking fees, and/or honoraria or stock options in UCB	Patients with a history of tuberculosis or a chest radiograph showing active or later tuberculosis or those with a positive reaction to purified protein derivative (PPD) reaction were also excluded Funding sources: UCB Conflict of interest: Dr. Keystone has received consulting fees, speaking fees, and/o honoraria from Abbott, Amgen, Wyeth, Centocor, UCB, Roche, Genentech, Schering Plough, and Bristol-Myers Squibb (less than \$10,000 each). Dr. van der Heijde has re ceived consulting fees, speaking fees, and/or honoraria from Abbott, Amgen, Centoco UCB, Roche, Schering-Plough, and Bristol-Myers Squibb (less than \$10,000 each). D Landewe' has received consulting fees, speaking fees, and/or honoraria from Abbott Amgen, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Centocor, Schering-Plough, UCB, and Wyeth (less tha \$10,000 each). Dr. van Vollenhoven has received consulting fees, speaking fees, and or honoraria from UCB (more than \$10,000). Dr. Combe has received consulting fees speaking fees, and/or honoraria from Abbott, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Merck, Sharp, & Dohme, Roche, Schering, UCB, and Wyeth (less than \$10,000 each). Dr. Emery ha received consulting fees from UCB (less than \$10,000). Dr. Strand receives consulting fees (her primary source of income) from Abbott Immunology, Allergan, Almirall, A Pharma, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bayhill, Bexel, Biogen Idec, Can-Fite, Centocor, Chelse Cypress Bioscience, Dianippon Sumitomo, Euro-Diagnostica, FibroGen, Forest, Genelabs, Genentech, Huma Genome Sciences, Idera, Incyte, Jazz, Lexicon Genetics Lux Biosciences, Merck Serono Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Noxxon Pharma, Nuon, Ono Pharmaceutical, Pfizer, Proc ter & Gamble, Rigel, RiGEN, Roche, Sanofi-Aventis, Savient, Schering-Plough, Scio SKK, UCB, VLST, Wyeth, XDx, and Zelos Therapeutics (less than \$10,000 each) an receives fees as a member of the advisory board for Abbott, Amgen, Biogen Idec, Bioseel Bristol-Myers Squibb, Can-Fite, Centocor, Chelsea, Cypress, Euro-Diagnostica, Fores Idera, Incyte, Jazz, Novariis, Pfizer, Rigel, RiGEN, Roche, Savient, S		
Outcomes	Co-primary endpoints were the <i>A</i> in the modified Total Sharp Sco change from baseline in modified in the disability Index (DI) of the and 52, the ACR20 responder ra rates at weeks 24 and 52 Follow-up 24-52 weeks	Co-primary endpoints were the ACR20 at week 24 and the mean change from baseline in the modified Total Sharp Score at week 52. Major secondary end points were: the change from baseline in modified Total Sharp Score at week 24, the change from baseline in the disability Index (DI) of the Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ) at weeks 24 and 52, the ACR20 responder rate at week 52, and the ACR50 and ACR70 responder rates at weeks 24 and 52 Follow-up 24-52 weeks		
Interventions	982 patients were randomised 2:2 pegol at an initial dosage of 400 r of 200 mg or 400 mg given ever	982 patients were randomised 2:2:1 to receive treatment with subcutaneous certolizumab pegol at an initial dosage of 400 mg given at weeks 0, 2, and 4, with a subsequent dosage of 200 mg or 400 mg given every 2 weeks, plus MTX, or placebo plus MTX		

RAPID1 2005 (Continued)

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Code list prepared by independent group
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Interactive voice recognition system (IVRS) used to allocate patient to treatment group (2:2:1 ratio)
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	Low risk	UCB stated: "All the study staff with the exception of the unblinded dispenser, was blind to the treatment. Each study center was required to have a written blind- ing plan in place signed by the principal investigator, which detailed the study center's steps for ensuring that the double blind nature of the study was main- tained"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	High risk	65% of certolizumab 200 mg and 70.3% certolizumab 400 mg of group and 22% of placebo completed 12 months of treatment. Missing data were imputed for analysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 12 months in the treatment group
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Full account of all withdrawals and reasons for with- drawals HAQ, quote: "Analyses were performed using the last observation carried forward (LOCF) method for im- putation of missing scores in the total ITT population and the actual scores (observed) in those who with- drew at week 16" Safety: ITT analysis
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All the outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specified way
Other bias	Low risk	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph

RAPID2 2007

Methods	Randomised double-blind trial
Participants	619 patients aged over 18 years and with RA of at least 6 months and defined by the ACR classification criteria who had received MTX for \geq 6 months with at a stable dose of \geq 10 mg/week for at least 2 months before baseline were included. Patients with a disease duration of > 15 years were excluded. At inclusion, patients had to have active disease as defined by: TJC and SJC of \geq 9, ESR \geq 30 mm/H, and a CRP of \geq 15 mg/L. Patients previously treated with a TNF inhibitor were also excluded if they had previously failed to respond to treatment
Interventions	Patients were randomised 2:2:1 to one of two regimens of subcutaneous liquid cer- tolizumab pegol (400 mg at weeks 0, 2 and 4, followed by 200 or 400 mg every 2 weeks) plus MTX, or placebo (saline) plus MTX
Outcomes	The primary endpoint was ACR20 response at week 24, and physician's global assess- ment of disease activity, patient's assessment of pain, Health Assessment Questionnaire- Disability Index (HAQ-DI) and serum CRP or ESR Secondary efficacy endpoints at week 24 included ACR50, ACR70, mean change from baseline in van der Heijde modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS), Short Form-36 (SF-36) Health Survey, and individual ACR core set variables. Disease activity was assessed using the Disease Activity Score 28-joint assessment 4 (DAS-28 (ESR) Follow-up 24 weeks
Notes	Patients who did not show an ACR20 response at both weeks 12 and 14 were to be withdrawn from the study, designated ACR20 non-responders in the primary analysis and allowed to enter an open-label extension study at week 16 with certolizumab pegol 400 mg every 2 weeks Patients with history of, or positive chest x-ray findings for, tuberculosis, or a positive pu- rified protein derivative (PPD) skin test (defined as positive indurations per local medical practice) were excluded. As per protocol, if a positive PPD skin test was assumed by the local investigators to be related to previous bacille Calmette-Guerin (BCG) vaccination and was not associated with clinical or radiographic suspicion of tuberculosis, patients could be enrolled at the discretion of the investigator. In total, 101 patients (16%) were enrolled with a PPD test > 5 mm at baseline Funding sources: UCB Conflict of interest: J Smolen, R B Landewé, P Mease, RF van Vollenhoven, A Ka- vanaugh, M Schiff, GR Burmester, V Strand and D van der Heijde serve as consultants to UCB, Inc. RB Landewé, A Kavanaugh, M Schiff and D van der Heijde receive research funding from UCB, Inc and GR Burmester and J Vencovsky have received honorarium from UCB, Inc for speaking. D Mason and K Luijtens are employees of UCB, Inc. J Brzezicki has nothing to disclose
Risk of bias	

5		

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Code list prepared by independent group

RAPID2 2007 (Continued)

Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Interactive voice recognition system (IVRS) used to allocate patient to treatment group (2:2:1 ratio)
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	Low risk	UCB stated: "All the study staff with the exception of the unblinded dispenser, was blind to the treatment. Each study center was required to have a written blind- ing plan in place signed by the principal investigator, which detailed the study center's steps for ensuring that the double blind nature of the study was main- tained"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	High risk	71% and 74% of certolizumab pegol 200 mg and certolizumab pegol 400 mg respectively and 13% of placebo completed 6 months of treatment. Missing data were imputed for analysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 6 months in the treatment group
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Full account of all withdrawals and reasons for with- drawals Safety: ITT analysis. Quote: "two patients in the placebo group received certolizumab pegol 200 mg and were included in the certolizumab pegol 200 mg group for safety evaluations"
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All the outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specified way
Other bias	Low risk	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Radiographs were read centrally and blinded (for treat- ment, visit and patient identification) and indepen- dently by two experienced readers

REALISTIC 2008

Methods	Treatment, randomised, double-blind (subject, outcomes assessor), parallel assignment, safety/efficacy study			
Participants	Patients with established adult patients with moderate-to-severe rheumatoid arthritis			
Interventions	400 mg CZP given as two 200 mg subcutaneous (sc) injections at Weeks 0, 2, and 4, followed by 200 mg CZP given as 1 sc injection on Weeks 6, 8, and 10. At Week 12 subjects enter the open-label phase and receive 200 mg of CZP every other week for a minimum 16 additional weeks until CZP is commercially available versus placebo (0.9% saline) given as 2 subcutaneous (sc) injections at Weeks 0, 2, and 4, followed by placebo given as 1 sc injection on Weeks 6, 8, and 10. At Week 12 subjects enter the open-label phase and receive 200 mg of CZP every other week for a minimum 16 additional weeks until CZP is commercially available.			
Outcomes	To assess the clinical responses rate as measured by ACR20 response rate Week 12. Other outcomes: responder rate, disease activity, fatigue, physical functioning. In the group remaining in the study after week 12: responder rate, disease activity, fatigue, physical functioning. (Time Frame: Week 12 and every 8 weeks thereafter, until study completion) Follow-up 12 weeks			
Notes	http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/results/NCT00717236? term=NCT00717236& rank=1 Funding sources: UCB Conflict of interest: "Principal Investigators are NOT employed by the organization sponsoring the study.". "There IS an agreement between Principal Investigators and the Sponsor (or its agents) that restricts the PI's rights to discuss or publish trial results after the trial is completed." "Restriction Description: UCB has > 60 but <= 180 days to review results communications prior to public release and may delete information that is confidential and compromises ongoing studies or is considered proprietary. This restric- tion is not intended to compromise the objective scientific integrity of the manuscript, it being understood that the results shall be published regardless of outcome"			

Risk of bias

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	"Patients were randomised 4:1 via an inter- active voice response system"
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"Patients were randomised 4:1 via an inter- active voice response system"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) ACR50	Low risk	Blinding of participants and key study per- sonnel ensured, and unlikely that the blind- ing could have been broken. UCB ex- plained us that: "All the study staff with the exception of the unblinded dispenser, was blind to the treatment". "Each study center

REALISTIC 2008 (Continued)

		was required to have a written blinding plan in place signed by the principal investiga- tor, which detailed the study center's steps for ensuring that the double blind nature of the study was maintained"
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	See above paragraph
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) ACR50	Low risk	90% of certolizumab pegol group and 86% of placebo completed 12 weeks of treat- ment. Missing data were imputed for anal- ysis. Judged at high risk of bias due to > 20% dropout rate at 12 weeks in the treat- ment group
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Full account of all withdrawals and reasons for withdrawals ITT analysis for efficacy outcomes but per protocol analysis in safety: 9 patients less in arm of certolizumab pegol and 3 patients less in placebo group
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All the outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-spec- ified way
Other bias	Low risk	The study appears to be free of other sources of bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Despite blinding is not described, Blinding of participants and key study personnel en- sured, and unlikely that the blinding could have been broken
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Blinding of participants and key study per- sonnel ensured, and unlikely that the blind- ing could have been broken

Choy's study didn't show number of patients in each arm, mean age (SD), percentage of females, previous DMARD, on steroids, on NSAIDs; and DAS was reported as mean change from baseline without SD.

Characteristics of excluded studies [ordered by study ID]

Study	Reason for exclusion
Aaltonen 2012	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Alten 2013	OLE
Andreakos 2003	Different drug/agent studied
Anonymous 2003	Review; different drug/agent studied
Audrey 2010	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Bain 2003	Different drug/agent studied
Bansback 2005	Different drug/agent studied
Barnes 2007	Review
Baugh 2001	Review
Bayes M 2006	Review
Chang 2006	Different drug/agent studied
Chikanza 2000a	Review in children
Chikanza 2000b	Review
Deeks 2013	Review
Dose Flex 2007	Is a RCT that tested clinical efficacy of two dosing regimes of CZP (200 mg Q2W or 400 mg Q4W + MTX) compared to MTX alone for maintenance of clinical response up to 34 weeks in patients who have achieved ACR20 after a 16 week open-label run-in period of CZP treatment (CZP 200 mg Q2W + MTX). Reason for exclusion is that patients are not with active disease at the moment of randomisation and so is a criterion of out
Evans 2003	Different drug/agent studied
Fanet-Goguet 2004	Review
Fleischmann 2005	Review
Fleischmann 2013	Open-label extension study (OLE)
Gabay 2002	Review
Garber 2005	Different drug/agent studied

(Continued)

Genovese 2005	Review
Goldblatt 2005	Review
Graninger 2002	Different drug/agent studied
Ingham 2010	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Janssen 2012	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Kathmann 2005	Review
Kaushik 2005	Review
Kavanaugh 2013	Open-label extension study (OLE)
Kavanaugh A	Assessed in RAPID1 and RAPID2, a work productivity survey (WPS-RA)
Keystone 2013	Open-label extension
Keystone 2013a	Open-label extension (OLE)
Kochbati 2004	Review
Launois 2011	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Launois 2011a	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Le 2010	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Le 2012	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
LE Blay P	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Lopez-Olivo 2012	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Mealy 2005	Different drug/agent studied
Mok 2004	Review
Moulis 2012	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Mount 2005	Review
NCT00160641	Just one simple group
NCT00160693	Is an OLE with just one simple group

(Continued)

NCT00175877	Just one simple group
NCT00753454	One simple group
NCT00843778	Just one simple group
NCT00993668	Excluded because adverse events were studied in the blinded period just at 4 weeks
Osbourn 2003	Review
Paleolog 2003	Review
Pearce 2001	Review
Pierreisnard 2012	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Rose-John 2003	Review
Russo 2005	Different drug/agent studied
Sandborn 2003	Crohn's disease review
Schreiber	Crohn's disease
Smolen 2013	Open-label extension (OLE)
Sorbera 2005	Review
Takeuchi 2005	Review
Tanaka 2013	Open-label extension (OLE)
Taylor 2003	Different drug/agent studied
Taylor 2003a	Review
Toussirot 2004	Review
Toussirot 2007	Review
Wang 2013	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
Yamanaka	Conference proceedings without useful data
Yamanaka a	Conference proceedings without useful data
Zhu 2013	Meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials

(Continued)

Zwerina 2005

Review

Characteristics of ongoing studies [ordered by study ID]

NCT00850343

Trial name or title	Long-term Treatment Study of CDP870 Without Coadministration of MTX in Japanese Rheumatoid Arthri- tis (RA) Patients
Methods	Randomized, open-label, uncontrolled, parallel assignment
Participants	Japanese RA patients who are transferred from the study (Study 275-08-003), as well as to evaluate the effects of dosing regimens on safety and efficacy of CDP870 in the ACR20 responders who completed Study 275-08-003
Interventions	Drug: CDP870 200mg and CDP870 400mg
Outcomes	Primary outcome: adverse events (Time Frame: At any time) (Designated as safety issue: Yes); Secondary outcome: ACR20/50/70 responder rate DAS-28 (ESR), Modified Total Sharp Score
Starting date	Mar 2009; expected completed date: Mar 2012
Contact information	Drug Information Centeropc_ctr@otsuka.jp
Notes	

NCT00851318

Trial name or title	Long-term Treatment Study of CDP870 as Add-on Medication to MTX in Japanese Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA) Patients
Methods	Randomised, open-label, uncontrolled, parallel assignment, safety/efficacy study
Participants	
Interventions	Two arms: CDP870 200 mg given every 2 weeks, SC; CP870 400mg given every 2 weeks, sc
Outcomes	ACR20/50/70 responder rate (Time Frame: Week 24, 52) ([Designated as safety issue: Yes) DAS28 (ESR) (Time Frame: Week 24, 52) (Designated as safety issue: Yes) Modified Total Sharp Score (Time Frame: Week 24) (Designated as safety issue: Yes)
Starting date	Mar 2009; expected completion Mar 2011
Contact information	Contact: Drug Information Centeropc_ctr@otsuka.jp

NCT00851318 (Continued)

Notes

NCT01451203	
Trial name or title	A Multicenter, Double-blind, Randomized, Placebo-controlled, Parallel-group Study to Assess the Efficacy and Safety of CDP870 in Early MTX-naive Rheumatoid Arthritis Patients With Poor Prognosis
Methods	Clinical trial randomised, double-blind
Participants	Estimated enrolment 300
Interventions	400mg of CDP870 given at Week 0, 2. 4, and thereafter 200mg CDP870 given every q2 weeks versus placebo given every q2 weeks
Outcomes	Primary outcome measures:Inhibition of radiographic progression at week 52 Seconary outcomes measures: Inhibition of radiographic progression at week 24 Clinical remission rate at week 24 and week 52
Starting date	October 2011
Contact information	Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co, Ltd
Notes	Final data collection for primary outcomes measure

DATA AND ANALYSES

Comparison	1.	Efficacy a	ıt 12	weeks,	any	dose
------------	----	------------	-------	--------	-----	------

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 ACR20	5		Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 certolizumab 50 mg sc	1	47	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	0.27 [0.13, 0.57]
1.2 certolizumab 100 mg sc	2	145	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	0.78 [0.09, 7.05]
1.3 certolizumab 200 mg sc	5	1577	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.84 [0.99, 3.40]
1.4 certolizumab 400 mg sc	2	161	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.40 [0.38, 5.23]
1.5 certolizumab 600 mg sc	1	47	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	0.68 [0.51, 0.90]
1.6 certolizumab 800 mg sc	1	46	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	0.83 [0.66, 1.04]
2 ACR50	3		Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 certolizumab 50 mg sc	1	47	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.58 [0.09, 27.88]
2.2 certolizumab 100 mg sc	1	48	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.10 [0.06, 20.96]
2.3 certolizumab 200 mg sc	3	1239	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.57 [1.76, 3.75]
2.4 certolizumab 400 mg sc	1	50	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	7.33 [0.48, 110.96]
3 ACR70	3		Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 certolizumab 50 mg sc	1	47	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.13 [0.06, 21.47]
3.2 certolizumab 100 mg sc	1	48	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	0.66 [0.03, 14.89]
3.3 certolizumab 200 mg sc	3	1239	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	4.52 [2.14, 9.57]
3.4 certolizumab 400 mg sc	1	50	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	5.23 [0.34, 80.54]

Comparison 2. Efficacy at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab pegol

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 ACR 20	6	1675	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	3.71 [2.68, 5.13]
2 ACR 50	5	1445	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	3.80 [2.42, 5.95]
3 ACR 70	5	1445	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	7.26 [3.83, 13.76]

Comparison 3. Efficacy at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 ACR 20	5	1591	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	3.73 [2.43, 5.72]
2 ACR 50	5	1591	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	4.65 [3.09, 6.99]
3 ACR 70	5	1591	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	7.20 [2.25, 23.03]

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Comparison 4.	Efficacy at	t 24 wee	ks, any dose
---------------	-------------	----------	--------------

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 ACR20	8	2935	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.76 [2.29, 3.33]
1.1 certolizumab 100 mg sc	1	98	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.65 [1.28, 5.47]
1.2 certolizumab 200 mg sc	6	1462	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.92 [2.17, 3.95]
1.3 certolizumab 400 mg sc	5	1375	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.65 [1.98, 3.56]
2 ACR50	7	2705	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.95 [2.37, 3.68]
2.1 certolizumab 100 mg sc	1	98	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.89 [1.13, 7.38]
2.2 certolizumab 200 mg sc	5	1232	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.76 [2.02, 3.78]
2.3 certolizumab 400 mg sc	5	1375	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	3.18 [2.29, 4.41]
3 ACR70	7	2705	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	4.15 [2.68, 6.42]
3.1 certolizumab 100 mg sc	1	98	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	6.86 [0.97, 48.72]
3.2 certolizumab 200 mg sc	5	1232	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	4.29 [2.36, 7.77]
3.3 certolizumab 400 mg sc	5	1375	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	4.04 [1.37, 11.90]

Comparison 5. Efficacy at 52 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 ACR 20	1	592	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.05 [2.80, 5.87]
2 ACR 50	1	592	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	5.03 [3.04, 8.32]
3 ACR 70	1	592	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.00 [2.83, 12.74]

Comparison 6. Efficacy at 52 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 ACR 20	1	589	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.18 [2.89, 6.05]
2 ACR 50	1	589	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	5.27 [3.19, 8.71]
3 ACR 70	1	589	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.56 [3.10, 13.89]

Comparison 7.	Efficacy at 52	weeks, any d	ose
---------------	----------------	--------------	-----

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 ACR20	1	982	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.06 [1.61, 2.62]
1.1 certolizumab 200 mg sc	1	493	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.04 [1.44, 2.87]
1.2 certolizumab 400 mg sc	1	489	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.08 [1.48, 2.93]
2 ACR50	1	982	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.58 [1.83, 3.62]
2.1 certolizumab 200 mg sc	1	493	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.53 [1.56, 4.10]
2.2 certolizumab 400 mg sc	1	489	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.62 [1.62, 4.25]
3 ACR70	1	982	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	3.14 [1.86, 5.29]
3.1 certolizumab 200 mg sc	1	493	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	3.02 [1.44, 6.32]
3.2 certolizumab 400 mg sc	1	489	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	3.26 [1.56, 6.82]

Comparison 8. Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Any adverse event	7	2729	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.19 [1.07, 1.32]
2 Adverse events Intensity mild	4	2249	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.18 [1.00, 1.41]
3 Adverse events Intensity moderate	4	2249	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.07 [0.86, 1.32]
4 Adverse events Intensity severe	4	2249	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.14 [0.78, 1.65]
5 Adverse events related to study drug	2	964	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.59 [1.27, 1.99]
6 Serious Adverse Events (SAE)	7	2729	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.77 [1.27, 2.46]
7 Serious Infections	2	964	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.30 [1.45, 7.51]
8 Adverse events leading to death	5	2443	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.34 [0.46, 11.84]
9 Adverse events leading to withdrawal	7	2729	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.62 [1.07, 2.44]
10 Death	5	2441	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.56 [0.56, 11.59]
11 Tuberculosis	5	2340	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.53 [0.94, 21.85]
12 Malignancies included lymphoma	6	2570	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.79 [0.29, 2.12]
13 Injection site pain	3	1091	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.85 [0.49, 6.92]
14 Injection side reactions	4	2178	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.28 [1.80, 5.99]
15 Neutralising Anti-certolizumab pegol antibodies	1	373	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.57 [0.71, 29.59]
16 Systemic lupus erythematosus	2	567	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.50 [0.07, 286.06]
17 Prolonged activated partial thromboplastin time (aPTT)	2	500	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.73 [0.98, 7.61]
18 Urinary tract infection	5	2340	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.83 [0.51, 1.36]
19 Upper respiratory tract infection	7	2729	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.51 [1.08, 2.09]
20 Lower respiratory tract infection/ lung infection	6	2356	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.12 [0.76, 5.95]

21 Headache	5	2372	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.05 [0.67, 1.64]
22 Bacteriuria	1	373	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.01 [0.30, 3.40]
23 Nasopharyngitis/Pharyngitis	6	1674	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.46 [1.02, 2.09]
24 Hypertension	4	1353	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.09 [1.64, 5.84]
25 Hematuria	1	373	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.36 [0.09, 1.47]
26 Hepatic enzyme increased	2	532	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.49 [0.17, 1.48]
27 AST increased	1	373	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.18 [0.04, 0.86]
28 ALT increased	1	373	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.09 [0.02, 0.45]
29 Back pain	1	591	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.91 [1.11, 7.65]
30 Herpes viral infection	2	821	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	5.80 [0.34, 100.23]
31 Bacterial peritonitis	1	591	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.52 [0.07, 285.70]
32 Opportunistic infections	4	2070	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	7.33 [0.46, 117.85]
33 Infections and infestations	7	2712	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.29 [1.07, 1.56]
34 Gastroenteritis	2	785	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.97 [0.33, 2.87]
35 Hematologic abnormalities	2	821	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.02 [0.27, 15.21]
36 Decreased haemoglobin	1	591	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.02 [0.09, 11.18]
37 Increased platelet count	1	591	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.05 [0.00, 3.25]
38 Pneumonia	4	1606	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.88 [0.51, 6.99]
39 Diarrhoea	2	321	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.64 [0.22, 1.90]
40 Cerebral haemorrhage including subarachnoid	2	321	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.27 [0.12, 13.50]
41 Nausea/vomiting	2	1249	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.83 [0.45, 1.50]
42 Acute miocardial infarction	1	194	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.0 [0.0, 0.0]
43 Constipation	1	230	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	7.46 [1.04, 53.63]
44 Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders	3	516	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.54 [1.81, 6.95]
45 Cough	1	127	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.84 [0.28, 12.22]
46 Pruritus	1	127	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.56 [0.40, 51.56]
47 Abdominal	1	127	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.58 [0.80, 8.35]
pain/discomfort/dyspepsia				- *
48 Fatigue	1	127	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.45 [0.18, 11.96]
49 Periodontitis	1	162	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.80 [0.35, 9.16]

Comparison 9. Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Any adverse events	5	1584	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.20 [1.06, 1.35]
2 Adverse events Intensity mild	4	1422	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.25 [1.04, 1.50]
3 Adverse events Intensity moderate	4	1422	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.24 [1.06, 1.45]
4 Adverse events Intensity severe	4	1422	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.23 [0.83, 1.81]
5 Adverse events related to study drug	3	1179	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.46 [1.19, 1.80]
6 Serious infections	4	1422	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.25 [1.65, 6.39]
7 3Serious Adverse Events (SAE)	5	1584	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.98 [1.36, 2.90]
8 Adverse events leading to death	3	1179	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.16 [0.40, 11.79]

9 Adverse events leading to withdrawal	5	1584	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.01 [1.20, 3.36]
10 Death	4	1422	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.16 [0.40, 11.79]
11 Vomiting	1	220	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.13 [0.00, 6.70]
12 Pneumonitis	1	220	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.13 [0.00, 6.70]
13 Tuberculosis	3	1179	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.55 [0.71, 29.11]
14 Arthritis bacterial	1	220	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
15 Mastitis	1	220	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
16 Benign Tumour	1	220	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	7.32 [0.46, 117.84]
17 Ischaemeic stroke	1	220	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
18 Dizziness postural	1	220	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
19 Menorrhagia	1	220	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
20 Malignancies included	3	1179	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.26 [0.26, 6.08]
lymphoma				
21 Injection site pain	3	1179	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.74 [0.41, 7.42]
22 Injection side reactions	5	1584	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.34 [0.20, 0.56]
23 Anti-certolizumab pegol	2	591	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.70 [2.18, 20.55]
24 Antipudear antibadias (ANA)	1	220	Pate Odda Patia (Pata Fixed 95% CI)	1 65 [0 77 2 52]
24 Antinuciear antibodies (ANA)	1	220	Peto Odds Katio (Peto, Fixed, 93% CI)	1.03 [0.77, 5.33]
25 Prolonged activated partial thromboplastin time (aPTT)	1	3/1	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.46 [0.80, 7.60]
26 Urinary tract infection	2	959	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.87 [0.50, 1.52]
27 Back pain	2	831	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.11 [1.48, 6.55]
28 Upper respiratory tract	4	1364	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.42 [0.77, 2.61]
infection				
29 Lower respiratory tract	3	993	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.11 [0.75, 5.95]
infection/ lung infection				
30 Headache	4	1364	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.30 [0.76, 2.20]
31 Bacteriuria	1	371	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.75 [0.20, 2.82]
32 Hypertension	3	1121	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.35 [1.80, 6.20]
33 Hematuria	1	371	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.37 [0.09, 1.49]
34 Hepatic enzyme increased	2	533	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.69 [0.25, 1.92]
35 AST increased	1	371	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.58 [0.16, 2.07]
36 ALT increased	1	373	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.67 [0.22, 2.05]
37 Herpes viral infection	1	588	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.53 [0.07, 285.35]
38 Bacterial peritonitis	1	588	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	$0.0 \ [0.0, \ 0.0]$
39 Opportunistic infections	1	588	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	$0.0 \ [0.0, \ 0.0]$
40 Infections and infestations	4	1364	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	1.49 [1.11, 1.99]
41 Nasopharyngitis/Pharyngitis	4	1364	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.98 [1.26, 3.11]
42 Gastrointestinal disorders	2	831	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.05 [0.54, 2.03]
43 Hematologic abnormalities	2	750	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.13 [0.21, 6.07]
44 Decreased Haemoglobin	1	588	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.49 [0.03, 9.10]
45 Increased platelet count	1	588	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.02 [0.09, 11.23]
46 Skin and subcutaneous tissue	1	162	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.38 [0.38, 4.94]
disorders	1	1/2		
4/ Acute miocardial infarction	1	162	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl)	6./3 [0.13, 340.56]
48 Corneal Perforation	1	162	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	6./3 [0.13, 340.56]
49 Conjunctivitis allergic	1	162	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% Cl)	6.73 [0.13, 340.56]
50 Periodontitis	1	159	Kisk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.94 [0.14, 6.50]
51 Fatigue	1	243	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.46 [0.52, 4.15]
Comparison 10. Mean HAQ-DI from baseline at week 12

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc	1	1063	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.22 [-0.23, -0.21]

Comparison 11. Mean HAQ-DI from baseline at week 24

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc	4	1268	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.35 [-0.43, -0.26]
2 certolizumab 400 mg sc	4	1425	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.38 [-0.48, -0.28]

Comparison 12. HAQ-DI at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	5	2246	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.36 [-0.43, -0.29]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	3	985	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.33 [-0.44, -0.23]
mg sc				
1.2 certolizumab pegol 400	4	1261	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.38 [-0.48, -0.27]
mg sc				

Comparison 13. HAQ-DI at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	1	982	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.43 [-0.52, -0.35]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	1	493	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.42 [-0.54, -0.30]
mg sc 1.2 certolizumab pegol 400	1	489	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.45 [-0.57, -0.33]
mg sc				

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Comparison 14. SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 24

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc	3	1129	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	5.03 [3.90, 6.16]
2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	3	1205	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	5.54 [4.11, 6.97]

Comparison 15. SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 24

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc	2	965	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	4.18 [2.70, 5.66]
2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	3	1205	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	4.05 [2.77, 5.34]

Comparison 16. SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 52

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 certolizumab 200 mg sc	1	592	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.06 [4.59, 7.53]
2 certolizumab 400 mg sc	1	589	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.88 [5.42, 8.34]

Comparison 17. SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc	1	592	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.3 [2.40, 6.20]
2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	1	589	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.3 [2.40, 6.20]

Comparison 18. SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 24, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	3	1765	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	5.29 [4.37, 6.21]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	3	967	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	4.99 [3.79, 6.20]
mg sc 1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	2	798	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	5.62 [3.70, 7.54]

Comparison 19. SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	4	2012	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	4.01 [2.94, 5.08]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	3	971	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	4.11 [2.62, 5.61]
mg sc 1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	3	1041	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	3.91 [2.38, 5.44]

Comparison 20. SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 52, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	1	982	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.47 [5.13, 7.81]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	1	493	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.06 [4.17, 7.95]
mg sc 1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	1	489	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.88 [4.99, 8.77]

Comparison 21. SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	1	982	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.3 [2.57, 6.03]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc	1	493	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.3 [1.86, 6.74]
1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	1	489	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.3 [1.85, 6.75]

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Comparison 22. Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg	1	1063	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.36 [1.53, 3.65]

Comparison 23. Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks	5	2264	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	5.28 [3.08, 9.05]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc	4	1222	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	5.97 [2.93, 12.17]
1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	3	1042	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	4.46 [1.95, 10.21]

Comparison 24. Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks	1	977	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	5.80 [2.60, 12.94]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	1	491	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	5.29 [1.69, 16.49]
1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	1	486	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.31 [2.03, 19.59]

Comparison 25. Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg	1	1063	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.82 [1.60, 5.00]

2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg	4	1381	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	8.47 [4.15, 17.28]
3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 400 mg	3	1201	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	7.18 [3.12, 16.50]
4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg	1	587	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	10.36 [3.29, 32.58]
5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg	1	583	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	12.49 [3.99, 39.12]

Comparison 26. DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from	1	1063	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.0 [0.0, 0.0]
baseline				

Comparison 27. DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline	2	593	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-1.46 [-2.49, -0.42]

Comparison 28. DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from	1	592	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.9 [-1.12, -0.68]
baseline				

Comparison 29. DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline	1	589	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.0 [-1.23, -0.77]

Comparison 30. DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	2	839	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-1.59 [-2.10, -1.08]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	1	310	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-1.77 [-2.08, -1.46]
mg sc 1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	2	529	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-1.45 [-2.49, -0.41]

Comparison 31. DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	1	982	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.95 [-1.15, -0.75]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	1	493	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.90 [-1.19, -0.61]
mg sc				
1.2 certolizumab pegol 400	1	489	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.0 [-1.29, -0.71]
mg sc				

Comparison 32. DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from	1	373	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.77 [-2.02, -1.52]
baseline				

Comparison 33. Erosion score (ES)

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg	2	859	Std. Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.35 [-0.50, -0.21]
2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg	2	869	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.76 [-1.14, -0.37]
3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg	1	544	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.4 [-2.08, -0.72]
4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg	1	543	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.50 [-2.20, -0.80]

Comparison 34. Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	2	1437	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.70 [-0.98, -0.42]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	2	714	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.67 [-1.06, -0.28]
mg sc 1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	2	723	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.73 [-1.14, -0.32]

Comparison 35. Erosion score (ES) at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	1	908	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.45 [-2.11, -0.79]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	1	455	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.4 [-2.32, -0.48]
mg sc		(52		15[2/(05)]
ng sc	1	455	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.5 [-2.44, -0.56]

Comparison 36. Joint space narrowing (JSN)

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from the baseline mean JSN 24 weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg	2	861	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.45 [-0.77, -0.13]
2 Change from the baseline mean JSN 24 weeks,certolizumab pegol 400 mg	2	869	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.55 [-0.86, -0.24]
3 Change from the baseline mean JSN 52 weeks,certolizumab pegol 200 mg	1	548	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.00 [-1.85, -0.15]
4 Change from the baseline mean JSN 52 weeks, certolizumab pegol 400 mg	1	544	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.2 [-1.98, -0.42]

Comparison 37. Joint space narrowing (JSN) at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	2	1439	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.50 [-0.79, -0.21]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	2	716	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.46 [-0.87, -0.04]
mg sc 1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	2	723	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.54 [-0.96, -0.13]

Comparison 38. Joint space narrowing (JSN) at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	1	911	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.10 [-1.88, -0.33]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	1	458	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.00 [-2.11, 0.11]
mg sc 1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	1	453	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.2 [-2.27, -0.13]

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Comparison 39. Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS) at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	2	1437	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-1.18 [-1.67, -0.69]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	2	713	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-1.06 [-1.75, -0.38]
mg sc 1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	2	724	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-1.30 [-1.99, -0.60]

Comparison 40. Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS) at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	1	908	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.50 [-3.70, -1.30]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200	1	455	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.4 [-4.11, -0.69]
mg sc				
1.2 certolizumab pegol 400	1	453	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.60 [-4.29, -0.91]
mg sc				

Comparison 41. Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm)

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Mean change at 24 weeks certolizumab pegol 200 mg	2	965	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-20.49 [-23.43, -17. 55]
2 Mean change at 24 weeks certolizumab pegol 400 mg	3	1182	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-22.69 [-25.53, -19. 84]
3 Mean change at 52 weeks certolizumab pegol 200 mg	1	592	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-22.2 [-26.19, -18. 21]
4 Mean change at 52 weeks certolizumab pegol 400 mg	1	589	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-24.7 [-28.62, -20. 78]

Comparison 42. Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm) at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	4	2064	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-21.07 [-23.59, -18. 55]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc	2	803	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-20.48 [-24.26, -16. 69]
1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	4	1261	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-21.35 [-25.08, -17. 61]

Comparison 43. Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm) at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from baseline	1	982	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-23.48 [-27.09, -19. 88]
1.1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc	1	493	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-22.2 [-27.37, -17. 03]
1.2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc	1	489	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-24.7 [-29.73, -19. 67]

Comparison 44. Modified total Sharp scores (mTSS)

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 24 weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.	2	859	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-1.06 [-1.58, -0.55]
2 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 24 weeks, certolizumab 400 mg	2	869	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-1.32 [-1.85, -0.78]
3 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 52 weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg	1	545	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.4 [-3.68, -1.12]
4 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 52 weeks, certolizumab pegol 400 mg	1	544	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.60 [-3.84, -1.36]

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Comparison 45. Certolizumab pegol 1mg/kg/day sc

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size	
1 Headache	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.5 [0.56, 35.98]	
2 Lower respiratory tract infection	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.48 [0.02, 10.54]	
3 Adverse events Intensity severe	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]	
4 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA)	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.00 [0.32, 27.83]	
5 Urinary tract infection	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]	

Comparison 46. Certolizumab 5 mg/kg/day sc

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Lower respiratory tract infection	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.50 [0.11, 20.68]
2 Urinary tract infection	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]

Comparison 47. Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of No. of studies participants		Statistical method	Effect size	
1 Headache	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.5 [0.56, 35.98]	
2 Lower respiratory tract infection	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.00 [0.32, 27.83]	
3 Death	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]	
4 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA)	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.50 [0.11, 20.68]	
5 Urinary tract infection	1	20	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]	

Comparison 48. Withdrawals

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 All Withdrawn: any doses any follow up	10	3962	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	0.42 [0.36, 0.50]
2 Withdrawn due to lack of efficacy: any doses any follow	5	2195	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	0.30 [0.25, 0.37]
3 Withdrawals due to adverse events	9	3998	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.66 [1.15, 2.37]

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Comparison 49. Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size	
1 ACR 50 200 mg certolizumab 24 weeks	5	1445	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	3.80 [2.42, 5.95]	
2 HAQ change from baseline 200 mg certolizumab 24 weeks	4	1268	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.35 [-0.43, -0.26]	
3 Serious adverse events certolizumab 200 mg sc	7	2729	Risk Difference (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.04 [0.02, 0.06]	
3.1 certolizumab 200 mg	7	2729	Risk Difference (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.04 [0.02, 0.06]	
4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg	4	1381	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	8.47 [4.15, 17.28]	
5 Radiological changes: Erosion Scores (ES) certolizumab 200 mg sc	2	859	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.67 [-0.96, -0.38]	
5.1 certolizumab 200 mg sc 24 weeks	2	859	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	-0.67 [-0.96, -0.38]	
6 All Withdrawals:	10	3962	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	0.42 [0.36, 0.50]	
7 Withdrawals due to adverse events	9	3998	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.66 [1.15, 2.37]	
8 Deaths	9	3866	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.56 [0.72, 9.07]	
8.1 Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	6	2387	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.94 [0.36, 10.32]	
8.2 Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	5	1349	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.53 [0.40, 31.39]	
8.3 Other doses	2	130	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.48 [0.07, 286.49]	
9 Tuberculosis	6	3195	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.71 [0.94, 14.61]	
9.1 Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	5	2179	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.85 [0.66, 22.30]	
9.2 Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	3	1016	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.52 [0.40, 31.33]	
10 Upper respiratory tract infections	8	3692	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.17 [0.86, 1.59]	
10.1 Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	7	2528	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.28 [0.91, 1.80]	
10.2 Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	4	1164	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.81 [0.41, 1.61]	
11 Lower respiratory tract infections	7	3073	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.66 [0.77, 3.58]	
11.1 Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	6	2218	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.81 [0.62, 5.26]	
11.2 Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	3	855	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.52 [0.50, 4.59]	
12 Malignancies including lymphoma	7	3749	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.90 [0.39, 2.08]	

12.1 Certolizumab pegol 200	6	2570	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.79 [0.29, 2.12]
mg				
12.2 Certolizumab pegol 400	3	1179	Peto Odds Ratio (Peto, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.26 [0.26, 6.08]
mg				

Comparison 50. Analysis of sensibility ACR50

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Doses	8	3768	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.89 [2.38, 3.51]
1.1 certolizumab 100 mg sc	1	98	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.89 [1.13, 7.38]
1.2 certolizumab 200 mg sc	6	2295	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.73 [2.13, 3.51]
1.3 certolizumab 400 mg sc	5	1375	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	3.18 [2.29, 4.41]
2 Size	8	3768	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.89 [2.38, 3.51]
2.1 certolizumab < 200 patients	2	321	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.44 [1.45, 4.10]
2.2 certolizumab > 200 patients	6	3447	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.97 [2.41, 3.67]
3 Use of MTX	8	3768	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.89 [2.38, 3.51]
3.1 With MTX	5	3038	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.77 [2.21, 3.46]
3.2 Without MTX	3	730	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	3.32 [2.23, 4.95]
4 Population	8	3768	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.89 [2.38, 3.51]
4.1 Asian trials	2	443	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.66 [1.77, 4.00]
4.2 Other trials	6	3325	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.96 [2.37, 3.70]
5 Duration of previous disease	6	3258	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.87 [2.31, 3.57]
5.1 Long previous disease duration (9 years or more)	2	467	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	4.02 [2.02, 7.98]
5.2 Short previous disease duration (less than 7 years)	4	2791	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.75 [2.18, 3.47]
6 Published vs unpublished studies	8	3768	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.89 [2.38, 3.51]
6.1 Published studies	5	3131	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.97 [2.36, 3.73]
6.2 Unpublished studies	3	637	Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% CI)	2.71 [1.89, 3.90]

Analysis I.I. Comparison I Efficacy at 12 weeks, any dose, Outcome I ACR20.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: I Efficacy at 12 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I ACR20

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,959 Cl
l certolizumab 50 mg sc					
CDP870-004 2001	8/39	6/8		100.0 %	0.27 [0.13, 0.57]
Subtotal (95% CI)	39	8	•	100.0 %	0.27 [0.13, 0.57]
Total events: 8 (Certolizumab p	egol), 6 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.45$	(P = 0.00056)				
2 certolizumab 100 mg sc	8/40	6/8		497%	027[013 056]
	45/72	7/25		50.3 %	2 23 [1 16 4 29]
	-15/72	1125		50.5 %	
Subtotal (95% CI)	112	33		100.0 %	0.78 [0.09, 7.05]
Total events: 53 (Certolizumab)	pegol), 13 (Control)	12 -0504			
Test for overall effect: $7 = 0.22$	(P = 0.82)	; 193%			
3 certolizumab 200 mg sc	(1 - 0.02)				
CDP870-004 2001	4/4	6/8		18.9 %	0.46 [0.25, 0.82]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	78/116	17/114		20.3 %	4.51 [2.86, 7.12]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	63/82	7/26		18.3 %	2.85 [1.50, 5.44]
NCT00993317	52/85	15/42		20.4 %	1.71 [1.10, 2.66]
REALISTIC 2008	435/851	55/212	•	22.1 %	1.97 [1.55, 2.50]
Subtotal (95% CI)	1175	402	•	100.0 %	1.84 [0.99, 3.40]
Total events: 642 (Certolizumab	pegol), 100 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.43$; Chi	$^{2} = 40.08, df = 4 (P < 0.0001)$; l ² =90%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.93$	(P = 0.054)				
4 certolizumab 400 mg sc	25/42	(10)	_	500 %	
CDP870-004 2001	25/42	6/8		50.9 %	0.79 [0.50, 1.27]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	66/85	8/26		49.1 %	2.52 [1.40, 4.54]
Subtotal (95% CI)	127	34		100.0 %	1.40 [0.38, 5.23]
Total events: 91 (Certolizumab	pegol), 14 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.83$; Chi	$P^2 = 12.22$, df = 1 (P = 0.0004)	7); I ² =92%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.50$	(P = 0.62)				
5 certolizumab 600 mg sc					
			0.05 0.2 1 5 20		
			Favours control Favours certoli	zumab pego	

(Continued . . .)

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	(Continued) Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
CDP870-004 2001 (2)	25/39	8/8		100.0 %	0.68 [0.51, 0.90]
Subtotal (95% CI)	39	8	•	100.0 %	0.68 [0.51, 0.90]
Total events: 25 (Certolizumab p	pegol), 8 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.73$	(P = 0.0064)				
6 certolizumab 800 mg sc					
CDP870-004 2001 (3)	30/38	8/8		100.0 %	0.83 [0.66, 1.04]
Subtotal (95% CI)	38	8	•	100.0 %	0.83 [0.66, 1.04]
Total events: 30 (Certolizumab p	pegol), 8 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.61$	(P = 0.11)				
Test for subgroup differences: C	hi ² = 17.21, df = 5 (P = 0.00),	$ ^2 = 7 \%$			

0.05 0.2 I 5 20

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

(1) We need to split the results in placebo 22 of 77 patients by 3

(2) From EMEA report, only data for ACR20

(3) From EMEA report, only data for ACR20

Analysis I.2. Comparison I Efficacy at I2 weeks, any dose, Outcome 2 ACR50.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: | Efficacy at |2 weeks, any dose

Outcome: 2 ACR50

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M- H,Random,95% Cl		M- H,Random,95% Cl
l certolizumab 50 mg sc					
CDP870-004 2001	3/39	0/8		100.0 %	1.58 [0.09, 27.88]
Subtotal (95% CI)	39	8		100.0 %	1.58 [0.09, 27.88]
Total events: 3 (Certolizum	ab pegol), 0 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicat	ble				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.31 (P = 0.76)				
2 certolizumab 100 mg sc					
CDP870-004 2001	2/40	0/8	_	100.0 %	1.10 [0.06, 20.96]
Subtotal (95% CI)	40	8		100.0 %	1.10 [0.06, 20.96]
Total events: 2 (Certolizum	ab pegol), 0 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicat	ble				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.06 (P = 0.95)				
3 certolizumab 200 mg sc					
CDP870-004 2001	7/41	0/8		1.9 %	3.21 [0.20, 51.33]
NCT00993317	21/85	5/42		17.5 %	2.08 [0.84, 5.12]
REALISTIC 2008	226/851	21/212	-	80.6 %	2.68 [1.76, 4.08]
Subtotal (95% CI)	977	262	•	100.0 %	2.57 [1.76, 3.75]
Total events: 254 (Certolizu	umab pegol), 26 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$;	Chi ² = 0.28, df = 2 (P = 0.87); I ² =0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4$	4.90 (P < 0.00001)				
4 certolizumab 400 mg sc					
CDP870-004 2001	17/42	0/8		100.0 %	7.33 [0.48, 110.96]
Subtotal (95% CI)	42	8		100.0 %	7.33 [0.48, 110.96]
Total events: 17 (Certolizur	mab pegol), 0 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicat	ble				
Test for overall effect: Z =	1.44 (P = 0.15)				
Test for subgroup difference	es: $Chi^2 = 1.00$, $df = 3$ (P = 0	80), l ² =0.0%			
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
			Favours control Favours certoli	zumab pego	

Analysis I.3. Comparison I Efficacy at 12 weeks, any dose, Outcome 3 ACR70.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: I Efficacy at 12 weeks, any dose

Outcome: 3 ACR70

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
l certolizumab 50 mg sc					
CDP870-004 2001	2/39	0/8		100.0 %	1.13 [0.06, 21.47]
Subtotal (95% CI)	39	8		100.0 %	1.13 [0.06, 21.47]
Total events: 2 (Certolizuma	ab pegol), 0 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.08 (P = 0.94)				
2 certolizumab 100 mg sc	1.110			100.00	
CDP870-004 2001	1/40	0/8		100.0 %	0.66 [0.03, 14.89]
Subtotal (95% CI)	40	8		100.0 %	0.66 [0.03, 14.89]
Total events: I (Certolizuma	ab pegol), 0 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.26 (P = 0.79)				
3 certolizumab 200 mg sc	2/41	0/0		(0.0/	
CDP870-004 2001	3/41	0/8		6.8 %	1.50 [0.08, 26.57]
NCT00993317	11/85	0/42		7.1 %	.50 [0.69, 90.57]
REALISTIC 2008	0/85	6/212		86.1 %	4.57 [2.04, 10.24]
Subtotal (95% CI)	9 77	262	•	100.0 %	4.52 [2.14, 9.57]
Total events: 124 (Certolizu	ımab pegol), 6 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$;	Chi ² = 1.01, df = 2 (P = 0.60);	l ² =0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$	8.95 (P = 0.000079)				
4 certolizumab 400 mg sc					
CDP870-004 2001	12/42	0/8		100.0 %	5.23 [0.34, 80.54]
Subtotal (95% CI)	42	8		100.0 %	5.23 [0.34, 80.54]
Total events: 12 (Certolizun	nab pegol), 0 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le				
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.19 (P = 0.24)				
Test for subgroup difference	es: Chi ² = 2.13, df = 3 (P = 0.5	5), I ² =0.0%			

0.01 0.1 1 10 100

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 2.1. Comparison 2 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab pegol, Outcome I ACR 20.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 2 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab pegol

Outcome: I ACR 20

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Placebo	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M- H,Random,95% Cl		M- H,Random,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	35/96	15/98		15.5 %	2.38 [1.39, 4.07]
NCT00993317	54/85	11/42	-	15.5 %	2.43 [1.42, 4.13]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	60/82	19/77	+	18.7 %	2.97 [1.96, 4.48]
RAPIDI 2005	228/393	27/199	•	20.1 %	4.28 [2.98, 6.13]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	74/116	3/ 4	-	15.6 %	5.59 [3.29, 9.50]
RAPID2 2007	141/246	11/127		14.5 %	6.62 [3.72, .76]
Total (95% CI)	1018	657	•	100.0 %	3.71 [2.68, 5.13]
Total events: 592 (Certolizumab	o pegol 200 mg), 96 (Plac	cebo)			
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.10$; Chi	$i^2 = 13.68$, df = 5 (P = 0	0.02); l ² =63%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 7.92	(P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				

0.01 0.1 1 10 100

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 2.2. Comparison 2 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab pegol, Outcome 2 ACR 50.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 2 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab pegol

Outcome: 2 ACR 50

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Placebo	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	20/96	7/98		16.7 %	2.92 [1.29, 6.58]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	45/82	13/77	-	24.4 %	3.25 [1.91, 5.54]
NCT00993317	35/85	8/42		20.2 %	2.16 [1.10, 4.24]
RAPID 2005	144/393	15/199	+	25.3 %	4.86 [2.94, 8.04]
RAPID2 2007	80/246	4/127		13.4 %	10.33 [3.87, 27.54]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 324 (Certolizumal Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; Ch Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.82$ Test for subgroup differences: N	902 b pegol 200 mg), 47 (Pla i ² = 9.05, df = 4 (P = 0. (P < 0.00001) Not applicable	543 cebo) 06); I ² =56%	•	100.0 %	3.80 [2.42, 5.95]
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 2.3. Comparison 2 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab pegol, Outcome 3 ACR 70.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 2 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab pegol

Outcome: 3 ACR 70

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Placebo	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	9/96	3/98		22.4 %	3.06 [0.85, 10.97]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	24/82	1/77	_ _	10.0 %	22.54 [3.12, 162.58]
NCT00993317	14/85	1/42		9.8 %	6.92 [0.94, 50.85]
RAPID 2005	83/393	6/199		47.8 %	7.00 [3.11, 15.76]
RAPID2 2007	39/246	1/127	→	10.0 %	20.13 [2.80, 144.86]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 169 (Certolizumal Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05; CF Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.07$ Test for subgroup differences: N	902 b pegol 200 mg), 12 (Pla i ² = 4.38, df = 4 (P = 0 (P < 0.00001) Not applicable	543 acebo) 36); I ² =9%	•	1 00.0 %	7.26 [3.83, 13.76]
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 3.1. Comparison 3 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome I ACR 20.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 3 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab

Outcome: I ACR 20

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Kandom,95% Cl		H,Kandom,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	56/126	27/121	+	21.8 %	1.99 [1.35, 2.93]
FAST4WARD 2005	50/111	10/109		16.9 %	4.91 [2.63, 9.18]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	61/85	19/77		21.2 %	2.91 [1.93, 4.39]
RAPIDI 2005	236/390	27/199	-	22.3 %	4.46 [3.11, 6.39]
RAPID2 2007	141/246	11/127		17.9 %	6.62 [3.72, .76]
Total (95% CI)	958	633	•	100.0 %	3.73 [2.43, 5.72]
Total events: 544 (Certolizuma	ab pegol), 94 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.18; Cl	hi ² = 17.77, df = 4 (P = 0.00	I); I ² =77%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.03$	B (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differences: I	Not applicable				

0.05 0.2 I 5 20

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 3.2. Comparison 3 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 2 ACR 50.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 3 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab

Outcome: 2 ACR 50

-

-

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ra M-	tio Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,9 Cl	95%	H,Random,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009 (1)	22/126	7/121			3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
FAST4WARD 2005	25/111	4/109		L 12.3 %	6.14 [2.21, 17.05]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	46/85	3/77	-	27.9 %	3.21 [1.88, 5.46]
RAPIDI 2005	155/390	15/199	-	- 29.5 %	5.27 [3.19, 8.71]
RAPID2 2007	81/246	4/127	-		10.45 [3.92, 27.88]
Total (95% CI)	958	633	•	100.0 %	4.65 [3.09, 6.99]
Total events: 329 (Certolizun	nab pegol), 43 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.08;$	Chi ² = 6.53, df = 4 (P = 0.16);	l ² =39%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 7.3$	37 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differences	: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1	10 100	
			Favours control Fav	vours certolizumab pego	

certolizumab and placebo groups for safety.

(1) EMEA report quotes 126 and 121 patients in certoluzimab and placebo group. Clinical Study Summary (CSS) from UCB quotes n=125 for both groups for effectiveness and 119 and 124 for

Analysis 3.3. Comparison 3 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 3 ACR 70.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 3 Efficacy at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab

Outcome: 3 ACR 70

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M- H Pandom 25%	Weight	Risk Ratio M- H Pandom 95%
	n/N	n/N	CI		CI
CDP870-014 2009 (1)	0/126	2/121		11.2 %	0.19 [0.01, 3.96]
FAST4WARD 2005	6/111	0/109		12.1 %	12.77 [0.73, 223.93]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	26/85	1/77	_ _	19.7 %	23.55 [3.27, 169.46]
RAPIDI 2005	80/390	6/199	-	37.4 %	6.80 [3.02, 15.32]
RAPID2 2007	26/246	1/127		19.6 %	3.42 [.84, 97.78]
Total (95% CI)	958	633	•	100.0 %	7.20 [2.25, 23.03]
Total events: 138 (Certolizum	ab pegol), 10 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.77; C	Chi ² = 7.46, df = 4 (P = 0.11);	l ² =46%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3	33 (P = 0.00088)				
Test for subgroup differences:	Not applicable				

0.01 0.1 1 10 100

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

(I) From EMEA report

Analysis 4.1. Comparison 4 Efficacy at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome I ACR20.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 4 Efficacy at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I ACR20

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
I certolizumab 100 mg sc					
NCT00791999 JRAPID	44/72	6/26		5.1 %	2.65 [1.28, 5.47]
Subtotal (95% CI)	72	26	•	5.1 %	2.65 [1.28, 5.47]
Total events: 44 (Certolizumab pe	egol), 6 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: $7 = 2.63$ (F	P = 0.0085				
2 certolizumab 200 mg sc	0.0000)				
CERTAIN 2008	35/96	15/98		7.9 %	2.38 [1.39, 4.07]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	74/116	3/ 4		8.0 %	5.59 [3.29, 9.50]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	60/82	6/26		5.3 %	3.17 [1.55, 6.47]
NCT00993317	54/85	11/42		8.0 %	2.43 [1.42, 4.13]
RAPIDI 2005	228/393	27/100	+	13.1 %	2.15 [1.54, 3.00]
RAPID2 2007	141/246	11/64		7.7 %	3.33 [1.93, 5.77]
Subtotal (95% CI)	1018	444	•	50.0 %	2.92 [2.17, 3.95]
Total events: 592 (Certolizumab p	begol), 83 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ²	= 10.25, df = 5 (P = 0.07)	; I ² =51%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 7.01$ (F	9 < 0.00001)				
3 certolizumab 400 mg sc					
CDP870-014 2009	56/126	27/121	-	11.5 %	1.99 [1.35, 2.93]
FAST4WARD 2005	50/111	10/109		6.4 %	4.91 [2.63, 9.18]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	61/85	7/25		6.2 %	2.56 [1.35, 4.87]
RAPIDI 2005	236/390	27/99	-	3. %	2.22 [1.59, 3.09]
RAPID2 2007	141/246	11/63		7.7 %	3.28 [1.90, 5.68]
Subtotal (95% CI)	958	417	•	44.9 %	2.65 [1.98, 3.56]
Total events: 544 (Certolizumab p	begol), 82 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05; Chi ²	= 7.42, df = 4 (P = 0.12);	l ² =46%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.53$ (F	P < 0.00001)				
Total (95% CI)	2048	887	•	100.0 %	2.76 [2.29, 3.33]
lotal events: 1180 (Certolizumab	pegol), $1/1$ (Control)	2), 12 - 209/			
Test for overall effect: $7 = 10.61$	= 10.10, 01 $=$ 11 (F $=$ 0.00	s); I [−] − 37/6			
Test for subgroup differences: Chi	$^2 = 0.22 \text{ df} = 2 (P = 0.89)$	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$			
	0.22, 0. 2 (1 0.07,	,, 1 01070			
			0.05 0.2 1 5 20		
			Favours control Favours certol	izumab pego	

Analysis 4.2. Comparison 4 Efficacy at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 2 ACR50.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 4 Efficacy at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome: 2 ACR50

n/N 32/72 72 4 (Control)	n/N 4/26 26	H,Random,95% Cl	5.5 % 5.5 %	H,Random,95' Cl 2.89 [1.13, 7.38]
32/72 72 4 (Control)	4/26 26		5.5 % 5.5 %	2.89 [1.13, 7.38]
32/72 72 4 (Control))27)	4/26 26	→ ◆	5.5 % 5.5 %	2.89 [1.13, 7.38]
72 4 (Control) 127)	26	•	5.5 %	
4 (Control))27)				2.89 [1.13, 7.38]
)27)				
027)				
20/07	7/00		72.0/	
20/96	//98		7.3 %	2.92 [1.29, 6.58]
45/82	4/26		5.7 %	3.57 [1.42, 8.97]
35/85	8/42		10.6 %	2.16 [1.10, 4.24]
144/393	15/100	+	20.5 %	2.44 [1.50, 3.96]
80/246	4/64		5.2 %	5.20 [1.98, 13.67]
902	330	•	49.3 %	2.76 [2.02, 3.78]
38 (Control)				
df = 4 (P = 0.59); I ²	=0.0%			
00001)				
22/126	7/121		7.3 %	3.02 [.34, 6.8]
25/111	4/109		4.6 %	6.14 [2.21, 17.05]
46/85	5/25		7.4 %	2.71 [1.21, 6.07]
155/390	15/99		20.8 %	2.62 [1.62, 4.25]
81/246	4/63		5.2 %	5.19 [1.98, 13.61]
958	417	•	45.2 %	3.18 [2.29, 4.41]
35 (Control)				
df = 4 (P = 0.49); l ²	=0.0%			
00001)				
1932	773	•	100.0 %	2.95 [2.37, 3.68]
77 (Control)				
df = 10 (P = 0.76);	12 =0.0%			
00001)				
38, df = 2 (P = 0.83)	, l ² =0.0%			
	46/85 155/390 81/246 958 35 (Control) df = 4 (P = 0.49); I ² 0001) 1932 77 (Control) df = 10 (P = 0.76); 00001) 38, df = 2 (P = 0.83)	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 4.3. Comparison 4 Efficacy at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 3 ACR70.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 4 Efficacy at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome: 3 ACR70

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
l certolizumab 100 mg sc					
NCT00791999 JRAPID	19/72	1/26		4.9 %	6.86 [0.97, 48.72]
Subtotal (95% CI)	72	26		4.9 %	6.86 [0.97, 48.72]
Total events: 19 (Certolizuma	b pegol), I (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.9$	3 (P = 0.054)				
2 certolizumab 200 mg sc					
CERTAIN 2008	9/96	3/98		11.7 %	3.06 [0.85, 10.97]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	24/82	0/26		2.5 %	5.94 [1.00, 253.38]
NCT00993317	14/85	1/42		4.8 %	6.92 [0.94, 50.85]
RAPIDI 2005	83/393	6/100		29.8 %	3.52 [1.58, 7.83]
RAPID2 2007	39/246	1/64		4.9 %	10.15 [1.42, 72.45]
Subtotal (95% CI)	902	330	•	53.6 %	4.29 [2.36, 7.77]
Total events: 169 (Certolizum	ab pegol), 11 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; Ch	$ni^2 = 2.55$, df = 4 (P = 0.64);	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.7$	9 (P < 0.00001)				
3 certolizumab 400 mg sc					
CDP870-014 2009	0/126	2/121		2.1 %	0.19 [0.01, 3.96]
FAST4WARD 2005	6/111	0/109	+	2.3 %	2.77 [0.73, 223.93]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	26/85	0/25		2.5 %	16.02 [1.01, 253.98]
RAPID 2005	80/390	6/99		29.7 %	3.38 [1.52, 7.53]
RAPID2 2007	26/246	1/63		4.9 %	6.66 [0.92, 48.13]
Subtotal (95% CI)	958	417	-	41.4 %	4.04 [1.37, 11.90]
Total events: 138 (Certolizum	ab pegol), 9 (Control)				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
			Favours control Favours certoliza	umab pego	

(Continued . . .)

						(Continued)
Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control		Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
			H,R	andom,95%		H,Random,95%
,	n/N	n/N		CI		CI
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.50$;	Chi ² = 5.94, df = 4 (P = 0.20);	$ ^2 = 33\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2$.53 (P = 0.011)					
Total (95% CI)	1932	773		•	100.0 %	4.15 [2.68, 6.42]
Total events: 326 (Certolizur	mab pegol), 21 (Control)					
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; (Chi ² = 8.81, df = 10 (P = 0.55);	l ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6$.40 (P < 0.00001)					
Test for subgroup difference	s: Chi ² = 0.23, df = 2 (P = 0.89), l ² =0.0%				
			0.01 0.1	1 10 100)	
			Envours control	Envours certal		
			i avoui s control	i avours cer loi	iizumao pego	

Analysis 5.1. Comparison 5 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome I ACR 20.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 5 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab

Outcome: I ACR 20

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	208/393	26/199		100.0 %	4.05 [2.80, 5.87]
Total (95% CI)	393	199	•	100.0 %	4.05 [2.80, 5.87]
Total events: 208 (Certol	izumab pegol), 26 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applic	able				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 7.40 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 10	0	
			Favours control Favours certo	lizumab pego	

Analysis 5.2. Comparison 5 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 2 ACR 50.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 5 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab

Outcome: 2 ACR 50

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control		Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,F	ixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	149/393	15/199			100.0 %	5.03 [3.04, 8.32]
Total (95% CI)	393	199		•	100.0 %	5.03 [3.04, 8.32]
Total events: 149 (Certol	izumab pegol), 15 (Control)					
Heterogeneity: not applic	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 6.30 (P < 0.00001)					
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	1 10 100)	

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 5.3. Comparison 5 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 3 ACR 70.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 5 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab

Outcome: 3 ACR 70

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	83/393	7/199		100.0 %	6.00 [2.83, 2.74]
Total (95% CI)	393	199	•	100.0 %	6.00 [2.83, 12.74]
Total events: 83 (Certoliz	zumab pegol), 7 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applie	able				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 4.67 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differe	nces: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 10	0	
			Favours control Favours certo	olizumab pego	

Analysis 6.1. Comparison 6 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome I ACR 20.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 6 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab

Outcome: I ACR 20

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
RAPID I 2005	213/390	26/199		100.0 %	4.18 [2.89, 6.05]
Total (95% CI)	390	199	•	100.0 %	4.18 [2.89, 6.05]
Total events: 213 (Certol	izumab pegol), 26 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applic	able				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 7.58 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable				
				1	
			0.01 0.1 1 10 1	00	

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 6.2. Comparison 6 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 2 ACR 50.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 6 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab

Outcome: 2 ACR 50

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% CI		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	155/390	15/199		100.0 %	5.27 [3.19, 8.71]
Total (95% CI)	390	199	•	100.0 %	5.27 [3.19, 8.71]
Total events: 155 (Certol	izumab pegol), 15 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applic	able				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 6.49 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100)	
			Favours control Favours certol	lizumab pego	

Analysis 6.3. Comparison 6 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome 3 ACR 70.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 6 Efficacy at 52 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab

Outcome: 3 ACR 70

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control			Risk Ratio		Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N		M-H,F	ixed,95% C			M-H,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	90/390	7/199			++-		100.0 %	6.56 [3.10, 13.89]
Total (95% CI)	390	199			•		100.0 %	6.56 [3.10, 13.89]
Total events: 90 (Certoliz	rumab pegol), 7 (Control)							
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 4.92 (P < 0.00001)							
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable							
			0.01	0.1	I I0	100		

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 7.1. Comparison 7 Efficacy at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome I ACR20.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 7 Efficacy at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I ACR20

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% CI
I certolizumab 200 mg sc					
RAPID 2005	208/393	26/100	-	49.8 %	2.04 [1.44, 2.87]
Subtotal (95% CI)	393	100	*	49.8 %	2.04 [1.44, 2.87]
Total events: 208 (Certolizu	ımab pegol), 26 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4$	4.06 (P = 0.000050)				
2 certolizumab 400 mg sc					
RAPIDI 2005	213/390	26/99	-	50.2 %	2.08 [1.48, 2.93]
Subtotal (95% CI)	390	99	•	50.2 %	2.08 [1.48, 2.93]
Total events: 213 (Certolizu	ımab pegol), 26 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4$	4.19 (P = 0.000028)				
Total (95% CI)	783	199	•	100.0 %	2.06 [1.61, 2.62]
Total events: 421 (Certolizu	ımab pegol), 52 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0;$	$Chi^2 = 0.01$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.93);	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 5$	5.83 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup difference	es: $Chi^2 = 0.01$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.92	3), l ² =0.0%			

0.01 0.1 1 10 100

Favours control Favours certoluzimab pego

Analysis 7.2. Comparison 7 Efficacy at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 2 ACR50.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 7 Efficacy at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome: 2 ACR50

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,959 Cl
l certolizumab 200 mg sc					
RAPIDI 2005	149/393	15/100	-	49.8 %	2.53 [1.56, 4.10]
Subtotal (95% CI)	393	100	•	49.8 %	2.53 [1.56, 4.10]
Total events: 149 (Certolizun	nab pegol), 15 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable	2				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.7$	76 (P = 0.00017)				
2 certolizumab 400 mg sc					
RAPIDI 2005	155/390	15/99	-	50.2 %	2.62 [1.62, 4.25]
Subtotal (95% CI)	390	99	•	50.2 %	2.62 [1.62, 4.25]
Total events: 155 (Certolizun	nab pegol), 15 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable	2				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.9$	92 (P = 0.000088)				
Total (95% CI)	783	199	•	100.0 %	2.58 [1.83, 3.62]
Total events: 304 (Certolizun	nab pegol), 30 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; C	$hi^2 = 0.01$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.92);	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.4$	43 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differences	$: Chi^2 = 0.01, df = 1 (P = 0.92)$	2), I ² =0.0%			
		C	0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours control Favours certoluzimab pego

Analysis 7.3. Comparison 7 Efficacy at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 3 ACR70.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 7 Efficacy at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome: 3 ACR70

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,959 Cl
l certolizumab 200 mg sc					
RAPIDI 2005	83/393	7/100		49.8 %	3.02 [1.44, 6.32]
Subtotal (95% CI)	393	100	•	49.8 %	3.02 [1.44, 6.32]
Total events: 83 (Certolizum	ab pegol), 7 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable	e				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.5$	93 (P = 0.0034)				
2 certolizumab 400 mg sc					
RAPID I 2005	90/390	7/99	-	50.2 %	3.26 [1.56, 6.82]
Subtotal (95% CI)	390	99	•	50.2 %	3.26 [1.56, 6.82]
Total events: 90 (Certolizum	ab pegol), 7 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable	e				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$.	15 (P = 0.0017)				
Total (95% CI)	783	199	•	100.0 %	3.14 [1.86, 5.29]
Total events: 173 (Certolizur	nab pegol), 14 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; C	$Chi^2 = 0.02$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.88);	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4$.	29 (P = 0.000017)				
Test for subgroup differences	s: $Chi^2 = 0.02$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.8	8), I ² =0.0%			
		C).0 0,1 0 00		

Favours control Favours certoluzimab pego

Analysis 8.1. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome I Any adverse event.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: I Any adverse event

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Kandom,95% Cl		H,Kandom,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	37/96	41/98		7.4 %	0.92 [0.65, 1.30]
NCT00791921 HIKARI (1)	59/116	44/114		9.5 %	1.32 [0.98, 1.77]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	48/82	31/77		8.0 %	1.45 [1.05, 2.02]
NCT00993317	60/85	21/42		7.8 %	1.41 [1.01, 1.97]
RAPIDI 2005	293/392	115/199		24.4 %	1.29 [1.13, 1.48]
RAPID2 2007	139/248	66/125		16.2 %	1.06 [0.87, 1.30]
REALISTIC 2008	571/846	129/209		26.7 %	1.09 [0.97, 1.23]
Total (95% CI)	1865	864	•	100.0 %	1.19 [1.07, 1.32]
Total events: 1207 (Certolizumab μ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01; Chi ² = Test for overall effect: Z = 3.29 (P Test for subgroup differences: Not	begol 200 mg), 447 (Co = 9.80, df = 6 (P = 0.13 = 0.00099) applicable	ntrol)); I ² =39%			
			0.5 0.7 I I.5 2		
		Favours ce	rtolizumab pego Favours contro	I	

(1) UCB provides us different number of AE that appears in clinicaltrials.org. 67 in CZP 200 mg and 83 in control groups Check with UCB again

Analysis 8.2. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 2 Adverse events Intensity mild.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 2 Adverse events Intensity mild

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
NCT00791921 HIKARI (1)	29/116	33/114	-	12.7 %	0.86 [0.56, 1.32]
RAPIDI 2005	244/392	90/199	-	37.2 %	1.38 [1.16, 1.63]
RAPID2 2007	108/248	45/125	-	23.6 %	1.21 [0.92, 1.59]
REALISTIC 2008	248/846	56/209	+	26.5 %	1.09 [0.85, 1.40]
Total (95% CI)	1602	647	•	100.0 %	1.18 [1.00, 1.41]
Total events: 629 (Certolizumab p	begol 200 mg), 224 (Con	trol)			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01; Chi ²	= 5.26, df = 3 (P = 0.15)	; I ² =43%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.94 (P	e = 0.053)				
Test for subgroup differences: Not	t applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours cer	tolizumab pego Favours control		

(1) UCB provides us different number of AE that appears in clinicaltrials.org

Analysis 8.3. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 3 Adverse events Intensity moderate.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 3 Adverse events Intensity moderate

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
NCT00791921 HIKARI	36/116	44/114	-	20.2 %	0.80 [0.56, 1.15]
RAPIDI 2005	174/392	66/199	-	30.9 %	1.34 [1.07, 1.68]
RAPID2 2007	61/248	32/125	+	19.4 %	0.96 [0.66, 1.39]
REALISTIC 2008	257/846	58/209	+	29.5 %	1.09 [0.86, 1.39]
Total (95% CI)	1602	647	•	100.0 %	1.07 [0.86, 1.32]
Total events: 528 (Certolizumal	b pegol 200 mg), 200 (C	ontrol)			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02; Ch	$mi^2 = 6.36$, $df = 3$ (P = 0.	10); I ² =53%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.61$	(P = 0.54)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	√ot applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control
Analysis 8.4. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 4 Adverse events Intensity severe.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 4 Adverse events Intensity severe

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg n/N	Control n/N	Peto Odds Ratio Peto.Fixed.95% Cl	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio Peto.Fixed.95% Cl
NCT00791921 HIKARI	2/116	6/114	-	7.0 %	0.35 [0.09, 1.43]
REALISTIC 2008	66/846	15/209	+	42.8 %	1.09 [0.62, 1.93]
RAPIDI 2005	32/392	13/199	+	33.5 %	1.26 [0.66, 2.40]
RAPID2 2007	17/248	5/125		16.7 %	1.67 [0.67, 4.16]
Total (95% CI)	1602	647	*	100.0 %	1.14 [0.78, 1.65]
Total events: 117 (Certolizumab	pegol 200 mg), 39 (Co	ntrol)			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.49, df =	= 3 (P = 0.32); I ² = I 4%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.67$ ((P = 0.50)				
Test for subgroup differences: No	ot applicable				

0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.5. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 5 Adverse events related to study drug.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 5 Adverse events related to study drug

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	CI		H,Random,73%
RAPIDI 2005	167/392	50/199	-	72.2 %	1.70 [1.30, 2.21]
RAPID2 2007	61/248	23/125	-	27.8 %	1.34 [0.87, 2.05]
Total (95% CI)	640	324	•	100.0 %	1.59 [1.27, 1.99]
Total events: 228 (Certoli:	zumab pegol 200 mg), 73	(Control)			
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$); Chi ² = 0.85, df = 1 (P =	0.36); l ² =0.0%			
Test for overall effect: Z =	4.01 (P = 0.000062)				
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable				

 0.01
 0.1
 1
 10
 100

 Favours certolizumab pego
 Favours control

Analysis 8.6. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 6 Serious Adverse Events (SAE).

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 6 Serious Adverse Events (SAE)

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl	-	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	5/96	7/98		8.1 %	0.72 [0.22, 2.30]
REALISTIC 2008	52/846	2/209	=	27.3 %	1.07 [0.57, 2.02]
RAPIDI 2005	45/392	/ 99		32.4 %	2.00 [1.12, 3.58]
RAPID2 2007	18/248	4/125	_	13.2 %	2.07 [0.83, 5.16]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	4/82	1/77		3.5 %	3.21 [0.54, 19.00]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	13/116	3/114		10.7 %	3.74 [1.36, 10.31]
NCT00993317	8/85	0/42		4.8 %	4.86 [1.07, 22.14]
Total (95% CI)	1865	864		100.0 %	1.77 [1.27, 2.46]
Total events: 145 (Certolizuma	b pegol 200 mg), 38 (C	Control)			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.21, df	$= 6 (P = 0.16); I^2 = 359$	%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.38	8 (P = 0.00074)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	Not applicable				
			0.5 0.7 I I.5 2		
		-			

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.7. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 7 Serious Infections.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 7 Serious Infections

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	16/392	2/199		69.1 %	2.83 [1.05, 7.63]
RAPID2 2007	8/248	0/125		30.9 %	4.63 [1.05, 20.39]
Total (95% CI)	640	324	•	100.0 %	3.30 [1.45, 7.51]
Total events: 24 (Certolizu	umab pegol 200 mg), 2 (C	ontrol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.2$	9, df = 1 (P = 0.59); l ² =0).0%			
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.84 (P = 0.0046)				
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100	0	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.8. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 8 Adverse events leading to death.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 8 Adverse events leading to death

-

-

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	0/98			Not estimable
NCT00791921 HIKARI (1)	1/116	0/114	_	17.1 %	7.26 [0.14, 366.07]
RAPIDI 2005	2/392	1/199	_	45.8 %	1.02 [0.09, 11.18]
RAPID2 2007	1/248	0/125		15.3 %	4.50 [0.07, 286.06]
REALISTIC 2008	2/846	0/209		21.8 %	3.48 [0.11, 112.96]
Total (95% CI)	1698	745	-	100.0 %	2.34 [0.46, 11.84]
Total events: 6 (Certolizumab peg	gol 200 mg), I (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.93$, df =	3 (P = 0.82); I ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.02$ (F	P = 0.31)				
Test for subgroup differences: No	t applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours ce	rtolizumab pego Favours control		

(1) I patient died of a rupture of a dissecting aortic aneurysm in the thoracic region, but UCB considered that in unlikely to have been related to study medication

Analysis 8.9. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 9 Adverse events leading to withdrawal.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 9 Adverse events leading to withdrawal

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl	-	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	6/96	6/98	••	12.5 %	1.02 [0.32, 3.28]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	8/116	2/114		10.6 %	3.42 [0.97, 12.13]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	3/82	3/77	< ₽ →	6.4 %	0.94 [0.18, 4.77]
NCT00993317	4/85	2/42	<→	5.6 %	0.99 [0.17, 5.60]
RAPIDI 2005	17/392	3/199		19.1 %	2.37 [0.92, 6.09]
RAPID2 2007	12/248	2/125		13.3 %	2.45 [0.79, 7.57]
REALISTIC 2008	40/846	8/209	_	32.3 %	1.23 [0.60, 2.54]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 90 (Certolizumab Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.38, df = Test for overall effect: Z = 2.28 Test for subgroup differences: N	1865 pegol 200 mg), 26 (Cor = 6 (P = 0.62); I ² =0.0% (P = 0.022) lot applicable	864		100.0 %	1.62 [1.07, 2.44]
			0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.10. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 10 Death.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 10 Death

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	0/98			Not estimable
NCT00791921 HIKARI (1)	1/116	0/114		14.9 %	7.26 [0.14, 366.07]
RAPID 2005 (2)	3/392	1/199		52.9 %	1.48 [0.18, 11.81]
RAPID2 2007	1/246	0/125		13.3 %	4.52 [0.07, 285.66]
REALISTIC 2008	2/846	0/209		18.9 %	3.48 [0.11, 112.96]
Total (95% CI)	1696	745		100.0 %	2.56 [0.56, 11.59]
Total events: 7 (Certolizumab peg	gol 200 mg), I (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.64$, df =	3 (P = 0.89); I ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.22$ (F	9 = 0.22)				
Test for subgroup differences: No	t applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours	certolizumab pego Favours control		

(1) I patient died of a rupture of a dissecting aortic aneurysm in the thoracic region, but UCB considered that in unlikely to have been related to study medication

(2) One patient died of hepatic neoplam and other for cardiac arrest. One patient died in placebo group of a myocardial infarction

Analysis 8.11. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 11 Tuberculosis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: II Tuberculosis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	0/98			Not estimable
NCT00993317	2/85	0/42		28.3 %	4.5 [0.23, 86.80]
RAPIDI 2005	2/392	0/199		28.8 %	4.53 [0.24, 85.22]
RAPID2 2007	3/248	0/125		42.9 %	4.54 [0.41, 50.19]
REALISTIC 2008	0/846	0/209			Not estimable
Total (95% CI) Total events: 7 (Certolizu Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Test for subgroup differen	1667 mab pegol 200 mg), 0 (Cc 20, df = 2 (P = 1.00); l ² = (= 1.88 (P = 0.060) mces: Not applicable	673 ontrol) 0.0%		100.0 %	4.53 [0.94, 21.85]
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.12. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 12 Malignancies included lymphoma.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 12 Malignancies included lymphoma

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	2/98		12.7 %	0.14 [0.01, 2.20]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	0/116	/ 4	• • •	6.4 %	0.13 [0.00, 6.70]
NCT00993317 (1)	0/85	0/42			Not estimable
RAPID 2005 (2)	7/392	1/199		45.2 %	2.61 [0.60, 11.41]
RAPID2 2007	1/248	1/125		11.4 %	0.48 [0.03, 9.01]
REALISTIC 2008	4/846	2/209		24.3 %	0.43 [0.06, 3.18]
Total (95% CI)	1783	787	•	100.0 %	0.79 [0.29, 2.12]
Total events: 12 (Certolizumab	pegol 200 mg), 7 (Contr	rol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 5.32$, df	= 4 (P = 0.26); I ² =25%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.48$	(P = 0.63)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

system], one adrenal adenoma, one hepatic neoplasm one esophageal carcinoma, and uterine cancer

(1) Data provided by UCB

(2) One patient in the arm of placebo suffered a thyroid neoplasm and 7 in the arm of certolizumab 200 mg sc suffered: three basal cell carcinomas [one with metastasis to the central nervous

Analysis 8.13. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 13 Injection site pain.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 13 Injection site pain

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00993317	0/85	2/42	← <u>∎</u>	19.9 %	0.05 [0.00, 0.91]
RAPIDI 2005	8/392	0/199		80.1 %	4.60 [1.05, 20.10]
RAPID2 2007	0/248	0/125			Not estimable
Total (95% CI)	725	366		100.0 %	1.85 [0.49, 6.92]
Total events: 8 (Certolizur	mab pegol 200 mg), 2 (Co	ntrol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 7.3$	86, df = 1 (P = 0.01); $I^2 = 8$	6%			
Test for overall effect: Z =	:0.91 (P = 0.36)				
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable				

0.01 0.1 I 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.14. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 14 Injection side reactions.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 14 Injection side reactions

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
NCT00791999 JRAPID	1/82	0/77		2.4 %	6.95 [0.14, 351.04]
RAPIDI 2005	9/392	0/199		18.7 %	4.61 [1.15, 18.55]
RAPID2 2007	3/248	0/125		6.3 %	4.54 [0.41, 50.19]
REALISTIC 2008	49/846	2/209	-	72.7 %	2.86 [1.41, 5.79]
Total (95% CI)	1568	610	•	100.0 %	3.28 [1.80, 5.99]
Total events: 62 (Certolizumab	pegol 200 mg), 2 (Contr	nol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.59$, df	= 3 (P = 0.90); $I^2 = 0.0\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.87$	(P = 0.000)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	Not applicable				

0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.15. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 15 Neutralising Anti-certolizumab pegol antibodies.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

_

Outcome: 15 Neutralising Anti-certolizumab pegol antibodies

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,F	Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
RAPID2 2007	5/248	0/125			100.0 %	4.57 [0.71, 29.59]
Total (95% CI)	248	125			100.0 %	4.57 [0.71, 29.59]
Total events: 5 (Certolizu	mab pegol 200 mg), 0 (Co	ontrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applic	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= I.60 (P = 0.11)					
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours ce	rtolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 8.16. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 16 Systemic lupus erythematosus.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 16 Systemic lupus erythematosus

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fix	ed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	0/98				Not estimable
RAPID2 2007	1/248	0/125		<mark></mark>	100.0 %	4.50 [0.07, 286.06]
Total (95% CI)	344	223			100.0 %	4.50 [0.07, 286.06]
Total events: I (Certolizu	mab pegol 200 mg), 0 (C	ontrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applic	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.71 (P = 0.48)					
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	1 10 100		
		Favours o	ertolizumab pego	Favours control		

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 8.17. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 17 Prolonged activated partial thromboplastin time (aPTT).

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 17 Prolonged activated partial thromboplastin time (aPTT)

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	C	Peto Idds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Petc	,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00993317	3/85	0/42			17.8 %	4.56 [0.40, 51.56]
RAPID2 2007	12/248	2/125		-	82.2 %	2.45 [0.79, 7.57]
Total (95% CI)	333	167		-	100.0 %	2.73 [0.98, 7.61]
Total events: 15 (Certoliz	umab pegol 200 mg), 2 (C	ontrol)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.2$	21, df = 1 (P = 0.65); $I^2 = 0$).0%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.92 (P = 0.054)					
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours c	ertolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 8.18. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 18 Urinary tract infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 18 Urinary tract infection

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control		Pet Odds Rati	0	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,Fixed,9	5% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	6/96	5/98				16.6 %	1.24 [0.37, 4.17]
NCT00993317	1/85	0/42			·	1.4 %	4.46 [0.07, 287.18]
RAPID I 2005	23/392	13/199		-		48.1 %	0.89 [0.44, 1.82]
RAPID2 2007	/248	9/125				26.9 %	0.58 [0.22, 1.51]
REALISTIC 2008	5/846	2/209				7.0 %	0.57 [0.09, 3.70]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 46 (Certolizi Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.7 Test for overall effect: Z = Test for subgroup differen	1667 umab pegol 200 mg), 29 (77, df = 4 (P = 0.78); I ² = = 0.73 (P = 0.46) uces: Not applicable	673 Control) 0.0%		•		100.0 %	0.83 [0.51, 1.36]
			0.01	0.1 1	10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.19. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 19 Upper respiratory tract infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 19 Upper respiratory tract infection

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl	-	Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	6/96	4/98		6.7 %	1.55 [0.44, 5.53]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	3/116	4/114		4.8 %	0.73 [0.16, 3.29]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	2/82	3/77		3.4 %	0.62 [0.11, 3.67]
NCT00993317	12/85	5/42		9.2 %	1.21 [0.41, 3.56]
RAPIDI 2005	24/392	5/199		17.2 %	2.16 [0.98, 4.77]
RAPID2 2007	11/248	2/125	+	7.8 %	2.32 [0.72, 7.47]
REALISTIC 2008	112/846	19/209		51.0 %	1.46 [0.93, 2.32]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 170 (Certolizumal Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35 , df Test for overall effect: Z = 2.45 Test for subgroup differences: N	1865 p pegol 200 mg), 42 (Co = 6 (P = 0.76); I ² =0.0% (P = 0.014) Not applicable	864 ntrol)	•	100.0 %	1.51 [1.08, 2.09]
			0.05 0.2 I 5 20		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.20. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 20 Lower respiratory tract infection/ lung infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 20 Lower respiratory tract infection/ lung infection

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Odds	Peto Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixe	d,95% Cl	-	Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	1/98	· · · · ·		6.9 %	0.14 [0.00, 6.96]
NCT00791921 HIKARI (1)	2/116	0/114	+	_	13.8 %	7.33 [0.46, 117.85]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	1/82	1/77			13.7 %	0.94 [0.06, 15.16]
NCT00993317	2/85	0/42			12.2 %	4.51 [0.23, 86.80]
RAPIDI 2005	3/392	0/199	+		18.5 %	4.54 [0.41, 49.96]
REALISTIC 2008	7/846	1/209		-	34.9 %	1.59 [0.28, 9.09]
Total (95% CI)	1617	739	-	•	100.0 %	2.12 [0.76, 5.95]
Total events: 15 (Certolizumab peg	gol 200 mg), 3 (Control)					
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 3.70$, df = 5	(P = 0.59); l ² =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.43$ (P =	= 0.15)					
Test for subgroup differences: Not	applicable					
			0.01 0.1 1	10 100		
		Favours	certolizumab pego	Favours control		

(1) 2(1 pneumonia neumococcal and 1 pneumocystis jirobenzi pneumonia)

Analysis 8.21. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 21 Headache.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 21 Headache

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	1/96	5/98		7.6 %	0.26 [0.05, 1.31]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	0/82	0/77			Not estimable
RAPID I 2005	22/392	11/199	-	36.1 %	1.02 [0.48, 2.13]
RAPID2 2007	9/248	1/125		11.3 %	2.95 [0.78, 11.14]
REALISTIC 2008	47/846	11/209	+	45.1 %	1.06 [0.54, 2.05]
Total (95% CI)	1664	708	+	100.0 %	1.05 [0.67, 1.64]
Total events: 79 (Certolizumab	pegol 200 mg), 28 (Con	trol)			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.18, df =	= 3 (P = 0.16); l ² =42%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.22$	(P = 0.82)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				

0.01 0.1 I 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.22. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 22 Bacteriuria.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 22 Bacteriuria

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg n/N	Control n/N		O Peto	Peto dds Ratio Fixed.95% C	1	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio Peto Fixed 95% Cl
RAPID2 2007	8/248	4/125		-			100.0 %	1.01 [0.30, 3.40]
Total (95% CI)	248	125		-	-		100.0 %	1.01 [0.30, 3.40]
Total events: 8 (Certolizur	nab pegol 200 mg), 4 (Co	ntrol)						
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.01 (P = 0.99)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable							
			0.01	0.1	I I0	100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.23. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 23 Nasopharyngitis/Pharyngitis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 23 Nasopharyngitis/Pharyngitis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	10/96	11/98		15.8 %	0.92 [0.37, 2.27]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	26/116	21/114		31.5 %	1.28 [0.67, 2.42]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	16/82	12/77	-	19.5 %	1.31 [0.58, 2.95]
NCT00993317	10/85	4/42		9.3 %	1.25 [0.39, 4.06]
RAPIDI 2005	21/392	3/199		17.3 %	2.68 [1.13, 6.36]
RAPID2 2007	8/248	1/125	+	6.6 %	2.79 [0.69, 11.32]
Total (95% CI)	1019	655	•	100.0 %	1.46 [1.02, 2.09]
Total events: 91 (Certolizumab p	begol 200 mg), 52 (Cont	rol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 4.04$, df =	= 5 (P = 0.54); I ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.05$ ((P = 0.040)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	ot applicable				

0.01 0.1 1 10 100

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.24. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 24 Hypertension.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 24 Hypertension

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00791921 HIKARI	4/116	/ 4	+	13.0 %	3.33 [0.57, 19.54]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	3/82	0/77		7.8 %	7.13 [0.73, 69.59]
RAPIDI 2005	25/392	2/199		60.8 %	3.42 [1.51, 7.74]
RAPID2 2007	6/248	2/125		18.4 %	1.48 [0.34, 6.50]
Total (95% CI)	838	515	•	100.0 %	3.09 [1.64, 5.84]
Total events: 38 (Certolizumab	pegol 200 mg), 5 (Contr	ol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1.54$, df	= 3 (P = 0.67); I ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.48	(P = 0.0005 I)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours of	certolizumab pego Favours control		

Analysis 8.25. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 25 Hematuria.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 25 Hematuria

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,955	% CI	Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID2 2007	4/248	5/125		100.0 %	0.36 [0.09, 1.47]
Total (95% CI)	248	125		100.0 %	0.36 [0.09, 1.47]
Total events: 4 (Certolizur	mab pegol 200 mg), 5 (Co	ontrol)			
Heterogeneity: not applica	able				
Test for overall effect: Z =	: 1.42 (P = 0.16)				
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1	10 100	
		Favours ce	rtolizumab pego Fav	vours control	

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 8.26. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 26 Hepatic enzyme increased.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 26 Hepatic enzyme increased

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/IN	n/IN	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00791999 JRAPID	3/82	4/77		52.3 %	0.70 [0.15, 3.15]
RAPID2 2007	3/248	4/125		47.7 %	0.34 [0.07, 1.66]
Total (95% CI)	330	202	-	100.0 %	0.49 [0.17, 1.48]
Total events: 6 (Certolizumab p	begol 200 mg), 8 (Control)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.41$, df	= $ (P = 0.52); ^2 = 0.0\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.26$	(P = 0.21)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	Vot applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours ce	ertolizumab pego Favours control		

Analysis 8.27. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 27 AST increased.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 27 AST increased

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control		Ode	Peto Is Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,F	xed,95% Cl			Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID2 2007	2/248	5/125			-		100.0 %	0.18 [0.04, 0.86]
Total (95% CI)	248	125		-	-		100.0 %	0.18 [0.04, 0.86]
Total events: 2 (Certolizur	mab pegol 200 mg), 5 (Co	ntrol)						
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.14 (P = 0.032)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable							
						1		
			0.01	0.1	I I0	100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.28. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 28 ALT increased.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 28 ALT increased

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Odds	Peto Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fix	ed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
RAPID2 2007	1/248	6/125			100.0 %	0.09 [0.02, 0.45]
Total (95% CI)	248	125			100.0 %	0.09 [0.02, 0.45]
Total events: (Certolizur	mab pegol 200 mg), 6 (Co	ntrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applica	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.95 (P = 0.0032)					
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	10 100		
		Favours ce	ertolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 8.29. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 29 Back pain.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 29 Back pain

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	17/392	2/199		100.0 %	2.91 [1.11, 7.65]
Total (95% CI)	392	199	•	100.0 %	2.91 [1.11, 7.65]
Total events: 17 (Certolizu	ımab 200 mg pegol), 2 (C	iontrol)			
Heterogeneity: not applica	ble				
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.17 (P = 0.030)				
Test for subgroup difference	ces: Not applicable				
				I.	
			0.01 0.1 1 10	100	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.30. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 30 Herpes viral infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 30 Herpes viral infection

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	0	Peto dds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto	,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00791921 HIKARI	1/116	0/114			52.8 %	7.26 [0.14, 366.07]
RAPIDI 2005	1/392	0/199			47.2 %	4.52 [0.07, 285.70]
Total (95% CI)	508	313			100.0 %	5.80 [0.34, 100.23]
Total events: 2 (Certolizumab 2	200 mg pegol), 0 (Contro	ol)				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.03, df	$= (P = 0.87); ^2 = 0.0\%$	Ś				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.21$	(P = 0.23)					
Test for subgroup differences: N	Vot applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours	certolizumab pego	Favours contro	bl	

Analysis 8.31. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 31 Bacterial peritonitis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 31 Bacterial peritonitis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Peto Odds Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio		
	n/N	n/N		Peto,Fixed,95% CI				Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	1/392	0/199				→	100.0 %	4.52 [0.07, 285.70]
Total (95% CI)	392	199					100.0 %	4.52 [0.07, 285.70]
Total events: I (Certolizu	mab 200 mg pegol), 0 (C	ontrol)						
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.71 (P = 0.48)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable							
			0.01	0.1	1 10	100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.32. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 32 Opportunistic infections.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 32 Opportunistic infections

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Odds I	Peto Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixe	d,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	0/98				Not estimable
NCT00791921 HIKARI (1)	2/116	0/114			100.0 %	7.33 [0.46, 117.85]
RAPIDI 2005	0/392	0/199				Not estimable
REALISTIC 2008	0/846	0/209				Not estimable
Total (95% CI)	1450	620			100.0 %	7.33 [0.46, 117.85]
Total events: 2 (Certolizumab 200) mg pegol), 0 (Control)					
Heterogeneity: not applicable						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.41$ (P	= 0.16)					
Test for subgroup differences: Not	t applicable					
			0.01 0.1 1	10 100		
		Favours cer	rtolizumab pego	Favours control		

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 8.33. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 33 Infections and infestations.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 33 Infections and infestations

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	27/96	26/98		11.8 %	1.06 [0.67, 1.68]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	33/116	27/114		12.6 %	1.20 [0.78, 1.86]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	27/82	16/77		9.5 %	1.58 [0.93, 2.70]
NCT00993317	30/85	9/42		7.0 %	1.65 [0.86, 3.14]
RAPIDI 2005	171/392	52/199	-	22.6 %	1.67 [1.29, 2.16]
RAPID2 2007	26/108	69/248		14.7 %	0.87 [0.59, 1.28]
REALISTIC 2008	245/846	48/209		21.8 %	1.26 [0.96, 1.65]
Total (95% CI)	1725	98 7	*	100.0 %	1.29 [1.07, 1.56]
Total events: 559 (Certolizumab	200 mg pegol), 247 (C	ontrol)			
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.02$; Chi	$i^2 = 9.71$, df = 6 (P = 0.	4); ² =38%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.63$	(P = 0.0085)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				
			0.2 0.5 2 5		
		Favour	s certolizumab pego Favours control		

Analysis 8.34. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 34 Gastroenteritis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 34 Gastroenteritis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control		0	Peto dds Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto	Fixed,95%	% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	7/96	6/98					93.2 %	1.20 [0.39, 3.70]
RAPID I 2005	0/392	1/199	←	•			6.8 %	0.05 [0.00, 3.25]
Total (95% CI)	488	297			+		100.0 %	0.97 [0.33, 2.87]
Total events: 7 (Certolizur	mab 200 mg pegol), 7 (Cor	ntrol)						
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 2.0$	17, df = $ (P = 0.15); ^2 = 5$	2%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.05 (P = 0.96)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable							
			0.01	0.1	I	10 10)	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.35. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 35 Hematologic abnormalities.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 35 Hematologic abnormalities

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio		
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI		
NCT00791921 HIKARI	1/116	/ 4		52.7 %	0.98 [0.06, 15.81]		
RAPIDI 2005	2/392	0/199		47.3 %	4.53 [0.24, 85.22]		
Total (95% CI)	508	313	-	100.0 %	2.02 [0.27, 15.21]		
Total events: 3 (Certolizumab 200 mg pegol), I (Control)							
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.55$, df	$= (P = 0.46); ^2 = 0.0\%$						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.68$	(P = 0.49)						
Test for subgroup differences: N	Not applicable						
			0.01 0.1 1 10 10	C			
		Favours	certolizumab pego Favours contr	ol			

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 8.36. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 36 Decreased haemoglobin.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 36 Decreased haemoglobin

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control		Odds	Peto Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,Fix	ed,95% Cl			Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
RAPID I 2005	2/392	1/199					100.0 %	1.02 [0.09, 11.18]
Total (95% CI)	392	199					100.0 %	1.02 [0.09, 11.18]
Total events: 2 (Certolizur	mab 200 mg pegol), I (Co	ontrol)						
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.01 (P = 0.99)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable							
			i		i	i		
			0.01	0.1	10	100		
			Favours	control	Favours o	ertolizumab p	ego	

Analysis 8.37. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 37 Increased platelet count.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 37 Increased platelet count

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control		Peto Odds Ratio))	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,Fixed,95	% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	0/392	1/199	← <mark>+</mark>			100.0 %	0.05 [0.00, 3.25]
Total (95% CI)	392	199				100.0 %	0.05 [0.00, 3.25]
Total events: 0 (Certolizur	mab 200 mg pegol), I (Co	ntrol)					
Heterogeneity: not applica	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	: 1.40 (P = 0.16)						
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable						
			ı				
			0.01 0).I I	10 100		

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 8.38. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 38 Pneumonia.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 38 Pneumonia

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	1/98	← ∎	11.2 %	0.14 [0.00, 6.96]
REALISTIC 2008	7/846	1/209		56.6 %	1.59 [0.28, 9.09]
NCT00993317	1/85	0/42		9.9 %	4.46 [0.07, 287.18]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	2/116	0/114		22.3 %	7.33 [0.46, 7.85]
Total (95% CI)	1143	463	-	100.0 %	1.88 [0.51, 6.99]
Total events: 10 (Certolizumab	200 mg pegol), 2 (Contr	ol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 2.83$, df	= 3 (P = 0.42); I ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.95$	6 (P = 0.34)				
Test for subgroup differences: I	Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours	certolizumab pego Favours control		

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 8.39. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 39 Diarrhoea.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 39 Diarrhoea

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Odds	Peto Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio	
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fix	ed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI	
CERTAIN 2008	5/96	6/98			80.0 %	0.84 [0.25, 2.84]	
NCT00993317	1/85	2/42			20.0 %	0.21 [0.02, 2.42]	
Total (95% CI)	181	140	-		100.0 %	0.64 [0.22, 1.90]	
Total events: 6 (Certolizur	mab 200 mg pegol), 8 (Coi	ntrol)					
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.9$	98, df = 1 (P = 0.32); $I^2 = 0$.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.80 (P = 0.42)						
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable						
			0.01 0.1 1	10 100			
Favours certolizumab pego Favours control							

Analysis 8.40. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 40 Cerebral haemorrhage including subarachnoid.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 40 Cerebral haemorrhage including subarachnoid

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control		Odd	Peto s Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,Fi	ked,95% Cl			Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	1/98	←				36.3 %	0.14 [0.00, 6.96]
NCT00993317	2/85	0/42					63.7 %	4.5 [0.23, 86.80]
Total (95% CI)	181	140					100.0 %	1.27 [0.12, 13.50]
Total events: 2 (Certolizu	mab 200 mg pegol), I (Co	ntrol)						
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1.9$	94, df = 1 (P = 0.16); $I^2 = 4$	18%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.20 (P = 0.84)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable							
					LI			
			0.01	0.1	I I0	100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.41. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 41 Nausea/vomiting.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 41 Nausea/vomiting

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Oc	Peto Ids Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,	Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	5/96	5/98		-	22.3 %	1.02 [0.29, 3.64]
REALISTIC 2008	42/846	13/209	-	-	77.7 %	0.78 [0.39, 1.53]
Total (95% CI)	942	307		•	100.0 %	0.83 [0.45, 1.50]
Total events: 47 (Certoliz	umab 200 mg pegol), 18 (0	Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.1$	4, df = 1 (P = 0.71); $I^2 = 0$).0%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.63 (P = 0.53)					
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours c	ertolizumab pego	Favours control		

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 8.42. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 42 Acute miocardial infarction.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 42 Acute miocardial infarction

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	l Odds R	Peto Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed	1,95% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	0/98				Not estimable
Total (95% CI)	96	98				Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Certolizum	nab 200 mg pegol), 0 (Cont	rol)				
Heterogeneity: not applical	ble					
Test for overall effect: not a	applicable					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1 1	10 100		
		Favours	certolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 8.43. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 43 Constipation.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 43 Constipation

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00791921 HIKARI	4/116	0/114		100.0 %	7.46 [1.04, 53.63]
Total (95% CI)	116	114	-	100.0 %	7.46 [1.04, 53.63]
Total events: 4 (Certolizumab 24	00 mg pegol), 0 (Contro)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.00$	(P = 0.046)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				

0.01 0.1 I 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.44. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 44 Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 44 Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00791921 HIKARI	17/116	3/114	-	54.3 %	4.52 [1.81, 11.28]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	10/82	4/77		38.0 %	2.38 [0.80, 7.10]
NCT00993317	3/85	0/42		7.7 %	4.56 [0.40, 51.56]
Total (95% CI)	283	233	•	100.0 %	3.54 [1.81, 6.95]
Total events: 30 (Certolizumab	200 mg pegol), 7 (Contr	rol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.82$, df =	= 2 (P = 0.66); I ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.68$	(P = 0.00024)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours c	ertolizumab pego Favours control		

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 8.45. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 45 Cough.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 45 Cough

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Odd	Peto s Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fi	ked,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
NCT00993317	4/85	1/42			100.0 %	1.84 [0.28, 12.22]
Total (95% CI)	85	42		-	100.0 %	1.84 [0.28, 12.22]
Total events: 4 (Certolizur	mab 200 mg pegol), I (Co	ontrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applica	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.63 (P = 0.53)					
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	1 10 100		
		Favours ce	ertolizumab pego	Favours contro	I	

Analysis 8.46. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 46 Pruritus.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 46 Pruritus

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control		Odd	Peto Is Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,Fi	xed,95% Cl			Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
NCT00993317	3/85	0/42		_		-	100.0 %	4.56 [0.40, 51.56]
Total (95% CI)	85	42		_		-	100.0 %	4.56 [0.40, 51.56]
Total events: 3 (Certolizur	mab 200 mg pegol), 0 (Co	ontrol)						
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.23 (P = 0.22)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable							
					<u> </u>			
			0.01	0.1	I I0	100		
		Favours o	ertolizum	ab pego	Favours	control		

Analysis 8.47. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 47 Abdominal pain/discomfort/dyspepsia.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 47 Abdominal pain/discomfort/dyspepsia

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	C	Peto Ddds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Pet	o,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00993317	12/85	2/42			100.0 %	2.58 [0.80, 8.35]
Total (95% CI)	85	42		-	100.0 %	2.58 [0.80, 8.35]
Total events: 12 (Certolizu	umab 200 mg pegol), 2 (C	ontrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applica	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	I.58 (P = 0.11)					
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IO	D	
		Favours	certolizumab pego	Favours contr	ol	

Analysis 8.48. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 48 Fatigue.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 48 Fatigue

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control		Odd	Peto s Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,Fix	ked,95% Cl			Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
NCT00993317	3/85	1/42					100.0 %	1.45 [0.18, 11.96]
Total (95% CI)	85	42					100.0 %	1.45 [0.18, 11.96]
Total events: 3 (Certolizur	mab 200 mg pegol), I (Co	ontrol)						
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.35 (P = 0.73)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable							
			0.01	0.1	0	100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 8.49. Comparison 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome 49 Periodontitis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 8 Safety, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: 49 Periodontitis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg pegol	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00791999 JRAPID	4/85	2/77		100.0 %	1.80 [0.35, 9.16]
Total (95% CI)	85	77	-	100.0 %	1.80 [0.35, 9.16]
Total events: 4 (Certolizumab 2	.00 mg pegol), 2 (Contro	I)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.71$	(P = 0.48)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours ce	ertolizumab pego Favours control		

Analysis 9.1. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 Any adverse events.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: I Any adverse events

Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.89$	(P = 0.0038)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.01$; Ch	$hi^2 = 8.60, df = 4 (P = 0.60)$	07); l ² =53%			
Total events: 650 (Certolizuma	b pegol 400 mg), 358 (C	Control)			
Total (95% CI)	955	629	•	100.0 %	1.20 [1.06, 1.35]
RAPID2 2007	125/246	66/125	+	18.5 %	0.96 [0.78, 1.18]
RAPID I 2005	298/389	115/199	-	27.0 %	1.33 [1.16, 1.51]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	46/85	31/77		9.9 %	1.34 [0.96, 1.88]
FAST4WARD 2005	84/111	63/109	-	19.9 %	1.31 [1.08, 1.59]
CDP870-014 2009	97/124	83/119	-	24.6 %	1.12 [0.96, 1.30]
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-

0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control
Analysis 9.2. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 2 Adverse events Intensity mild.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 2 Adverse events Intensity mild

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	64/124	61/119	_	24.7 %	1.01 [0.79, 1.29]
FAST4WARD 2005	62/111	43/109		21.2 %	1.42 [1.06, 1.88]
RAPIDI 2005	254/389	90/199		32.4 %	.44 [.22, .7]
RAPID2 2007	101/246	45/125		21.8 %	1.14 [0.86, 1.51]
Total (95% CI) 870 552 Total events: 481 (Certolizumab pegol 400 mg), 239 (Control) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02; Chi ² = 6.79, df = 3 (P = 0.08); I ² = 56% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.43 (P = 0.015)		552 (Control) 0.08); I ² =56%	-	100.0 %	1.25 [1.04, 1.50]
lest for subgroup difference	es: inot applicable		0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.3. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 3 Adverse events Intensity moderate.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 3 Adverse events Intensity moderate

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Risk Ratio M- H Random 95%	Weight	Risk Ratio M- H Random 95%
	n/N	n/N	Cl		Cl
CDP870-014 2009	59/124	45/119		24.4 %	1.26 [0.94, 1.69]
FAST4WARD 2005	52/111	40/109		21.7 %	1.28 [0.93, 1.75]
RAPIDI 2005	177/389	66/199		37.9 %	1.37 [1.10, 1.72]
RAPID2 2007	57/246	32/125		16.0 %	0.91 [0.62, 1.32]
Total (95% CI)	870	552	•	100.0 %	1.24 [1.06, 1.45]
Total events: 345 (Certolizu	ımab pegol 400 mg), 183 ((Control)			
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.00$;	; $Chi^2 = 3.52$, $df = 3$ (P =	0.32); I ² = I 5%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2$	2.64 (P = 0.0082)				
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable				
			0.5 0.7 I I.5 2		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.4. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 4 Adverse events Intensity severe.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 4 Adverse events Intensity severe

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CDP870-014 2009	17/124	4/ 9		26.5 %	1.19 [0.56, 2.53]
FAST4WARD 2005	8/	11/109	← ■	17.0 %	0.69 [0.27, 1.78]
RAPIDI 2005	38/389	13/199		40.8 %	1.50 [0.82, 2.76]
RAPID2 2007	14/246	5/125		15.8 %	1.41 [0.53, 3.75]
Total (95% CI)	870	552		100.0 %	1.23 [0.83, 1.81]
Total events: 77 (Certolizum	nab pegol 400 mg), 43 (Co	ontrol)			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93,	df = 3 (P = 0.59); I ² =0.0	%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.04 (P = 0.30)				
Test for subgroup difference	s: Not applicable				
			0.5 0.7 1.5 2		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.5. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 5 Adverse events related to study drug.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 5 Adverse events related to study drug

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% CI		M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
FAST4WARD 2005	27/111	24/109	-	20.0 %	1.10 [0.68, 1.79]
RAPIDI 2005	166/389	50/199	-	54.7 %	1.70 [1.30, 2.22]
RAPID2 2007	56/246	23/125	-	25.2 %	1.24 [0.80, 1.91]
Total (95% CI)	746	433	•	100.0 %	1.46 [1.19, 1.80]
Total events: 249 (Certolizur	mab pegol 400 mg), 97 (0	Control)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 3.08$,	df = 2 (P = 0.2 I); I ² =35	%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$.	.65 (P = 0.00027)				
Test for subgroup differences	s: Not applicable				

0.01 0.1 I 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.6. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 6 Serious infections.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 6 Serious infections

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CDP870-014 2009	3/124	2/119		14.6 %	1.44 [0.25, 8.44]
FAST4WARD 2005	2/111	0/109		5.9 %	7.32 [0.46, 117.84]
RAPIDI 2005	23/389	2/199		63.8 %	3.33 [1.43, 7.76]
RAPID2 2007	6/246	0/125		15.7 %	4.61 [0.84, 25.36]
Total (95% CI)	870	552	•	100.0 %	3.25 [1.65, 6.39]
Total events: 34 (Certolizun	nab pegol 400 mg), 4 (Co	ontrol)			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.31,	df = 3 (P = 0.73); $I^2 = 0.73$.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$.42 (P = 0.00063)				
Test for subgroup difference	s: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.7. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 7 3 Serious Adverse Events (SAE).

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 7 3Serious Adverse Events (SAE)

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	16/124	12/119		23.2 %	1.32 [0.60, 2.89]
FAST4WARD 2005	8/111	3/109		9.8 %	2.54 [0.76, 8.53]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	5/85	1/77		5.4 %	3.59 [0.70, 18.26]
RAPIDI 2005	48/389	11/199		44.4 %	2.12 [1.20, 3.75]
RAPID2 2007	18/246	4/125		17.3 %	2.09 [0.84, 5.19]
Total (95% CI)	955	629		100.0 %	1.98 [1.36, 2.90]
Total events: 95 (Certolizumab	pegol 400 mg), 31 (Cont	trol)			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.78, df =	= 4 (P = 0.78); I ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.55	(P = 0.00038)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	ot applicable				
			0.5 0.7 I I.5 2		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.8. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 8 Adverse events leading to death.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 8 Adverse events leading to death

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
FAST4WARD 2005	0/111	0/109			Not estimable
RAPID I 2005	4/389	1/199		83.3 %	1.86 [0.29, 11.96]
RAPID2 2007	1/246	0/125		16.7 %	4.52 [0.07, 285.66]
Total (95% CI)	746	433		100.0 %	2.16 [0.40, 11.79]
Total events: 5 (Certolizuma	ab pegol 400 mg), 1 (Con	trol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.15$, $df = 1 (P = 0.70)$; $I^2 = 0.0\%$					
Test for overall effect: $Z = C$	0.89 (P = 0.37)				
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable				

0.01 0.1 I 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.9. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 9 Adverse events leading to withdrawal.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 9 Adverse events leading to withdrawal

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	7/124	6/119	← ●	21.3 %	1.13 [0.37, 3.44]
FAST4WARD 2005	5/111	2/109		11.8 %	2.37 [0.53, 10.64]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	7/85	3/77		16.3 %	2.11 [0.59, 7.55]
RAPIDI 2005	22/389	3/199		37.1 %	2.77 [1.19, 6.44]
RAPID2 2007	7/246	2/125	← →	13.6 %	1.69 [0.42, 6.84]
Total (95% CI)	955	629		100.0 %	2.01 [1.20, 3.36]
Total events: 48 (Certolizumab	pegol 400 mg), 16 (Con	trol)			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.69, df	= 4 (P = 0.79); l ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.65	(P = 0.0081)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				
			0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.10. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 10 Death.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 10 Death

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	P Odds Ra	eto atio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,	95% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	0/124	0/119				Not estimable
FAST4WARD 2005	0/111	0/109				Not estimable
RAPIDI 2005	4/389	1/199		<u> </u>	83.3 %	1.86 [0.29, 11.96]
RAPID2 2007	1/246	0/125		•	16.7 %	4.52 [0.07, 285.66]
Total (95% CI)	870	552			100.0 %	2.16 [0.40, 11.79]
Total events: 5 (Certolizuma	ab pegol 400 mg), I (Con	trol)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.15$	df = 1 (P = 0.70); $I^2 = 0.0$)%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.89 (P = 0.37)					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1 1	10 100		
		Favours ce	rtolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 9.11. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 11 Vomiting.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: II Vomiting

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg n/N	Control n/N	Peto Odds Ratio Peto,Fixed,95% (Weight	Peto Odds Ratio Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
FAST4WARD 2005	0/111	1/109		100.0 %	0.13 [0.00, 6.70]
Total (95% CI)	111	109		100.0 %	0.13 [0.00, 6.70]
Total events: 0 (Certolizuma	ab pegol 400 mg), 1 (Cont	trol)			
Heterogeneity: not applicab	e				
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.01 (P = 0.31)				
Test for subgroup difference	s: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10	100	
		Favours	certolizumab pego Favou	rs control	

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 9.12. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 12 Pneumonitis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 12 Pneumonitis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
FAST4WARD 2005	0/111	1/109		100.0 %	0.13 [0.00, 6.70]
Total (95% CI)	111	109		100.0 %	0.13 [0.00, 6.70]
Total events: 0 (Certolizuma	ab pegol 400 mg), 1 (Cont	trol)			
Heterogeneity: not applicab	e				
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.01 (P = 0.31)				
Test for subgroup difference	s: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 10	0	
		Favours	certolizumab pego Favours conti	rol	

Analysis 9.13. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 13 Tuberculosis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 13 Tuberculosis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
FAST4WARD 2005	0/111	0/109			Not estimable
RAPIDI 2005	3/389	0/199		60.0 %	4.56 [0.42, 50.01]
RAPID2 2007	2/246	0/125		40.0 %	4.54 [0.24, 85.48]
Total (95% CI)	746	433		100.0 %	4.55 [0.71, 29.11]
Total events: 5 (Certolizum	ab pegol 400 mg), 0 (Con	trol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.00$	$df = (P = .00); ^2 = 0.0$)%			
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	1.60 (P = 0.11)				
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable				

0.01 0.1 I 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.14. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 14 Arthritis bacterial.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 14 Arthritis bacterial

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Odd	Peto s Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fi	xed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
FAST4WARD 2005	1/111	0/109		→	100.0 %	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
Total (95% CI)	111	109			100.0 %	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
Total events: I (Certolizum	ab pegol 400 mg), 0 (Cor	ntrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applicat	ble					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.99 (P = 0.32)					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours cer	rtolizumab pego	Favours control		

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 9.15. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 15 Mastitis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 15 Mastitis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Oc	Peto Ids Ratio Fixed 95% Cl	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio Peto Fixed 95% Cl
	11/15	11/1 N	reto,	rixed,75% Ci		1 eto,i 1xed,75% CI
FAST4WARD 2005	1/111	0/109			100.0 %	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
Total (95% CI)	111	109	_		100.0 %	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
Total events: I (Certolizum:	ab pegol 400 mg), 0 (Cor	ntrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.99 (P = 0.32)					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	1 10 10	00	
		Favours cer	rtolizumab pego	Favours cont	rol	

Analysis 9.16. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 16 Benign Tumour.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 16 Benign Tumour

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto I Odds Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio			
	n/N	n/N		Peto	,Fixed,S	95% CI			Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
FAST4WARD 2005	2/111	0/109				•		100.0 %	7.32 [0.46, 7.84]
Total (95% CI)	111	109						100.0 %	7.32 [0.46, 117.84]
Total events: 2 (Certolizuma	b pegol 400 mg), 0 (Cor	itrol)							
Heterogeneity: not applicabl	e								
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.40 (P = 0.16)								
Test for subgroup difference	s: Not applicable								
			0.01	0.1	Ι	10	100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.17. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 17 Ischaemeic stroke.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 17 Ischaemeic stroke

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Oc	Peto Ids Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio Pata Fixed 95% Cl
	n/IN	n/in	Peto,	FIXED,95% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
FAST4WARD 2005	1/111	0/109			100.0 %	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
Total (95% CI)	111	109			100.0 %	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
Total events: I (Certolizum	ab pegol 400 mg), 0 (Con	trol)				
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.99 (P = 0.32)					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	1 10 100		
		Favours o	ertolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 9.18. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 18 Dizziness postural.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 18 Dizziness postural

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control		Odd	Peto Is Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,Fi	xed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
FAST4WARD 2005	1/111	0/109				100.0 %	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
Total (95% CI)	111	109				100.0 %	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
Total events: I (Certolizum:	ab pegol 400 mg), 0 (Cor	ntrol)					
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$).99 (P = 0.32)						
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable						
			0.01	0.1	1 10 100)	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.19. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 19 Menorrhagia.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 19 Menorrhagia

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Od	Peto ds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,F	ixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
FAST4WARD 2005	1/111	0/109			100.0 %	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
Total (95% CI)	111	109			100.0 %	7.26 [0.14, 365.79]
Total events: I (Certolizum	nab pegol 400 mg), 0 (Coi	ntrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applical	ble					
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	0.99 (P = 0.32)					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours c	ertolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 9.20. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 20 Malignancies included lymphoma.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 20 Malignancies included lymphoma

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio			
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl			
FAST4WARD 2005	0/111	0/109			Not estimable			
RAPID1 2005 (1)	4/389	1/199		71.4 %	1.86 [0.29, 11.96]			
RAPID2 2007 (2)	1/246	1/125		28.6 %	0.48 [0.03, 9.06]			
Total (95% CI)	746	433	-	100.0 %	1.26 [0.26, 6.08]			
Total events: 5 (Certolizum	ab pegol 400 mg), 2 (Cont	rol)						
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.58$, df = 1 (P = 0.44); $I^2 = 0.0$	%						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.29 (P = 0.77)							
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable							
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100					
		Favours c	ertolizumab pego Favours control					
one papilloma.								

(1) In the placebo arm one patient suffered a thyroid neoplasm and 4 in the certolizumab 400 mg sc suffered two tongue neoplasm, I extranodal marginal zone B cell limphoma and

(2) One case of malignant neoplasm was reported in each arm, namely bladder cancer in the placebo group and colon cancer in certolizumab pegol 400 mg group

Analysis 9.21. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 21 Injection site pain.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 21 Injection site pain

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
FAST4WARD 2005	0/111	2/109		27.2 %	0.13[0.01, 2.12]
RAPIDI 2005	5/389	0/199	⊢ ∎−−	60.7 %	4.58 [0.71, 29.39]
RAPID2 2007	1/246	0/125		12.2 %	4.52 [0.07, 285.66]
Total (95% CI)	746	433	-	100.0 %	1.74 [0.41, 7.42]
Total events: 6 (Certolizuma	b pegol 400 mg), 2 (Cont	rol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 4.56$,	df = 2 (P = 0.10); $I^2 = 56$	%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$.	.75 (P = 0.45)				
Test for subgroup difference	s: Not applicable				

0.01 0.1 I 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.22. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 22 Injection side reactions.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 22 Injection side reactions

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009 (1)	5/124	34/119	-	54.6 %	0.16 [0.08, 0.32]
FAST4WARD 2005	5/111	15/109		30.3 %	0.33 [0.13, 0.82]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	2/85	0/77		3.3 %	6.81 [0.42, 110.13]
RAPIDI 2005	3/389	0/199		4.4 %	4.56 [0.42, 50.01]
RAPID2 2007	5/246	0/125		7.3 %	4.59 [0.71, 29.64]
Total (95% CI)	955	629	•	100.0 %	0.34 [0.20, 0.56]
Total events: 20 (Certolizumab p	begol 400 mg), 49 (Cont	trol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 20.89$, df	= 4 (P = 0.00033); I ² =	81%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.21$ ((P = 0.000025)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	ot applicable				
			0.00 0.0 0.1 10 00 000		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

(1) Authors explained that "possibly due to the use of the sorbitol placebo"

Analysis 9.23. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 23 Anti-certolizumab pegol antibodies.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

-

-

-

Outcome: 23 Anti-certolizumab pegol antibodies

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
FAST4WARD 2005	9/111	0/109		71.0 %	7.82 [2.07, 29.62]
RAPID2 2007	4/246	0/125	+	29.0 %	4.57 [0.57, 36.68]
Total (95% CI)	357	234	-	100.0 %	6.70 [2.18, 20.55]
Total events: 13 (Certolizum	nab pegol 400 mg), 0 (Co	ntrol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.18$,	df = 1 (P = 0.67); $I^2 = 0.0$)%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$.32 (P = 0.00089)				
Test for subgroup difference	s: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.24. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 24 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA).

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 24 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA)

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	С	Peto odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Petc	,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
FAST4WARD 2005	19/111	12/109		-	100.0 %	1.65 [0.77, 3.53]
Total (95% CI)	111	109		•	100.0 %	1.65 [0.77, 3.53]
Total events: 19 (Certolizum	nab pegol 400 mg), 12 (Co	ontrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applicabl	e					
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.30 (P = 0.19)					
Test for subgroup difference	s: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours	certolizumab pego	Favours contro		

Analysis 9.25. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 25 Prolonged activated partial thromboplastin time (aPTT).

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 25 Prolonged activated partial thromboplastin time (aPTT)

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	C	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto	,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID2 2007	12/246	2/125		+	100.0 %	2.46 [0.80, 7.60]
Total (95% CI)	246	125			100.0 %	2.46 [0.80, 7.60]
Total events: 12 (Certoliz	umab pegol 400 mg), 2 (C	ontrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applic	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.56 (P = 0.12)					
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours o	certolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 9.26. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 26 Urinary tract infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 26 Urinary tract infection

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	33/389	13/199		75.9 %	1.31 [0.69, 2.47]
RAPID2 2007	5/246	9/125		24.1 %	0.24 [0.08, 0.75]
Total (95% CI)	635	324	•	100.0 %	0.87 [0.50, 1.52]
Total events: 38 (Certoliz	umab pegol 400 mg), 22 (4	Control)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 6.5$	54, df = 1 (P = 0.01); $ ^2 = 8$	35%			
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.48 (P = 0.63)				
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable				
			0.05 0.2 I 5 20		
		Favours o	ertolizumab pego Favours contro	ol	

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 9.27. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 27 Back pain.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 27 Back pain

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	(Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Pet	o,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CDP870-014 2009	7/124	2/119			31.4 %	3.03 [0.80, 1.43]
RAPIDI 2005	20/389	2/199			68.6 %	3.15 [1.28, 7.74]
Total (95% CI)	513	318		•	100.0 %	3.11 [1.48, 6.55]
Total events: 27 (Certolizu						
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.0$	D, df = 1 (P = 0.96); $I^2 = 0$	0.0%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.98 (P = 0.0028)					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable					
					<u> </u>	
			0.01 0.1	I I0	100	
		Favo	urs certolizumab peg	o Favours d	control	

Analysis 9.28. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 28 Upper respiratory tract infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 28 Upper respiratory tract infection

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CDP870-014 2009	4/124	4/119		18.9 %	0.96 [0.23, 3.91]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	3/85	3/77	_	4. %	0.90 [0.18, 4.60]
RAPID I 2005	21/389	5/199	-	54.2 %	1.98 [0.86, 4.54]
RAPID2 2007	4/246	2/125	_	12.9 %	1.02 [0.18, 5.59]
Total (95% CI)	844	520	•	100.0 %	1.42 [0.77, 2.61]
Total events: 32 (Certolizumab	pegol 400 mg), 14 (Con	trol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1.36$, df =	= 3 (P = 0.72); $I^2 = 0.0\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.12$	(P = 0.26)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	ot applicable				

0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.29. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 29 Lower respiratory tract infection/ lung infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

-

_

Outcome: 29 Lower respiratory tract infection/ lung infection

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CDP870-014 2009	3/124	3/119		41.1 %	0.96 [0.19, 4.83]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	4/85	1/77		34.0 %	3.10 [0.52, 18.35]
RAPID 2005	4/389	0/199		24.9 %	4.57 [0.57, 36.44]
Total (95% CI)	598	395	-	100.0 %	2.11 [0.75, 5.95]
Total events: 11 (Certolizumab	pegol 400 mg), 4 (Contr	ol)			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.63, df	= 2 (P = 0.44); I ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.41$	(P = 0.16)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	Vot applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100	1	
		Favours c	ertolizumab pego Favours contro	bl	

Analysis 9.30. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 30 Headache.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 30 Headache

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	12/124	9/119		35.1 %	1.31 [0.53, 3.19]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	3/85	0/77		5.4 %	6.89 [0.70, 67.36]
RAPIDI 2005	18/389	11/199		45.1 %	0.83 [0.38, 1.82]
RAPID2 2007	8/246	1/125		14.4 %	2.81 [0.69, 11.36]
Total (95% CI)	844	520	•	100.0 %	1.30 [0.76, 2.20]
Total events: 41 (Certolizumab	pegol 400 mg), 21 (Cont	trol)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 4.50$, df =	= 3 (P = 0.21); I ² =33%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.96$	(P = 0.34)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				
			0.02 0.1 1 10 50		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.31. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 31 Bacteriuria.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 31 Bacteriuria

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio Pete Fixed 95%	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio Pata Fixed 95% Cl
	h/IN	n/IN	Peto,Fixed,95%		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID2 2007	6/246	4/125		100.0 %	0.75 [0.20, 2.82]
Total (95% CI)	246	125		100.0 %	0.75 [0.20, 2.82]
Total events: 6 (Certolizur	mab pegol 400 mg), 4 (Co	ontrol)			
Heterogeneity: not applica	able				
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.43 (P = 0.67)				
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 1	0 100	
		Favours ce	rtolizumab pego Favo	ours control	

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 9.32. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 32 Hypertension.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 32 Hypertension

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Pe Odds Rat	to io	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,9	5% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
NCT00791999 JRAPID	2/85	0/77		+	4.9 %	6.81 [0.42, 110.13]
RAPID I 2005	32/389	2/199	-	-	71.3 %	3.76 [1.81, 7.80]
RAPID2 2007	9/246	2/125		_	23.7 %	2.04 [0.57, 7.25]
Total (95% CI)	720	401	•	•	100.0 %	3.35 [1.80, 6.20]
Total events: 43 (Certolizumab	pegol 400 mg), 4 (Contr	ol)				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.93, df =	= 2 (P = 0.63); I ² =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.83	(P = 0.00013)					
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable					
			0.01 0.1 1	10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.33. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 33 Hematuria.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 33 Hematuria

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg n/N	Control n/N		Oc Peto	Pet Ids Rat Fixed 9	to io 5% CI		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio Peto Fixed 95% Cl
	101 1	1011		1 010,	ixed, /	570 CI			
RAPID2 2007	4/246	5/125			-			100.0 %	0.37 [0.09, 1.49]
Total (95% CI)	246	125						100.0 %	0.37 [0.09, 1.49]
Total events: 4 (Certolizur	mab pegol 400 mg), 5 (Co	ontrol)							
Heterogeneity: not applica	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	1.40 (P = 0.16)								
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable								
			0.01	0.1	I	10	100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.34. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 34 Hepatic enzyme increased.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 34 Hepatic enzyme increased

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Ode	Peto ds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,F	ixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00791999 JRAPID	5/85	4/77	_	+	58.1 %	1.14 [0.30, 4.36]
RAPID2 2007	3/246	4/125		+	41.9 %	0.34 [0.07, 1.67]
Total (95% CI)	331	202			100.0 %	0.69 [0.25, 1.92]
Total events: 8 (Certolizumab p	begol 400 mg), 8 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.28, df	$= (P = 0.26); ^2 = 22\%$					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.71$	(P = 0.48)					
Test for subgroup differences: N	Vot applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IO	D	
		Favours of	certolizumab pego	Favours contr	ol	

Analysis 9.35. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 35 AST increased.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 35 AST increased

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control		Oc	Peto ds Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto, P	ixed,95% C	I		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID2 2007	6/246	5/125		-			100.0 %	0.58 [0.16, 2.07]
Total (95% CI)	246	125					100.0 %	0.58 [0.16, 2.07]
Total events: 6 (Certolizur	mab pegol 400 mg), 5 (Co	ntrol)						
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	: 0.84 (P = 0.40)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable							
			0.01	0.1	I I0	100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.36. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 36 ALT increased.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 36 ALT increased

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID2 2007	8/246	6/127		100.0 %	0.67 [0.22, 2.05]
Total (95% CI)	246	127	•	100.0 %	0.67 [0.22, 2.05]
Total events: 8 (Certolizur	mab pegol 400 mg), 6 (Co	ntrol)			
Heterogeneity: not applica	able				
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.71 (P = 0.48)				
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours ce	rtolizumab pego Favours control		

Analysis 9.37. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 37 Herpes viral infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 37 Herpes viral infection

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Odd	Peto Is Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fi	xed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	1/389	0/199		· · · ·	100.0 %	4.53 [0.07, 285.35]
Total (95% CI)	389	199			100.0 %	4.53 [0.07, 285.35]
Total events: I (Certolizu	mab pegol 400 mg), 0 (C	ontrol)				
Heterogeneity: not applic	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.72 (P = 0.47)					
Test for subgroup differen	ices: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours ce	rtolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 9.38. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 38 Bacterial peritonitis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 38 Bacterial peritonitis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Odd	Peto Is Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fi	xed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	0/389	0/199				Not estimable
Total (95% CI)	389	199				Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Certolizun	nab pegol 400 mg), 0 (Cont	irol)				
Heterogeneity: not applica	ble					
Test for overall effect: not	applicable					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable					
					1	
			0.01 0.1	I I0	100	
		Favou	urs certolizumab pego	Favours co	ontrol	

Analysis 9.39. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 39 Opportunistic infections.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 39 Opportunistic infections

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
RAPID I 2005	0/389	0/199			Not estimable
Total (95% CI)	389	199			Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Certolizun	nab pegol 400 mg), 0 (Cont	rol)			
Heterogeneity: not applica	ble				
Test for overall effect: not	applicable				
Test for subgroup difference	ces: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

0.01 0.1 I 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.40. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 40 Infections and infestations.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 40 Infections and infestations

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	33/124	17/119	-=-	19.3 %	1.86 [1.10, 3.16]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	23/85	16/77	+	18.0 %	1.30 [0.74, 2.28]
RAPIDI 2005	184/389	52/199	-	37.4 %	1.81 [1.40, 2.34]
RAPID2 2007	53/246	26/125	+	25.3 %	1.04 [0.68, 1.57]
Total (95% CI)	844	520	•	100.0 %	1.49 [1.11, 1.99]
Total events: 293 (Certolizuma	b pegol 400 mg), 111 (C	ontrol)			
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.04$; Cl	$hi^2 = 5.84, df = 3 (P = 0.1)$	12); I ² =49%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.67$	′ (P = 0.0076)				
Test for subgroup differences: 1	Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10	100	
		Favours	certolizumab pego Favours c	control	

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 9.41. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 41 Nasopharyngitis/Pharyngitis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 41 Nasopharyngitis/Pharyngitis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg n/N	Control n/N	Peto Odds Ratio Peto,Fixed,95% Cl	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	15/124	8/119		27.6 %	1.87 [0.79, 4.40]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	15/85	12/77	-	29.8 %	1.16 [0.51, 2.64]
RAPIDI 2005	30/389	3/199		36.8 %	3.22 [1.53, 6.76]
RAPID2 2007	4/246	1/125		5.8 %	1.86 [0.29, 11.99]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 64 (Certolizumab Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 3.29$, df = Test for overall effect: Z = 2.97 Test for subgroup differences: N	844 pegol 400 mg), 24 (Con = 3 (P = 0.35); I ² =9% (P = 0.0029) ot applicable	520 trol)	•	100.0 %	1.98 [1.26, 3.11]

0.01 0.1 1 10 100

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.42. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 42 Gastrointestinal disorders.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 42 Gastrointestinal disorders

-

-

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control		Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CDP870-014 2009	22/124	19/119			97.4 %	1.13 [0.58, 2.22]
RAPIDI 2005	0/389	1/199	•	·	2.6 %	0.05 [0.00, 3.28]
Total (95% CI)	513	318		•	100.0 %	1.05 [0.54, 2.03]
Total events: 22 (Certolizun	nab pegol 400 mg), 20 (Co	ontrol)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 2.07$, df = 1 (P = 0.15); $I^2 = 52$	%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.14 (P = 0.89)					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable					
					1	
			0.01	0.1 1 10	100	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 9.43. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 43 Hematologic abnormalities.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 43 Hematologic abnormalities

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control		Odds	Peto Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,Fi×	ed,95% Cl			Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00791999 JRAPID (1)	1/85	0/77					18.3 %	6.73 [0.13, 340.56]
RAPIDI 2005	3/389	2/199					81.7 %	0.76 [0.12, 4.86]
Total (95% CI)	474	276					100.0 %	1.13 [0.21, 6.07]
Total events: 4 (Certolizumab pego	ol 400 mg), 2 (Control)							
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.97$, df = 1	(P = 0.32); I ² =0.0%							
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.14$ (P	= 0.89)							
Test for subgroup differences: Not	applicable							
			ı					
			0.01	0.1	I I0	100		
		Favours	certolizum	nab pego	Favours	control		

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

(1) I patinet with bone marrow failure



Analysis 9.45. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 45 Increased platelet count.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 45 Increased platelet count

-

-

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control		0	Pe dds Ra	eto tio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto	,Fixed,	95% CI			Peto,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	2/389	1/199			-			100.0 %	1.02 [0.09, 11.23]
Total (95% CI)	389	199						100.0 %	1.02 [0.09, 11.23]
Total events: 2 (Certolizu	ımab pegol 400 mg), 1 (0	Control)							
Heterogeneity: not applic	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.02 (P = 0.99)								
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable								
						- 1			
			0.01	0.1	T	10	100		
		Favo	ours certolizum	nab pego		Favours	control		

Analysis 9.46. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 46 Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 46 Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00791999 JRAPID	6/85	4/77	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	→ I00.0 %	1.38 [0.38, 4.94]
Total (95% CI)	85	77		100.0 %	1.38 [0.38, 4.94]
Total events: 6 (Certolizumab p	egol 400 mg), 4 (Contro)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.49$	(P = 0.62)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				
				1	
			0.5 0.7 I I.5	2	
		Favours	certolizumab pego Favours co	ntrol	

Analysis 9.47. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 47 Acute miocardial infarction.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 47 Acute miocardial infarction

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
NCT00791999 JRAPID	1/85	0/77		100.0 %	6.73 [0.13, 340.56]
Total (95% CI)	85	77		100.0 %	6.73 [0.13, 340.56]
Total events: I (Certolizumab p	begol 400 mg), 0 (Contr	ol)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.95	(P = 0.34)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				

 0.01
 0.1
 1
 10
 100

 Favours certolizumab pego
 Favours control

Analysis 9.48. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 48 Corneal Perforation.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 48 Corneal Perforation

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Od	Peto ds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,F	ixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
NCT00791999 JRAPID	1/85	0/77			100.0 %	6.73 [0.13, 340.56]
Total (95% CI)	85	77			100.0 %	6.73 [0.13, 340.56]
Total events: I (Certolizumab	pegol 400 mg), 0 (Contro	ol)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.95$	5 (P = 0.34)					
Test for subgroup differences:	Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours	certolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 9.49. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 49 Conjunctivitis allergic.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 49 Conjunctivitis allergic

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
NCT00791999 JRAPID	1/85	0/77		100.0 %	6.73 [0.13, 340.56]
Total (95% CI)	85	77		100.0 %	6.73 [0.13, 340.56]
Total events: I (Certolizumab p	egol 400 mg), 0 (Contr	ol)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.95$	(P = 0.34)				
Test for subgroup differences: N	lot applicable				

 0.01
 0.1
 1
 10
 100

 Favours certolizumab pego
 Favours control

Analysis 9.50. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 50 Periodontitis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 50 Periodontitis

-

-

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/IN	n/in	I*I-H,FIxed,95% CI		I*I-H,FIXEd,95% CI
NCT00791999 JRAPID	2/82	2/77		100.0 %	0.94 [0.14, 6.50]
Total (95% CI)	82	77		100.0 %	0.94 [0.14, 6.50]
Total events: 2 (Certolizumab pe	egol 400 mg), 2 (Control)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.06$ ((P = 0.95)				
Test for subgroup differences: No	ot applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours ce	ertolizumab pego Favours control		

Analysis 9.51. Comparison 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 51 Fatigue.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 9 Safety, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: 51 Fatigue

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	Control		Oc	Peto Ids Ratio		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N		Peto,I	Fixed,95% Cl			Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CDP870-004 2001	9/124	6/119					100.0 %	1.46 [0.52, 4.15]
Total (95% CI)	124	119			-		100.0 %	1.46 [0.52, 4.15]
Total events: 9 (Certolizum	ab pegol 400 mg), 6 (Con	itrol)						
Heterogeneity: not applicat	ble							
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.72 (P = 0.47)							
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable							
			0.01	0.1	I I0	100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 10.1. Comparison 10 Mean HAQ-DI from baseline at week 12, Outcome 1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 10 Mean HAQ-DI from baseline at week 12

Outcome: I certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Mara (CD)	Control	Mara (CD)		D	∩ iffere	lean ence		Weight	Mean Difference
	IN	I*lean(SD)	IN	I*lean(SD)		IV,FI	xea,:	75% CI			IV,FIXEd,95% CI
REALISTIC 2008	85 I	-0.43 (0.02)	212	-0.21 (0.04)			•			100.0 %	-0.22 [-0.23, -0.21]
Total (95% CI)	851		212				1			100.0 %	-0.22 [-0.23, -0.21]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable										
Test for overall effect: $Z = 77.70 (P < 0.00001)$											
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not applic	able									
					-4	-2	0	2	4		
				Favours certolizumab pegr				Favours	control		

Analysis 11.1. Comparison 11 Mean HAQ-DI from baseline at week 24, Outcome 1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: II Mean HAQ-DI from baseline at week 24

Outcome: I certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc

Certolizumab pegol 200 mg		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Random,95% CI		IV,Random,95% CI
393	-0.58 (0.59)	199	-0.17 (0.56)		33.9 %	-0.41 [-0.51, -0.31]
81	-0.54 (0.51)	40	-0.17 (0.7)	-	9.6 %	-0.37 [-0.61, -0.13]
246	-0.5 (0.47)	127	-0.14 (0.45)	=	33.7 %	-0.36 [-0.46, -0.26]
91	-0.25 (0.46)	91	-0.03 (0.49)	-	22.8 %	-0.22 [-0.36, -0.08]
811 = 0.00; Chi ² = 4.92 Z = 8.32 (P < 0.00 erences: Not applic	, df = 3 (P = 0.18 0001) cable	457 3); I ² =39%		•	100.0 %	-0.35 [-0.43, -0.26]
	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg 393 81 246 91 811 = 0.00; Chi ² = 4.92 Z = 8.32 (P < 0.00 erences: Not applic	Certolizumab N Mean(SD) 393 -0.58 (0.59) 81 -0.54 (0.51) 246 -0.5 (0.47) 91 -0.25 (0.46) 811 -0.25 (0.46) 811 = 0.00; Chi ² = 4.92, df = 3 (P = 0.18) Z = 8.32 (P < 0.00001)	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg Control N Mean(SD) N 393 -0.58 (0.59) 199 81 -0.54 (0.51) 40 246 -0.5 (0.47) 127 91 -0.25 (0.46) 91 811 457 = 0.00; Chi ² = 4.92, df = 3 (P = 0.18); l ² = 39% Z = 8.32 (P < 0.00001)	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg Control N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) 393 -0.58 (0.59) 199 -0.17 (0.56) 81 -0.54 (0.51) 40 -0.17 (0.7) 246 -0.5 (0.47) 127 -0.14 (0.45) 91 -0.25 (0.46) 91 -0.03 (0.49) 811 457 = 0.00; Chi ² = 4.92, df = 3 (P = 0.18); l ² = 39% Z = 8.32 (P < 0.00001)	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg Control Mean (SD) N Mean (SD) IV.Random,95% CI 393 -0.58 (0.59) 199 -0.17 (0.56) • 81 -0.54 (0.51) 40 -0.17 (0.7) • 246 -0.5 (0.47) 127 -0.14 (0.45) • 91 -0.25 (0.46) 91 -0.03 (0.49) • 811 457 • = 0.00; Chi ² = 4.92, df = 3 (P = 0.18); l ² = 39% Z = 8.32 (P < 0.00001)	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg Control Mean Difference Weight N Mean(SD) N Mean(SD) IV.Random,95% CI 393 -0.58 (0.59) 199 -0.17 (0.56) 33.9 % 81 -0.54 (0.51) 40 -0.17 (0.7) 96 % 246 -0.5 (0.47) 127 -0.14 (0.45) 33.7 % 91 -0.25 (0.46) 91 -0.03 (0.49) 22.8 % 811 457 • 100.0 % = 0.00; Chi ² = 4.92, df = 3 (P = 0.18); I ² = 39% Z = 8.32 (P < 0.00001)

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control
Analysis 11.2. Comparison 11 Mean HAQ-DI from baseline at week 24, Outcome 2 certolizumab 400 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: II Mean HAQ-DI from baseline at week 24

Outcome: 2 certolizumab 400 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 400 mg sc		Control		Diffe	Mean rence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Rando	om,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
CDP870-014 2009 (1)	124	-0.32 (0.7)	119	-0.09 (0.15)			23.2 %	-0.23 [-0.36, -0.10]
FAST4WARD 2005 (2)	111	-0.36 (0.51)	109	0.13 (0.51)	-		22.0 %	-0.49 [-0.62, -0.36]
RAPID 2005	390	-0.6 (0.59)	199	-0.17 (0.56)	-		27.4 %	-0.43 [-0.53, -0.33]
RAPID2 2007	246	-0.5 (0.47)	127	-0.14 (0.45)			27.4 %	-0.36 [-0.46, -0.26]
Total (95% CI)	871		554		•		100.0 %	-0.38 [-0.48, -0.28]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.01$;	Chi ² = 9.17, df =	= 3 (P = 0.03);	$ ^2 = 67\%$					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 7$.53 (P < 0.00001)						
Test for subgroup difference	s: Not applicable							
					-4 -2 0	2	4	
				Favours cert	tolizumab pego	Favours Co	ntrol	

(1) In CDP870-014 we have obtained standard deviations from p values according to the Handbook section 7.7.3.7. calculating t values , EE and finally SD

(2) In FAST4WARD we have obtained standard deviations from p values according to the Handbook section 7.7.3.7

Analysis 12.1. Comparison 12 HAQ-DI at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 12 HAQ-DI at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Diffe	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
,	N	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Rando	om,95% Cl	Ū.	IV,Random,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 200) mg sc							
CERTAIN 2008	91	-0.25 (0.46)	91	-0.03 (0.49)			13.3 %	-0.22 [-0.36, -0.08]
RAPIDI 2005	393	-0.58 (0.59)	100	-0.17 (0.56)	←∎—		14.7 %	-0.41 [-0.53, -0.29]
RAPID2 2007	246	-0.5 (0.47)	64	-0.14 (0.45)			14.6 %	-0.36 [-0.48, -0.24]
Subtotal (95% CI)	730		255		•		42.7 %	-0.33 [-0.44, -0.23]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$	00; Chi ² = 4.21, df = 2 ($P = 0.12$; $I^2 =$	53%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 6.05 (P < 0.00001)							
2 certolizumab pegol 400) mg sc			0.00 (0.15)	_			
CDP870-014 2009 (1)) 124	-0.32 (0.7)	119	-0.09 (0.15)			14.5 %	-0.23 [-0.36, -0.10]
FAST4WARD 2005	111	-0.36 (0.51)	109	0.13 (0.51)	-		13.7 %	-0.49 [-0.62, -0.36]
RAPIDI 2005	390	-0.6 (0.59)	99	-0.17 (0.56)	←∎		14.6 %	-0.43 [-0.55, -0.31]
RAPID2 2007	246	-0.5 (0.47)	63	-0.14 (0.45)			14.5 %	-0.36 [-0.49, -0.23]
Subtotal (95% CI)	871		390		•		57.3 %	-0.38 [-0.48, -0.27]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$	01; Chi ² = 8.67, df = 3 ($P = 0.03$; $I^2 =$	65%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 6.79 (P < 0.00001)							
Total (95% CI)	1601		645		•		100.0 %	-0.36 [-0.43, -0.29]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$	01; Chi ² = 13.43, df = 6	$(P = 0.04); I^2 =$	=55%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 9.67 (P < 0.00001)							
Test for subgroup differen	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.30$, $df = 1$	$(P = 0.59), I^2 =$	=0.0%					
					1 (1	
					-0.5 -0.25 (0 0.25 0	.5	
				Favours cert	olizumab pego	Favours cont	rol	

(1) In CDP870-014 we have obtained standard deviations from p values according to the Handbook section 7.7.3.7. calculating t values , EE and finally SD

Analysis 13.1. Comparison 13 HAQ-DI at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 13 HAQ-DI at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 20	0 mg sc						
RAPID I 2005	393	-0.6 (0.59)	100	-0.18 (0.56)	-	50.2 %	-0.42 [-0.54, -0.30]
Subtotal (95% CI)	393		100		•	50.2 %	-0.42 [-0.54, -0.30]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 6.62 (P < 0.00001)						
2 certolizumab pegol 40	0 mg sc						
RAPID 2005	390	-0.63 (0.59)	99	-0.18 (0.56)	-	49.8 %	-0.45 [-0.57, -0.33]
Subtotal (95% CI)	390		99		•	49.8 %	-0.45 [-0.57, -0.33]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 7.06 (P < 0.00001)						
Total (95% CI)	783		199		•	100.0 %	-0.43 [-0.52, -0.35]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$. , df = (P = 0.74); $ ^2$	=0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 9.68 (P < 0.00001)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.11$, $df = 1$	$(P = 0.74), I^2$	=0.0%				
				-1	-0.5 0 0.5	I	

Favours certoluzimab pego Favours control

```
Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)
Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
```

Analysis 14.1. Comparison 14 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 24, Outcome 1 certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 14 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 24

Outcome: I certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg		Control		Diffe	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Rand	om,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	82	6 (7.5)	82	1.7 (7.56)			20.9 %	4.30 [2.00, 6.60]
RAPID 2005	393	7.7 (7.93)	199	1.8 (8.46)			45.6 %	5.90 [4.49, 7.31]
RAPID2 2007	246	5.23 (8.31)	127	0.93 (8)			33.5 %	4.30 [2.56, 6.04]
Total (95% CI)	721		408				100.0 %	5.03 [3.90, 6.16]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.21; Chi ² = 2.51,	df = 2 (P = 0.29)	; I ² =20%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 8.72 (P < 0.00)	001)						
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not applica	able						
					-4 -2 (0 2 4		

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 14.2. Comparison 14 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 24, Outcome 2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 14 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 24

Outcome: 2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg		Control		Mea Differenc	n e Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Random,9	5% CI	IV,Random,95% CI
CDP870-014 2009 (1)	124	8.44 (19.76)	119	3.44 (8.07)		- 12.4 %	5.00 [1.23, 8.77]
RAPIDI 2005	390	8.3 (7.9)	199	1.8 (8.46)	•	48.5 %	6.50 [5.09, 7.91]
RAPID2 2007	246	5.46 (8.31)	127	0.93 (8)	-	39.1 %	4.53 [2.79, 6.27]
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.58 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Test for subgroup difference	760 ; Chi ² = 3.10, df = 7.60 (P < 0.00001) es: Not applicable	: 2 (P = 0.21); I ²	445 =36%		•	100.0 %	5.54 [4.11, 6.97]
					-20 -10 0	10 20	

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

(I) Calculating SD according to Handbook from p values

Analysis 15.1. Comparison 15 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 24, Outcome I certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 15 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 24

Outcome: I certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg		Control			C	Mean Difference		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Rai	ndom,95% Cl			IV,Random,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	393	6.3 (11.89)	199	2.3 (11.29)			•		56.9 %	4.00 [2.04, 5.96]
RAPID2 2007	246	6.05 (10.82)	127	1.63 (10.36)					43.1 %	4.42 [2.17, 6.67]
Total (95% CI)	639		326				•		100.0 %	4.18 [2.70, 5.66]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.0; $Chi^2 = 0.08$, c	f = 1 (P = 0.78);	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.54 (P < 0.00)	001)								
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not applica	able								
						1	_			
					-100	-50	0 50	100		

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 15.2. Comparison 15 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 24, Outcome 2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 15 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 24

Outcome: 2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg		Control		Dif	Mean ference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Rano	dom,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
CDP870-014 2009 (1)	124	4.6 (13.87)	119	1.58 (4.76)		•	24.7 %	3.02 [0.43, 5.61]
RAPIDI 2005	390	6.5 (11.85)	199	2.3 (11.29)		-	43.0 %	4.20 [2.24, 6.16]
RAPID2 2007	246	6.28 (10.98)	127	1.63 (10.36)		-	32.2 %	4.65 [2.39, 6.91]
Total (95% CI)	760		445			'	100.0 %	4.05 [2.77, 5.34]
Heterogeneity: $Iau^2 = 0.0;$	$Chi^2 = 0.90, dt = 1$	2 (P = 0.64); I ² =	=0.0%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6$	6.18 (P < 0.00001))						
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable							
					-100 -50	0 50	100	

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

(I) Calculating SD according to Handbook from p values

Analysis 16.1. Comparison 16 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 52, Outcome I certolizumab 200 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 16 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 52

Outcome: I certolizumab 200 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg		Control			Diffe	Mean rence		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fixed	d,95% CI			IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	393	7.79 (8.72)	199	1.73 (8.61)			•		100.0 %	6.06 [4.59, 7.53]
Total (95% CI)	393		199				+		100.0 %	6.06 [4.59, 7.53]
Heterogeneity: not app	olicable									
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 8.05 (P < 0.00)	001)								
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not applica	able								
					-100 -	-50 C	50	100		
					Favours co	ontrol	Favours	certolizun	nab pego	

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 16.2. Comparison 16 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 52, Outcome 2 certolizumab 400 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 16 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS), week 52

Outcome: 2 certolizumab 400 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg		Control			D	Mean ifference	1		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,F	ixed,95%	Cl			IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	390	8.61 (8.49)	199	1.73 (8.61)			•			100.0 %	6.88 [5.42, 8.34]
Total (95% CI)	390		199				•			100.0 %	6.88 [5.42, 8.34]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable										
Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.22 (P < 0.000)	(100									
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not applica	ble									
					-100	-50	0	50	100		
					Favours	control	Fav	vours ce	ertolizu	umab pego	

Analysis 17.1. Comparison 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52, Outcome I certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52

Outcome: I certolizumab pegol 200 mg sc

-

-

-

-

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg sc		Control		Di	Mean fference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fi>	ked,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	393	6.35 (.)	199	2.05 (11.14)		•	100.0 %	4.30 [2.40, 6.20]
Total (95% CI)	393		199			•	100.0 %	4.30 [2.40, 6.20]
Heterogeneity: not app	olicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.44 (P < 0.00)	0001)						
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not applic	able						
							1	
					-100 -50	0 50 I	00	
					Favours control	Favours cert	tolizumab pego	

Analysis 17.2. Comparison 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52, Outcome 2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 17 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), week 52

Outcome: 2 certolizumab pegol 400 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg		Control			Di	Miffere	ean nce		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fiz	xed,9	5% CI			IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	390	6.35 (11.06)	199	2.05 (11.14)			•			100.0 %	4.30 [2.40, 6.20]
Total (95% CI)	390		199				•			100.0 %	4.30 [2.40, 6.20]
Heterogeneity: not app	olicable										
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.44 (P < 0.00)	0001)									
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not applic	able									
					-100	-50	0	50	100		
					Favours	control		Favours	certolizu	umab pego	

Analysis 18.1. Comparison 18 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 18 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 24, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Random,95% CI		IV,Random,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 200) mg sc						
CERTAIN 2008	82	6 (7.5)	82	1.7 (7.56)		15.9 %	4.30 [2.00, 6.60]
RAPIDI 2005	393	7.7 (7.93)	100	1.8 (8.46)		25.1 %	5.90 [4.07, 7.73]
RAPID2 2007	246	5.23 (8.31)	64	0.93 (8)		17.2 %	4.30 [2.08, 6.52]
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.	721 0; Chi ² = 1.66, df = 2 (P	= 0.44); l ² =0.0	246		-	58.2 %	4.99 [3.79, 6.20]
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 8.12 (P < 0.00001)						
RAPID I 2005	390 390	8.3 (7.9)	99	1.8 (8.46)		24.9 %	6.50 [4.66, 8.34]
RAPID2 2007	246	5.46 (8.31)	63	0.93 (8)		17.0 %	4.53 [2.30, 6.76]
Subtotal (95% CI)	636		162		-	41.8 %	5.62 [3.70, 7.54]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.	85; Chi ² = 1.78, df = 1 ($P = 0.18$; $I^2 = 4$	4%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 5.74 (P < 0.00001)		(
Total (95% CI)	1357		408			100.0 %	5.29 [4.37, 6.21]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.	00; $Chi^2 = 4.00$, $df = 4$ ($P = 0.41$; $I^2 = 0$	%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= .28 (P < 0.0000)						
Test for subgroup differer	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.30$, $df = 1$	$(P = 0.59), I^2 =$:0.0%				

-4 -2 0 2 4

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 19.1. Comparison 19 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 19 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 24, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Random,95% CI		IV,Random,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 200	mg sc						
CERTAIN 2008	83	5.2 (8.43)	85	1.2 (7.72)	-	19.1 %	4.00 [1.55, 6.45]
RAPIDI 2005	393	6.3 (11.89)	100	2.3 (11.29)	-	18.2 %	4.00 [1.49, 6.51]
RAPID2 2007	246	6.05 (10.82)	64	1.63 (10.36)	•	13.8 %	4.42 [1.54, 7.30]
Subtotal (95% CI)	722		249		•	51.2 %	4.11 [2.62, 5.61]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0); Chi ² = 0.06, df = 2 (P	= 0.97); l ² =0.0	%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	5.39 (P < 0.00001)						
2 certolizumab pegol 400	mg sc						
CDP870-014 2009 (I)	124	4.6 (13.87)	119	1.58 (4.76)	•	17.1 %	3.02 [0.43, 5.61]
RAPIDI 2005	390	6.5 (11.85)	99	2.3 (11.29)	-	18.1 %	4.20 [1.68, 6.72]
RAPID2 2007	246	6.28 (10.98)	63	1.63 (10.36)	•	13.6 %	4.65 [1.75, 7.55]
Subtotal (95% CI)	760		281		•	48.8 %	3.91 [2.38, 5.44]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$); Chi ² = 0.76, df = 2 (P	= 0.69); l ² =0.0	%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 5.00 (P < 0.00001)						
Total (95% CI)	1482		530		٠	100.0 %	4.01 [2.94, 5.08]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$); $Chi^2 = 0.85$, $df = 5$ (P	= 0.97); l ² =0.0	%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 7.35 (P < 0.00001)						
Test for subgroup differen	ces: $Chi^2 = 0.03$, $df = 1$	$(P = 0.85), ^2 = 0.85)$	0.0%				

-100 -50 0 50 100 Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

(1) Calculating SD according to Handbook from p values

Analysis 20.1. Comparison 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 20 SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) at week 52, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 200	0 mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	393	7.79 (8.72)	100	1.73 (8.61)	•	50.0 %	6.06 [4.17, 7.95]
Subtotal (95% CI)	393		100		•	50.0 %	6.06 [4.17, 7.95]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 6.27 (P < 0.00001)						
2 certolizumab pegol 40	0 mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	390	8.61 (8.49)	99	1.73 (8.61)	•	50.0 %	6.88 [4.99, 8.77]
Subtotal (95% CI)	390		99		•	50.0 %	6.88 [4.99, 8.77]
Heterogeneity: not applie	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 7.12 (P < 0.00001)						
Total (95% CI)	783		199		•	100.0 %	6.47 [5.13, 7.81]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$.	.36, df = 1 (P = 0.55); l ² :	=0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 9.47 (P < 0.00001)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.36$, $df = 1$	(P = 0.55), I ² =	0.0%				
						1	

-100 -50 0 50 100

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 21.1. Comparison 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 21 SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) at week 52, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
L certolizumab pegol 200) mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	393	6.35 (11.1)	100	2.05 (11.14)	-	50.2 %	4.30 [1.86, 6.74]
Subtotal (95% CI)	393		100		•	50.2 %	4.30 [1.86, 6.74]
Heterogeneity: not applic	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 3.45 (P = 0.00056)						
2 certolizumab pegol 400) mg sc						
RAPID 2005	390	6.35 (11.06)	99	2.05 (11.14)	H	49.8 %	4.30 [1.85, 6.75]
Subtotal (95% CI)	390		99		•	49.8 %	4.30 [1.85, 6.75]
Heterogeneity: not applic	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 3.43 (P = 0.00059)						
Total (95% CI)	783		199		•	100.0 %	4.30 [2.57, 6.03]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$.	0, df = 1 (P = 1.00); $I^2 =$	0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 4.87 (P < 0.00001)						
Test for subgroup differer	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.0$, $df = 1$ ($P = 1.00$), $I^2 = 0$).0%				
				ı			

-100 -50 0 50 100

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 22.1. Comparison 22 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks, Outcome I Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

-

-

Comparison: 22 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6) at 12 weeks

Outcome: I Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg n/N	Control n/N		Od Peto F	Peto ds Ratio Fixed 95% CL		Weight	Peto Odds Ratio Peto Fixed 95% Cl
				1 010,1				
REALISTIC 2008	136/851	12/212					100.0 %	2.36 [1.53, 3.65]
Total (95% CI)	851	212			•		100.0 %	2.36 [1.53, 3.65]
Total events: 136 (Certoli	zumab pegol 200 mg), 12	(Control)						
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 3.88 (P = 0.00010)							
Test for subgroup differen	ices: Not applicable							
			0.01	0.1	I I0	100		
			Favour	s control	Favours of	certolizumab p	ego	

Analysis 23.1. Comparison 23 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks, Outcome I Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 23 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 24 weeks

Outcome: I Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
l certolizumab pegol 200 m	g sc				
CERTAIN 2008	19/96	3/98		20.8 %	6.47 [1.98, 21.14]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	19/116	/ 4		→ 7.3 %	18.67 [2.54, 137.17]
RAPID 2005 (1)	45/391	3/100		22.1 %	3.84 [1.22, 12.09]
RAPID2 2007 (2)	23/245	1/62		7.4 %	5.82 [0.80, 42.27]
Subtotal (95% CI)	848	374	•	57.6 %	5.97 [2.93, 12.17]
Total events: 106 (Certolizur Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 4$.	nab pegol), 8 (Control) Chi ² = 1.87, df = 3 (P = 0.60); 1 93 (P < 0.00001)	2 =0.0%			
2 certolizumab pegol 400 m	g sc				
CDP870-014 2009	9/126	2/121		12.7 %	4.32 [0.95, 19.60]
RAPID 2005 (3)	50/387	3/99		22.3 %	4.26 [1.36, 13.38]
RAPID2 2007 (4)	21/246	1/63		7.4 %	5.38 [0.74, 39.22]
Subtotal (95% CI)	759	283	•	42.4 %	4.46 [1.95, 10.21]
Total events: 80 (Certolizum	ab pegol), 6 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; C	Chi ² = 0.04, df = 2 (P = 0.98); I	2 =0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$.	53 (P = 0.00041)				
Total (95% CI)	1607	657	•	100.0 %	5.28 [3.08, 9.05]
Total events: 186 (Certolizur	nab pegol), 14 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; C	Chi ² = 2.19, df = 6 (P = 0.90); l	2 =0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6$.	04 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differences	s: $Chi^2 = 0.28$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.60), l ² =0.0%			
				1	
			0.01 0.1 1 10	100	
			Favours control Favours ce	rtolizumab pego	

(1) UCB report for NICE quoted Certolizumab n=391 and placebo n=196

(2) In NICE report UCB quoted certoluzimab n= 245 and placebo n=125

(3) In NICE report UCB quoted Certolizumab n= 387 and placebo n = 196 $\,$

(4) In NICE report UCB quoted placebo n =125

Analysis 24.1. Comparison 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks, Outcome | Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 24 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any dose, 52 weeks

Outcome: I Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
L certolizumab pegol 200 m	IF SC				
RAPID 2005 (I)	62/391	3/100		50.0 %	5.29 [1.69, 16.49]
Subtotal (95% CI)	391	100	•	50.0 %	5.29 [1.69, 16.49]
Total events: 62 (Certolizum	nab pegol), 3 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicabl	e				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2$.87 (P = 0.0041)				
2 certolizumab pegol 400 m	ig sc				
RAPID 2005 (2)	74/387	3/99		50.0 %	6.31 [2.03, 19.59]
Subtotal (95% CI)	387	99	-	50.0 %	6.31 [2.03, 19.59]
Total events: 74 (Certolizum	nab pegol), 3 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicabl	e				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$.19 (P = 0.0014)				
Total (95% CI)	778	199	•	100.0 %	5.80 [2.60, 12.94]
Total events: 136 (Certolizur	mab pegol), 6 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.05$,	df = 1 (P = 0.83); l ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 4	.29 (P = 0.000018)				
Test for subgroup difference	s: $Chi^2 = 0.05$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.8	3), I ² =0.0%			
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours control

Favours certolizumab pego

(1) In NICE report UCB quoted placebo certoluzimab n=391 and placebo n=196

(2) UCB report for NICE quoted Certolizumab n=387

Analysis 25.1. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome I Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

-

-

Comparison: 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time

Outcome: I Proportion of patients achieving remission 12 weeks certolizumab 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control			Risk Ri	atio		Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N		M-H,	Fixed,95	% Cl			M-H,Fixed,95% CI
REALISTIC 2008	36/85	12/212			-			100.0 %	2.82 [1.60, 5.00]
Total (95% CI)	851	212			-			100.0 %	2.82 [1.60, 5.00]
Total events: 136 (Certoliz	zumab pegol 200 mg), 12	(Control)							
Heterogeneity: not applica	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	: 3.56 (P = 0.00036)								
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable								
			0.01	0.1	I	10	100		
			Favour	s control	Fa	ivours	certolizu	imab pego	

Analysis 25.2. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time

Outcome: 2 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control		Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Ra	ndom,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	19/96	3/98			36.3 %	6.47 [1.98, 21.14]
RAPID 2005 (1)	45/391	3/196			38.1 %	7.52 [2.37, 23.89]
RAPID2 2007 (2)	23/245	1/125			12.8 %	.73 [.60, 85.89]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	19/116	/ 4		→	12.8 %	18.67 [2.54, 137.17]
Total (95% CI)	848	533		•	100.0 %	8.47 [4.15, 17.28]
Total events: 106 (Certolizuma	ab pegol 200 mg), 8 (Cor	ntrol)				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0; Chi	$P^2 = 0.97$, df = 3 (P = 0.8)	$); ^2 = 0.0\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.87$	7 (P < 0.00001)					
Test for subgroup differences: I	Not applicable					
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
			0.01 0.1	1 10 100		

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

(I) UCB report for NICE quote Certolizumab n=391

(2) UCB report for NICE quote Certolizumab n=245

Analysis 25.3. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 400 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time

Outcome: 3 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 400 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 400 mg	Control	Risk	Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Rando	m,95% Cl		H,Random,95%
CDP870-014 2009	9/126	2/121			30.3 %	4.32 [0.95, 19.60]
RAPID 2005 (1)	50/387	3/196			52.2 %	8.44 [2.67, 26.72]
RAPID2 2007	21/246	1/125	-		17.4 %	10.67 [1.45, 78.41]
Total (95% CI)	759	442		*	100.0 %	7.18 [3.12, 16.50]
Total events: 80 (Certolizun	nab 400 mg), 6 (Contro	ol)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; ($Chi^2 = 0.69, df = 2 (P = 1)$	= 0.7 l); l ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4$.64 (P < 0.00001)					
Test for subgroup difference	s: Not applicable					
				. I		
			0.01 0.1 1	10 100		
			Favours control	Favours certolizum	ab 400 mg sc	

(1) UCB report for NICE quote Certolizumab n=387

Analysis 25.4. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time

Outcome: 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control			Risk	k Ratio		Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N		M-H,	Fixed	I,95% CI			M-H,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID 2005 (1)	62/391	3/196						100.0 %	10.36 [3.29, 32.58]
Total (95% CI)	391	196				•		100.0 %	10.36 [3.29, 32.58]
Total events: 62 (Certolizu	umab pegol 200 mg), 3 (C	Control)							
Heterogeneity: not applica	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	4.00 (P = 0.000064)								
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable								
			0.01	0.1	T	10	100		
			Favours expe	erimental		Favours o	ertolizun	nab pego	

(1) UCB report for NICE quote Certolizumab n=391

.

Analysis 25.5. Comparison 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time, Outcome 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 25 Disease Activity Score (DAS-28) (ESR) remission (< 2.6), any time

Outcome: 5 Proportion of patients achieving remission 52 weeks certolizumab 400 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg n/N	Control n/N	M-F	Risk Ratio H,Fixed,95% Cl	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
RAPID 2005 (I)	74/387	3/196			100.0 %	12.49 [3.99, 39.12]
Total (95% CI)	387	196		•	100.0 %	12.49 [3.99, 39.12]
Total events: 74 (Certolizu	umab pegol 400 mg), 3 (C	Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applica	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	4.34 (P = 0.000015)					
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I I0	100	
			Favours contro	Favours ce	rtolizumab pego	

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 26.1. Comparison 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 26 DAS-28 at 12 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab

Outcome: I DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab 200 mg		Control			D	Mean ifference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fi	xed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
REALISTIC 2008	851	-1.64 (0)	212	-0.78 (0)					Not estimable
Total (95% CI)	851		212						Not estimable
Heterogeneity: not app	licable								
Test for overall effect: n	ot applicable								
Test for subgroup differ	ences: Not applicab	le							
					-10	-5	0 5	10	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 27.1. Comparison 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab, Outcome I DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 27 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 400 mg certolizumab

Outcome: I DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg		Control		D	Mean ifference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Rar	ndom,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
FAST4WARD 2005	111	-1.5 (2)	109	-0.6 (2)		+	47.5 %	-0.90 [-1.43, -0.37]
RAPID2 2007	246	-2.46 (1.31)	127	-0.5 (1.05)			52.5 %	-1.96 [-2.21, -1.71]
Total (95% CI)	357		236		•	•	100.0 %	-1.46 [-2.49, -0.42]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.52; Chi ² = 12.71,	df = 1 (P = 0.000)	036); I ² =929	%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.75 (P = 0.005	9)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: Not applicab	le						
							L	
					-10 -5	0 5	10	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 28.1. Comparison 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg, Outcome | DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 28 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 200 mg

Outcome: I DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg		Control			Diffe	Mean erence		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fixe	d,95% Cl			IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	393	-3.3 (1.3)	199	-2.4 (1.3)					100.0 %	-0.90 [-1.12, -0.68]
Total (95% CI)	393		199						100.0 %	-0.90 [-1.12, -0.68]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable									
Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.96 (P < 0.00)	001)								
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not applica	able								
					-100 -	-50 () 50	100		
				Favours cer	tolizumab	pego	Favour	s control		

Analysis 29.1. Comparison 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 29 DAS-28 at week 52, certolizumab 400 mg

Outcome: I DAS 28 (ESR) Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg		Control			Di	∩ iffere	1ean ence		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fi	xed,	95% CI			IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID 2005	390	-3.4 (1.4)	199	-2.4 (1.3)		-+-				100.0 %	-1.00 [-1.23, -0.77]
Total (95% CI)	390		199			•				100.0 %	-1.00 [-1.23, -0.77]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable										
Test for overall effect:	Z = 8.60 (P < 0.0)	0001)									
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not applie	able									
					-4	-2	0	2	4		
				Favours cer	tolizun	nab pego		Favours	control		

Analysis 30.1. Comparison 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 30 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	N	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Random,95% CI	-	IV,Random,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 20	0 mg sc						
RAPID2 2007	246	-2.27 (1.38)	64	-0.5 (1.05)		35.7 %	-1.77 [-2.08, -1.46]
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: not appli	cable 246		64		×	35.7 %	-1.77 [-2.08, -1.46]
Test for overall effect: Z	= 11.20 (P < 0.00001)						
2 certolizumab pegol 40	0 mg sc						
FAST4WARD 2005	111	-1.5 (2)	109	-0.6 (2)	•	28.6 %	-0.90 [-1.43, -0.37]
RAPID2 2007	246	-2.46 (1.31)	63	-0.5 (1.05)	•	35.8 %	-1.96 [-2.27, -1.65]
Subtotal (95% CI)	357		172			64.3 %	-1.45 [-2.49, -0.41]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.51; Chi² = 11.56, df = 1	(P = 0.00067);	² =9 %				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.74 (P = 0.0061)						
Total (95% CI)	603		236		,	100.0 %	-1.59 [-2.10, -1.08]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.17; Chi ² = 11.70, df = 2	$P = (P = 0.003); I^2$	=83%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 6.07 (P < 0.00001)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.33$, df =	(P = 0.57), ² =	=0.0%				
				-100	D -50 0 50 I	00	

Favours certolizumab pego

Favours control

Analysis 31.1. Comparison 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 31 DAS-28 at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	N	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	0	IV,Fixed,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 200) mg sc						
RAPID I 2005	393	-3.3 (1.3)	100	-2.4 (1.3)	•	51.0 %	-0.90 [-1.19, -0.61]
Subtotal (95% CI)	393		100			51.0 %	-0.90 [-1.19, -0.61]
Heterogeneity: not applic	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 6.18 (P < 0.00001)						
2 certolizumab pegol 400) mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	390	-3.4 (1.4)	99	-2.4 (1.3)		49.0 %	-1.00 [-1.29, -0.71]
Subtotal (95% CI)	390		99			49.0 %	-1.00 [-1.29, -0.71]
Heterogeneity: not applic	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 6.73 (P < 0.00001)						
Total (95% CI)	783		199			100.0 %	-0.95 [-1.15, -0.75]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$.	23, df = 1 (P = 0.63); l ²	=0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 9.12 (P < 0.00001)						
Test for subgroup differer	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.23$, $df = 1$	$(P = 0.63), I^2$	=0.0%				
				-100	-50 0 50	100	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 32.1. Comparison 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab, Outcome 1 DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 32 DAS-28 at 24 weeks, 200 mg certolizumab

Outcome: I DAS 28 (ESR) change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg		Control			D	∿ viffere	1ean ence		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fi	ixed,	95% CI			IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID2 2007	246	-2.27 (1.38)	127	-0.5 (1.05)		+				100.0 %	-1.77 [-2.02, -1.52]
Total (95% CI)	246		127			•				100.0 %	-1.77 [-2.02, -1.52]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable										
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.8 (P < 0.)	00001)									
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not applie	cable									
					-4	-2	0	2	4		
				Favours cer	tolizum	nah nego		Favours	control		

Analysis 33.1. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome I Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 33 Erosion score (ES)

Outcome: I Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg N	Mean(SD)	Control	Mean(SD)	D	Std. Mean ifference red 95% CL		Weight	Std. Mean Difference IVEixed 95% CI
	11	r icari(3D)	11	Ticari(SD)	19,02	.cu,7570 Ci			14,1120,7570 CI
RAPIDI 2005	353	0 (1.5)	180	0.7 (2.1)				61.6 %	-0.41 [-0.59, -0.22]
RAPID2 2007	214	0.1 (2)	112	0.7 (2.6)		•		38.4 %	-0.27 [-0.50, -0.04]
Total (95% CI)	567		292					100.0 %	-0.35 [-0.50, -0.21]
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.83, df = 1 (P = 0	0.36); l ² =0.0%							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.86 (P < 0.00)	001)							
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not applica	able							
					-100 -50	0 50	100		
				Favours cer	tolizumab pego	Favours	control		

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 33.2. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 33 Erosion score (ES)

Outcome: 2 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 24, certolizumab pegol 400 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Diff	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Rand	om,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	355	0.1 (2.4)	180	0.7 (2.1)			60.7 %	-0.60 [-1.00, -0.20]
RAPID2 2007	222	-0.3 (1.8)	112	0.7 (2.6)			39.3 %	-1.00 [-1.54, -0.46]
Total (95% CI)	577		292		•		100.0 %	-0.76 [-1.14, -0.37]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.02; Chi ² = 1.38, df =	= I (P = 0.24); I	2 =28%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.88 (P = 0.000)						
Test for subgroup diff	erences: Not applicable							
						1 1		
					-2 -1	0 I	2	
				Favours cert	tolizumab pego	Favours cor	ntrol	

Analysis 33.3. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 33 Erosion score (ES)

-

Outcome: 3 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		D	Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,F	ixed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	364	0.1 (2.5)	180	1.5 (4.3)		•	100.0 %	-1.40 [-2.08, -0.72]
Total (95% CI)	364		180				100.0 %	-1.40 [-2.08, -0.72]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.04 (P = 0.00005	3)						
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not applicable							
							1	
				-	100 -50	0 50	100	
				Favours certo	olizumab pego	Favours	control	

Analysis 33.4. Comparison 33 Erosion score (ES), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 33 Erosion score (ES)

Outcome: 4 Change from the baseline mean ES at week 52, certolizumab pegol 400 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol N	Mean(SD)	Control N	Mean(SD)	C IV,F	Mean Difference Fixed,95% Cl	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% Cl
RAPID 2005	363	0 (3)	180	1.5 (4.3)	←		100.0 %	-1.50 [-2.20, -0.80]
Total (95% CI)	363		180				100.0 %	-1.50 [-2.20, -0.80]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.20 (P = 0.00002	7)						
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not applicable							
					-2 -1	0 I	2	
				Favours Cert	olizumab pego	Favours	control	

Analysis 34.1. Comparison 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 34 Erosion score (ES) at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	N	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Random,95% Cl	-	IV,Random,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 20	0 mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	353	0 (1.5)	91	0.7 (2.1)	-	37.9 %	-0.70 [-1.16, -0.24]
RAPID2 2007	214	0.1 (2)	56	0.7 (2.6)		14.9 %	-0.60 [-1.33, 0.13]
Subtotal (95% CI)	567		147		•	52.8 %	-0.67 [-1.06, -0.28]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.0; $Chi^2 = 0.05$, $df = 1$ (F	= 0.82); l ² =0.	0%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.39 (P = 0.00071)						
2 certolizumab pegol 40	0 mg sc						
RAPID 2005	355	0.1 (2.4)	90	0.7 (2.1)	-	31.9 %	-0.60 [-1.10, -0.10]
RAPID2 2007	222	-0.3 (1.8)	56	0.7 (2.6)		15.4 %	-1.00 [-1.72, -0.28]
Subtotal (95% CI)	577		146		•	47.2 %	-0.73 [-1.14, -0.32]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.0; $Chi^2 = 0.80$, $df = 1$ (F	$r = 0.37$; $r^2 = 0.0$	0%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.48 (P = 0.00050)						
Total (95% CI)	1144		293		•	100.0 %	-0.70 [-0.98, -0.42]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.0; Chi ² = 0.89, df = 3 (F	$r = 0.83$; $r^2 = 0.0$	0%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 4.85 (P < 0.00001)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.04$, df = 1	$(P = 0.84), I^2 =$	=0.0%				
						1	
				-4	-2 0 2	4	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 35.1. Comparison 35 Erosion score (ES) at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 35 Erosion score (ES) at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 20	0 mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	364	0.1 (2.5)	91	1.5 (4.3)		51.1 %	-1.40 [-2.32, -0.48]
Subtotal (95% CI)	364		91		•	51.1 %	-1.40 [-2.32, -0.48]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.98 (P = 0.0029)						
2 certolizumab pegol 40	0 mg sc						
RAPID I 2005	363	0 (3)	90	1.5 (4.3)		48.9 %	-1.50 [-2.44, -0.56]
Subtotal (95% CI)	363		90		•	48.9 %	-1.50 [-2.44, -0.56]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.13 (P = 0.0018)						
Total (95% CI)	727		181		•	100.0 %	-1.45 [-2.11, -0.79]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$	02, df = 1 (P = 0.88); I^2	=0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 4.32 (P = 0.000016)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.02$, $df = 1$	$(P = 0.88), I^2 =$	=0.0%				
				Ĩ			
				-20	-10 0 10	20	

Favours certolizumab pego

Favours control

Analysis 36.1. Comparison 36 Joint space narrowing (JSN), Outcome I Change from the baseline mean JSN 24 weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 36 Joint space narrowing (JSN)

Outcome: I Change from the baseline mean JSN 24 weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg		Control		Diffe	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Rando	om,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
RAPID 2005	355	0.2 (2.5)	180	0.7 (2.4)			53.2 %	-0.50 [-0.94, -0.06]
RAPID2 2007	214	0.1 (1.4)	112	0.5 (2.3)		_	46.8 %	-0.40 [-0.87, 0.07]
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	569 = 0.0; Chi ² = 0.09, c	f = 1 (P = 0.76)	292 1 ² =0.0%		-		100.0 %	-0.45 [-0.77, -0.13]
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.79 (P = 0.00)	53)						
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not applica	able						
					-1 -0.5 (0.5	1	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 36.2. Comparison 36 Joint space narrowing (JSN), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean JSN 24 weeks, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 36 Joint space narrowing (JSN)

Outcome: 2 Change from the baseline mean JSN 24 weeks,certolizumab pegol 400 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg		Control		Diff	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Rand	om,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
RAPID 2005	355	0.2 (2.4)	180	0.7 (2.4)			51.8 %	-0.50 [-0.93, -0.07]
RAPID2 2007	222	-0.1 (1)	112	0.5 (2.3)	← ∎		48.2 %	-0.60 [-1.05, -0.15]
Total (95% CI)	577		292		-		100.0 %	-0.55 [-0.86, -0.24]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	$0.0; Chi^2 = 0.10, c$	∃f = I (P = 0.75)	; I ² =0.0%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.47 (P = 0.00)	052)						
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not applica	able						
					-1 -0.5	0 0.5	I	
				Favours cer	tolizumab pego	Favours cor	ntrol	

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 36.3. Comparison 36 Joint space narrowing (JSN), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean JSN 52 weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 36 Joint space narrowing (JSN)

Outcome: 3 Change from the baseline mean JSN 52 weeks,certolizumab pegol 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control			Dif	Mean ference		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl			IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID 2005	367	0.4 (4.2)	181	1.4 (5)			-		100.0 %	-1.00 [-1.85, -0.15]
Total (95% CI)	367		181			٠			100.0 %	-1.00 [-1.85, -0.15]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable									
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.32 (P = 0.020)									
Test for subgroup diff	erences: Not applicable									
					-4	-2	0 2	4		
				Favours cert	olizuma	ıb pego	Favour	s contro	bl	

Analysis 36.4. Comparison 36 Joint space narrowing (JSN), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean JSN 52 weeks, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 36 Joint space narrowing (JSN)

Outcome: 4 Change from the baseline mean JSN 52 weeks, certolizumab pegol 400 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab		Control		Dit	Mean fference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fix	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID 2005	363	0.2 (2.8)	181	1.4 (5)			100.0 %	-1.20 [-1.98, -0.42]
Total (95% CI)	363		181				100.0 %	-1.20 [-1.98, -0.42]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.00 (P = 0.00)	027)						
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not applica	able						
					-2 -1	0 I	2	
				Favour	s certolizumab	Favours c	ontrol	

Analysis 37.1. Comparison 37 Joint space narrowing (JSN) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 37 Joint space narrowing (JSN) at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		N Differe	1ean ence Weigł	Mean t Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Randor	n,95% Cl	IV,Random,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 20	0 mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	355	0.2 (2.5)	91	0.7 (2.4)	-	27.7 9	-0.50 [-1.06, 0.06]
RAPID2 2007	214	0.1 (1.4)	56	0.5 (2.3)	-	21.6 9	-0.40 [-1.03, 0.23]
Subtotal (95% CI)	569		147		•	49.4 %	6 -0.46 [-0.87, -0.04]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.0; $Chi^2 = 0.05$, $df = 1$ (F	$= 0.82$); $ ^2 = 0.0$)%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.14 (P = 0.032)						
2 certolizumab pegol 40	0 mg sc						
RAPID 2005	355	0.2 (2.4)	90	0.7 (2.4)	-	28.0 5	-0.50 [-1.06, 0.06]
RAPID2 2007	222	-0.1 (1)	56	0.5 (2.3)	-	22.7 9	-0.60 [-1.22, 0.02]
Subtotal (95% CI)	577		146		•	50.6 %	6 -0.54 [-0.96, -0.13]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.0; $Chi^2 = 0.06$, $df = 1$ (F	$r = 0.8 $); $ ^2 = 0.0$)%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.59 (P = 0.0097)						
Total (95% CI)	1146		293		•	100.0 %	6 -0.50 [-0.79, -0.21]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.0; Chi ² = 0.20, df = 3 (F	$r = 0.98$); $ ^2 = 0.0$)%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.35 (P = 0.00082)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.09$, $df = 1$	$(P = 0.77), I^2 =$	0.0%				
				-10	-5 0	5 10	
				Favours certoliza	umab pego	Favours control	

Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 38.1. Comparison 38 Joint space narrowing (JSN) at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 38 Joint space narrowing (JSN) at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	N	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	-	IV,Fixed,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 20) mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	367	0.4 (4.2)	91	1.4 (5)	-	48.1 %	-1.00 [-2.11, 0.11]
Subtotal (95% CI)	367		91		•	48.1 %	-1.00 [-2.11, 0.11]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.76 (P = 0.078)						
2 certolizumab pegol 40) mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	363	0.2 (2.8)	90	1.4 (5)	-	51.9 %	-1.20 [-2.27, -0.13]
Subtotal (95% CI)	363		90		•	51.9 %	-1.20 [-2.27, -0.13]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.19 (P = 0.028)						
Total (95% CI)	730		181		•	100.0 %	-1.10 [-1.88, -0.33]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$	06, df = 1 (P = 0.80); I^2	=0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.80 (P = 0.0051)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.06$, $df = 1$	$(P = 0.80), I^2 =$	=0.0%				
						1	
				-20	-10 0 10	20	

Favours certolizumab pego Fa

Favours control

Analysis 39.1. Comparison 39 Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 39 Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS) at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference	
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Random,95% CI		IV,Random,95% CI	
l certolizumab pegol 20	0 mg sc							
RAPIDI 2005	353	0.2 (3.2)	90	1.3 (3.8)	_	32.6 %	-1.10 [-1.95, -0.25]	
RAPID2 2007	214	0.2 (2.7)	56	1.2 (4.1)	• •	18.5 %	-1.00 [-2.13, 0.13]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	567		146		-	51.1 %	-1.06 [-1.75, -0.38]	
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.0; Chi ² = 0.02, df = 1 (P	= 0.89); l ² =0.0)%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.06 (P = 0.0022)							
2 certolizumab pegol 40	0 mg sc							
RAPIDI 2005	355	0.2 (4.2)	91	1.3 (3.8)		29.6 %	-1.10 [-1.99, -0.21]	
RAPID2 2007	222	-0.4 (2.1)	56	1.2 (4.1)	←∎	19.3 %	-1.60 [-2.71, -0.49]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	577		147		-	48.9 %	-1.30 [-1.99, -0.60]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0; Chi ² = 0.47, df = 1 (P = 0.49); l ² =0.0%								
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.65 (P = 0.00026)							
Total (95% CI)	1144		293		•	100.0 %	-1.18 [-1.67, -0.69]	
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$	0; Chi ² = 0.71, df = 3 (P	$= 0.87$); $ ^2 = 0.0$	0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 4.74 (P < 0.00001)							
Test for subgroup differe	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.22$, df = 1	$(P = 0.64), I^2 =$	=0.0%					
					-2 -1 0 1	2		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control
Analysis 40.1. Comparison 40 Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS) at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome I Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 40 Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTSS) at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 20) mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	364	0.4 (5.7)	91	2.8 (7.8)		49.4 %	-2.40 [-4.11, -0.69]
Subtotal (95% CI)	364		91		•	49.4 %	-2.40 [-4.11, -0.69]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.76 (P = 0.0058)						
2 certolizumab pegol 40) mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	363	0.2 (4.8)	90	2.8 (7.8)		50.6 %	-2.60 [-4.29, -0.91]
Subtotal (95% CI)	363		90		•	50.6 %	-2.60 [-4.29, -0.91]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.02 (P = 0.0025)						
Total (95% CI)	727		181		•	100.0 %	-2.50 [-3.70, -1.30]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$	03, df = 1 (P = 0.87); I^2	=0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 4.09 (P = 0.000043)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.03$, $df = 1$	$(P = 0.87), I^2 =$	=0.0%				
				-20	-10 0 10	20	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 41.1. Comparison 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm), Outcome 1 Mean change at 24 weeks certolizumab pegol 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm)

Outcome: I Mean change at 24 weeks certolizumab pegol 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg		Placebo		Diff	Mean ference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Ranc	lom,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	393	-29.6 (21.81)	199	-8.1 (22.57)	*		59.7 %	-21.50 [-25.31, -17.69]
RAPID2 2007	246	-23.7 (22)	127	-4.7 (21.41)			40.3 %	-19.00 [-23.63, -14.37]
Total (95% CI)	639		326		•		100.0 %	-20.49 [-23.43, -17.55]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.0; $Chi^2 = 0.67$, df = 1 (P = 0.4	I); I ² =0.0%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 13.66 (P < 0)	.00001)						
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not appl	icable						
							J	
					-100 -50	0 50	100	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 41.2. Comparison 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm), Outcome 2 Mean change at 24 weeks certolizumab pegol 400 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm)

Outcome: 2 Mean change at 24 weeks certolizumab pegol 400 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg		Placebo		l Differ	Mean rence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Rando	m,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
FAST4WARD 2005 (I)		-20.6 (42)	109	1.7 (42)	-#-		6.6 %	-22.30 [-33.40, -11.20]
RAPID 2005 (2)	390	-31.7 (21.72)	199	-8.1 (22.57)	-		55.8 %	-23.60 [-27.41, -19.79]
RAPID2 2007	246	-26.1 (22)	127	-4.7 (21.41)	-		37.7 %	-21.40 [-26.03, -16.77]
Total (95% CI)	747		435		•		100.0 %	-22.69 [-25.53, -19.84]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$;	Chi ² = 0.52, df =	= 2 (P = 0.77); I ²	2 =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	15.65 (P < 0.000	01)						
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable	9						
				-	00 -50 0	50	100	
				Favours certo	lizumab pego	Favours c	ontrol	

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

(1) In FAST4WARD we have obtained standard deviations from p values according to the Handbook section 7.7.3.7

(2) Data in RAPID1 from NICE report

Analysis 41.3. Comparison 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm), Outcome 3 Mean change at 52 weeks certolizumab pegol 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm)

Outcome: 3 Mean change at 52 weeks certolizumab pegol 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Diff	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID 2005	393	-31 (22.57)	199	-8.8 (23.79)	+		100.0 %	-22.20 [-26.19, -18.21]
Total (95% CI)	393		199		•		100.0 %	-22.20 [-26.19, -18.21]
Heterogeneity: not ap	oplicable							
Test for overall effects	Z = 10.91 (P < 0.0000))))						
Test for subgroup diff	erences: Not applicable	:						
				-	00 -50	0 50	00	
				Favours certo	lizumab pego	Favours cor	ntrol	

Analysis 41.4. Comparison 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm), Outcome 4 Mean change at 52 weeks certolizumab pegol 400 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 41 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm)

Outcome: 4 Mean change at 52 weeks certolizumab pegol 400 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab		Placebo		Diff	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	390	-33.5 (23.7)	199	-8.8 (22.57)	+		100.0 %	-24.70 [-28.62, -20.78]
Total (95% CI)	390		199		•		100.0 %	-24.70 [-28.62, -20.78]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 12.35 (P < 0)	.00001)						
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not appl	icable						
				-10	00 -50	0 50 I	00	
				Favours o	ertolizumab	Favours con	trol	

Analysis 42.1. Comparison 42 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm) at 24 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 42 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm) at 24 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Random,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 200) mg sc						
RAPID 2005 (1)	393	-29.6 (21.81)	100	-8.1 (22.57)	-	26.2 %	-21.50 [-26.42, -16.58]
RAPID2 2007	246	-23.7 (22)	64	-4.7 (21.41)	-	18.1 %	-19.00 [-24.92, -13.08]
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	639 0; Chi ² = 0.40, df = 1 (P = 0.52); I ² =	164 0.0%		•	44.3 %	-20.48 [-24.26, -16.69]
2 certolizumab pegol 400	= 10.60 (P < 0.00001)						
CDP870-014 2009 (2) 24	-21.8 (51.4)	119	-8.5 (19.92)	-#-	6.7 %	-13.30 [-23.03, -3.57]
FAST4WARD 2005	111	-20.6 (42)	109	1.7 (42)	-	5.1 %	-22.30 [-33.40, -11.20]
RAPIDI 2005	390	-31.7 (21.72)	99	-8.1 (22.57)	-	26.0 %	-23.60 [-28.54, -18.66]
RAPID2 2007	246	-26.1 (22)	63	-4.7 (21.41)	-	17.9 %	-21.40 [-27.36, -15.44]
Subtotal (95% CI)	871		390		•	55.7 %	-21.35 [-25.08, -17.61]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 2$.	00; Chi ² = 3.44, df = 3	$(P = 0.33); I^2 =$	=13%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= .20 (P < 0.0000)						
Total (95% CI)	1510		554		•	100.0 %	-21.07 [-23.59, -18.55]
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.	0; Chi ² = 4.01, df = 5 ($P = 0.55$; $I^2 =$	0.0%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 16.39 (P < 0.00001)						
Test for subgroup differer	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.10$, df =	$ (P = 0.75), ^2$	=0.0%				
				-1	00 -50 0 50	100	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

(1) Data in RAPID1 from NICE report

(2) Calculating SD according to Handbook from p values

Analysis 43.1. Comparison 43 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm) at 52 weeks, any dose, Outcome 1 Change from baseline.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 43 Patient's assessment of arthritis pain (VAS score 0 to 100 mm) at 52 weeks, any dose

Outcome: I Change from baseline

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% C		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l certolizumab pegol 20	0 mg sc						
RAPID 2005 (1)	393	-31 (22.57)	100	-8.8 (23.79)		48.6 %	-22.20 [-27.37, -17.03]
Subtotal (95% CI)	393		100		•	48.6 %	-22.20 [-27.37, -17.03]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 8.42 (P < 0.00001)						
2 certolizumab pegol 40	0 mg sc						
RAPIDI 2005	390	-33.5 (23.7)	99	-8.8 (22.57)	H	51.4 %	-24.70 [-29.73, -19.67]
Subtotal (95% CI)	390		99		•	51.4 %	-24.70 [-29.73, -19.67]
Heterogeneity: not appli	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 9.62 (P < 0.00001)						
Total (95% CI)	783		199		•	100.0 %	-23.48 [-27.09, -19.88]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$.46, df = 1 (P = 0.50); l	2 =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 12.77 (P < 0.00001)						
Test for subgroup differe	nces: $Chi^2 = 0.46$, df =	I (P = 0.50), I ²	2 =0.0%				
				1			
				-5	0 -25 0 2	5 50	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

(1) Data in RAPID1 from NICE report

Analysis 44.1. Comparison 44 Modified total Sharp scores (mTSS), Outcome 1 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 24 weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg..

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 44 Modified total Sharp scores (mTSS)

Outcome: I Change from the baseline mean mTSS 24 weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Random,95%	CI	IV,Random,95% CI
RAPID 2005	353	0.2 (3.2)	180	1.3 (3.8)		62.8 %	-1.10 [-1.75, -0.45]
RAPID2 2007	214	0.2 (2.7)	112	1.2 (4.1)		37.2 %	-1.00 [-1.84, -0.16]
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe	567 : 0.0; Chi ² = 0.03, c Z = 4.06 (P = 0.00 erences: Not applica	ff = I (P = 0.85) 0049) able	292 ; l ² =0.0%		•	100.0 %	-1.06 [-1.58, -0.55]
					-2 -1 0 1	2	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 44.2. Comparison 44 Modified total Sharp scores (mTSS), Outcome 2 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 24 weeks, certolizumab 400 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 44 Modified total Sharp scores (mTSS)

Outcome: 2 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 24 weeks, certolizumab 400 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg		Control			Di	Mea fferend	an ce		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Ran	IV,Random,95% CI			IV,Random,95% CI	
RAPID 1 2005	355	0.2 (4.2)	180	1.3 (3.8)		-	-			56.7 %	-1.10 [-1.81, -0.39]
RAPID2 2007	222	-0.4 (2.1)	112	1.2 (4.1)						43.3 %	-1.60 [-2.41, -0.79]
Total (95% CI)	577		292			•				100.0 %	-1.32 [-1.85, -0.78]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	$= 0.0; Chi^2 = 0.83, c$	f = 1 (P = 0.36);	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.85 (P < 0.00)	001)									
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not applica	able									
					-4	-2	0	2	4		
				Favours certe	olizum	nab pego	F	avours	control		

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 44.3. Comparison 44 Modified total Sharp scores (mTSS), Outcome 3 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 52 weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 44 Modified total Sharp scores (mTSS)

Outcome: 3 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 52 weeks, certolizumab pegol 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200mg		Control			l Differ	1ean rence		Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fixed	,95% CI			IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPIDI 2005	364	0.4 (5.7)	181	2.8 (7.8)					100.0 %	-2.40 [-3.68, -1.12]
Total (95% CI)	364		181			•			100.0 %	-2.40 [-3.68, -1.12]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable									
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.68 (P = 0.00)	0023)								
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not applica	able								
					-10 -5	5 0	5	10		
				Favours cert	olizumab p	ego	Favours	control		

Analysis 44.4. Comparison 44 Modified total Sharp scores (mTSS), Outcome 4 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 52 weeks, certolizumab pegol 400 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 44 Modified total Sharp scores (mTSS)

Outcome: 4 Change from the baseline mean mTSS 52 weeks, certolizumab pegol 400 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg		Control		Di	M ffere	ean nce		Weight	Mean Difference	
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fixed,95% CI					IV,Fixed,95% CI
RAPID I 2005	363	0.2 (4.8)	181	2.8 (7.8)						100.0 %	-2.60 [-3.84, -1.36]
Total (95% CI)	363		181							100.0 %	-2.60 [-3.84, -1.36]
Heterogeneity: not ap	plicable										
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.11 (P = 0.00)	00039)									
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not applic	able									
						i					
					-4	-2	0	2	4		
				Favours cer	tolizuma	ab pego		Favours	control		

Analysis 45.1. Comparison 45 Certolizumab pegol Img/kg/day sc, Outcome I Headache.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 45 Certolizumab pegol Img/kg/day sc

Outcome: I Headache

-

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol I mg n/N	control n/N		M-H	Risk F ,Fixed,9	Ratio 5% Cl		Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
Choy 2002	3/8	1/12				•		100.0 %	4.50 [0.56, 35.98]
Total (95% CI)	8	12						100.0 %	4.50 [0.56, 35.98]
Total events: 3 (certolizum	nab pegol I mg), I (contr	rol)							
Heterogeneity: not applica	able								
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	I.42 (P = 0.16)								
Test for subgroup difference	ces: Not applicable								
			0.01	0.1	L	10	100		
		Favour	s certolizun	nab pego	F	avours	control		

Analysis 45.2. Comparison 45 Certolizumab pegol 1mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 2 Lower respiratory tract infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 45 Certolizumab pegol Img/kg/day sc

Outcome: 2 Lower respiratory tract infection

-

-

.

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol I mg n/N	Control n/N	M-I	Risk Ratio H,Fixed,95% Cl	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
Choy 2002	0/8	1/12			100.0 %	0.48 [0.02, 10.54]
Total (95% CI)	8	12			100.0 %	0.48 [0.02, 10.54]
Total events: 0 (certolizum	ab pegol I mg), I (Con	trol)				
Heterogeneity: not applica	ble					
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.46 (P = 0.64)					
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I I0	100	
		Favours certolizu	mab Img/Kg/day s	c Favours co	ntrol	

Analysis 45.3. Comparison 45 Certolizumab pegol 1mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 3 Adverse events Intensity severe.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 45 Certolizumab pegol I mg/kg/day sc

Outcome: 3 Adverse events Intensity severe

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol I mg n/N	Control n/N	M-H,Fi	Risk Ratio xed,95% Cl	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
Choy 2002	1/8	0/12			100.0 %	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]
Total (95% CI)	8	12			100.0 %	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]
Total events: I (certolizum	nab pegol I mg), 0 (Cont	trol)				
Heterogeneity: not applica	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.93 (P = 0.35)					
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
		Favours ce	ertolizumab pego	Favours control		

Analysis 45.4. Comparison 45 Certolizumab pegol Img/kg/day sc, Outcome 4 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA).

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 45 Certolizumab pegol Img/kg/day sc

Outcome: 4 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA)

-

-

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol I mg n/N	Control n/N		M-H	Risł I,Fixec	< Ratio 1,95% CI		Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
Choy 2002	2/8	1/12				+		100.0 %	3.00 [0.32, 27.83]
Total (95% CI)	8	12						100.0 %	3.00 [0.32, 27.83]
Total events: 2 (certolizum	ab pegol I mg), I (Con	trol)							
Heterogeneity: not applica	ble								
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	0.97 (P = 0.33)								
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable								
				ı		1			
			0.01	0.1	Ι	10	100		
		Favour	s certolizun	nab pego		Favours	control		

Analysis 45.5. Comparison 45 Certolizumab pegol Img/kg/day sc, Outcome 5 Urinary tract infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 45 Certolizumab pegol I mg/kg/day sc

Outcome: 5 Urinary tract infection

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol I mg n/N	Control n/N	M-I	Risk Ratio H,Fixed,95% Cl	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
Choy 2002	1/8	0/12	-		- 100.0 %	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]
Total (95% CI)	8	12			100.0 %	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]
Total events: I (certolizun	nab pegol I mg), 0 (Cont	trol)				
Heterogeneity: not applica	able					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.93 (P = 0.35)					
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1	I I0 I	00	
		Favours	certolizumab peg	o Favours con	itrol	

Analysis 46.1. Comparison 46 Certolizumab 5 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome I Lower respiratory tract infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 46 Certolizumab 5 mg/kg/day sc

Outcome: I Lower respiratory tract infection

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol 5 mg	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
Choy 2002	1/8	1/12		100.0 %	1.50 [0.11, 20.68]
Total (95% CI)	8	12		100.0 %	1.50 [0.11, 20.68]
Total events: I (certolizun	nab pegol 5 mg), 1 (Con	trol)			
Heterogeneity: not applica	able				
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.30 (P = 0.76)				
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable				
				100	

0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 46.2. Comparison 46 Certolizumab 5 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 2 Urinary tract infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 46 Certolizumab 5 mg/kg/day sc

Outcome: 2 Urinary tract infection

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol 5 mg	Control			Risk Ratio		Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N		M-H,Fi	xed,95% Cl			M-H,Fixed,95% CI
Choy 2002	1/8	0/12					100.0 %	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]
Total (95% CI)	8	12					100.0 %	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]
Total events: I (certolizun	nab pegol 5 mg), 0 (Cont	trol)						
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.93 (P = 0.35)							
Test for subgroup differen	ices: Not applicable							
			0.01	0.1	I I0	100		
		Favours	certolizuma	ab pego	Favours	control		

Analysis 47.1. Comparison 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome I Headache.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc

Outcome: I Headache

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol 20 mg	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
Choy 2002	3/8	1/12		100.0 %	4.50 [0.56, 35.98]
Total (95% CI)	8	12		100.0 %	4.50 [0.56, 35.98]
Total events: 3 (certolizur	mab pegol 20 mg), I (Coi	ntrol)			
Heterogeneity: not applic	able				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.42 (P = 0.16)				
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable				

0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours certolizumab pego Control

Analysis 47.2. Comparison 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 2 Lower respiratory tract infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc

Outcome: 2 Lower respiratory tract infection

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol 20 mg	Control		мп	Risk Ratio		Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/IN	n/IN		Iĭ-H	Fixed,95%	CI		IM-H,Fixed,95% CI
Choy 2002	2/8	1/12		-			100.0 %	3.00 [0.32, 27.83]
Total (95% CI)	8	12		-		-	100.0 %	3.00 [0.32, 27.83]
Total events: 2 (certolizum	nab pegol 20 mg), I (Cor	ntrol)						
Heterogeneity: not applica	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	: 0.97 (P = 0.33)							
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable							
			0.01	0.1	(001 (
		Favours	s certolizum	nab pego	Favo	urs control		

Analysis 47.3. Comparison 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 3 Death.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc

Outcome: 3 Death

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol 20 mg	Control		F	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N		M-H,Fix	ed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
Choy 2002	1/8	0/12				100.0 %	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]
Total (95% CI)	8	12				100.0 %	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]
Total events: I (certolizum	nab pegol 20 mg), 0 (Cor	ntrol)					
Heterogeneity: not applica	able						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.93 (P = 0.35)						
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable						
			0.01	0.1	I IO IO	0	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 47.4. Comparison 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 4 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA).

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc

Outcome: 4 Antinuclear antibodies (ANA)

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol 20 mg n/N	Control		М-Н	Risk Ri Fixed 95	atio 5% CI		Weight	Risk Ratio M-H Fixed 95% Cl
	17/19	11/1 1		1 1-1 1,	rixed,75	70 CI			1 H I, I XCG, 7378 CI
Choy 2002	1/8	1/12						100.0 %	1.50 [0.11, 20.68]
Total (95% CI)	8	12						100.0 %	1.50 [0.11, 20.68]
Total events: I (certolizun	nab pegol 20 mg), 1 (Co	ntrol)							
Heterogeneity: not applica	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.30 (P = 0.76)								
Test for subgroup differen	ces: Not applicable								
			1						
			0.01	0.1	I	10	100		
		Favours	certolizum	nab pego	Fa	avours d	control		

Analysis 47.5. Comparison 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc, Outcome 5 Urinary tract infection.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 47 Certolizumab 20 mg/kg/day sc

Outcome: 5 Urinary tract infection

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol 20 mg	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
Choy 2002	1/8	0/12		100.0 %	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]
Total (95% CI)	8	12		100.0 %	4.33 [0.20, 94.83]
Total events: I (certolizur	nab pegol 20 mg), 0 (Cor	ntrol)			
Heterogeneity: not applic	able				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.93 (P = 0.35)				
Test for subgroup differen	ices: Not applicable				

 0.01
 0.1
 1
 10
 100

 Favours certolizumab pego
 Favours control

Analysis 48.1. Comparison 48 Withdrawals, Outcome I All Withdrawn: any doses any follow up.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 48 Withdrawals

Outcome: I All Withdrawn: any doses any follow up

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	28/126	56/121	+	9.5 %	0.48 [0.33, 0.70]
CERTAIN 2008	12/96	18/98	-+-	4.6 %	0.68 [0.35, 1.34]
Choy 2002	2/24	6/12		1.3 %	0.17 [0.04, 0.71]
FAST4WARD 2005	35/111	81/109	+	11.8 %	0.42 [0.32, 0.57]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	34/116	96/114	•	11.9 %	0.35 [0.26, 0.47]
NCT00791999 JRAPID (1)	36/167	52/77	+	10.9 %	0.32 [0.23, 0.44]
NCT00993317	25/85	21/42	-	8.0 %	0.59 [0.38, 0.92]
RAPIDI 2005	254/783	156/199	•	17.0 %	0.41 [0.37, 0.47]
RAPID2 2007	137/492	110/127	•	16.1 %	0.32 [0.27, 0.38]
REALISTIC 2008	80/851	28/212	-	9.0 %	0.71 [0.48, 1.07]
Total (95% CI)	2851	1111	•	100.0 %	0.42 [0.36, 0.50]
Total events: 643 (certolizumab pe	egol), 624 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04; Chi ² =	= 26.60, df = 9 (P = 0.002)	$ ^2 = 66\%$			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 10.16$ (F	P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differences: Not	applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

(1) Only for 200 and 400 mg of CTZ

Analysis 48.2. Comparison 48 Withdrawals, Outcome 2 Withdrawn due to lack of efficacy: any doses any follow up.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 48 Withdrawals

Outcome: 2 Withdrawn due to lack of efficacy: any doses any follow up

Study or subgroup	certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Kandom,95% Cl		H,Kandom,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	16/126	45/121		10.8 %	0.34 [0.20, 0.57]
FAST4WARD 2005	24/111	75/109	+	16.6 %	0.31 [0.22, 0.46]
NCT00993317	18/85	18/42		10.0 %	0.49 [0.29, 0.85]
RAPIDI 2005	151/783	125/199	•	32.4 %	0.3 [0.26, 0.37]
RAPID2 2007	95/492	101/127	•	30.2 %	0.24 [0.20, 0.30]
Total (95% CI)	1597	598	•	100.0 %	0.30 [0.25, 0.37]
Total events: 304 (certolizu	mab pegol), 364 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.02$; $Chi^2 = 7.90$, $df = 4$ (P = 0	0.10); 1 ² =49%			
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	12.04 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup difference	es: Not applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours Control

Analysis 48.3. Comparison 48 Withdrawals, Outcome 3 Withdrawals due to adverse events.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 48 Withdrawals

Outcome: 3 Withdrawals due to adverse events

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% CI		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
CDP870-014 2009	7/126	6/121	← →	10.4 %	1.13 [0.37, 3.44]
CERTAIN 2008	6/96	6/98	••	9.5 %	1.02 [0.32, 3.28]
FAST4WARD 2005	5/111	2/109		5.7 %	2.37 [0.53, 10.64]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	8/116	2/114		8.1 %	3.42 [0.97, 12.13]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	3/239	3/77	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	9.5 %	1.38 [0.43, 4.44]
NCT00993317	4/85	2/42	• • •	4.3 %	0.99 [0.17, 5.60]
RAPIDI 2005	39/783	3/199		22.0 %	2.33 [1.08, 5.03]
RAPID2 2007	17/492	2/127		10.2 %	1.88 [0.61, 5.82]
REALISTIC 2008	33/851	6/212		20.3 %	1.34 [0.60, 2.99]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 132 (Certolizum: Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.11, d Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.7$. Test for subgroup differences:	2899 ab pegol), 32 (Control) f = 8 (P = 0.85); I ² =0.0% 4 (P = 0.0061) Not applicable	1099		100.0 %	1.66 [1.15, 2.37]
			0.5 0.7 I I.5 2		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 49.1. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 1 ACR 50 200 mg certolizumab 24 weeks.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: I ACR 50 200 mg certolizumab 24 weeks

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Placebo	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	20/96	7/98	-	16.7 %	2.92 [1.29, 6.58]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	45/82	13/77	+	24.4 %	3.25 [1.91, 5.54]
NCT00993317	35/85	8/42	-	20.2 %	2.16 [1.10, 4.24]
RAPIDI 2005	144/393	15/199	-	25.3 %	4.86 [2.94, 8.04]
RAPID2 2007	80/246	4/127		13.4 %	10.33 [3.87, 27.54]
Total (95% CI)	902	543	•	100.0 %	3.80 [2.42, 5.95]
Total events: 324 (Certolizumab	pegol 200 mg), 47 (Pla	cebo)			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; Chi ²	² = 9.05, df = 4 (P = 0.	06); I ² =56%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.82$ ((P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differences: No	ot applicable				

0.001 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 1000

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 49.2. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 2 HAQ change from baseline 200 mg certolizumab 24 weeks.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: 2 HAQ change from baseline 200 mg certolizumab 24 weeks

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control			Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Random,95% C		IV,Random,95% CI
CERTAIN 2008	91	-0.25 (0.46)	91	-0.03 (0.49)			22.8 %	-0.22 [-0.36, -0.08]
NCT00993317	81	-0.54 (0.51)	40	-0.17 (0.7)		-	9.6 %	-0.37 [-0.61, -0.13]
RAPIDI 2005	393	-0.58 (0.59)	199	-0.17 (0.56)		-	33.9 %	-0.41 [-0.51, -0.31]
RAPID2 2007	246	-0.5 (0.47)	127	-0.14 (0.45)		•	33.7 %	-0.36 [-0.46, -0.26]
Total (95% CI)	811		457			•	100.0 %	-0.35 [-0.43, -0.26]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² :	= 0.00; Chi ² = 4.92, df =	= 3 (P = 0.18); I	2 =39%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 8.32 (P < 0.0000 I)						
Test for subgroup diff	erences: Not applicable							
1					1	<u> </u>	I	
					-4	-2 0 2	4	

Favours certolizumab pego

Favours control

Analysis 49.3. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 3 Serious adverse events certolizumab 200 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: 3 Serious adverse events certolizumab 200 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Difference	Weight	Risk Difference
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95%	Cl	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
l certolizumab 200 mg					
CERTAIN 2008	5/96	7/98	+	8.7 %	-0.02 [-0.09, 0.05]
REALISTIC 2008	52/846	12/209	-	30.1 %	0.00 [-0.03, 0.04]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	4/82	1/77	-	7.1 %	0.04 [-0.02, 0.09]
RAPID2 2007	18/248	4/125	-	14.9 %	0.04 [0.00, 0.09]
RAPIDI 2005	45/392	/ 99	-	23.7 %	0.06 [0.01, 0.10]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	3/ 6	3/114	+	10.3 %	0.09 [0.02, 0.15]
NCT00993317	8/85	0/42	+	5.1 %	0.09 [0.02, 0.16]
Total (95% CI)	1865	864	•	100.0 %	0.04 [0.02, 0.06]
Total events: 145 (Certolizuma	ab pegol), 38 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 11.67$, o	df = 6 (P = 0.07); $I^2 = 49\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.62$	2 (P = 0.00030)				
Test for subgroup differences:	Not applicable				
				L	
			-1 -0.5 0 0.1	5 1	

Favours certolizumab pego

Favours control

Analysis 49.4. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: 4 Proportion of patients achieving remission 24 weeks certolizumab 200 mg

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Control	Risk	Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Randoi	m,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
CERTAIN 2008	19/96	3/98	-		36.3 %	6.47 [1.98, 21.14]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	19/116	/ 4			12.8 %	18.67 [2.54, 137.17]
RAPID 2005 (1)	45/391	3/196			38.1 %	7.52 [2.37, 23.89]
RAPID2 2007 (2)	23/245	1/125	-		12.8 %	.73 [.60, 85.89]
Total (95% CI)	848	533		•	100.0 %	8.47 [4.15, 17.28]
Total events: 106 (Certolizuma	b pegol 200 mg), 8 (Cor	ntrol)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; Chi	$^{2} = 0.97$, df = 3 (P = 0.8	$); ^2 = 0.0\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.87$	″(P < 0.0000∣)					
Test for subgroup differences: I	Not applicable					
			0.01 0.1 1	10 100		
			Favours control	Favours certolizun	nab pego	

(1) UCB report for NICE quote Certolizumab n=391

(2) UCB report for NICE quote Certolizumab n=245

Analysis 49.5. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 5 Radiological changes: Erosion Scores (ES) certolizumab 200 mg sc.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: 5 Radiological changes: Erosion Scores (ES) certolizumab 200 mg sc

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol		Control		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Random,95%	S CI	IV,Random,95% CI
l certolizumab 200 n	ng sc 24 weeks						
RAPID 2005	353	0 (1.5)	180	0.7 (2.1)	-	71.9 %	-0.70 [-1.04, -0.36]
RAPID2 2007	214	0.1 (2)	112	0.7 (2.6)		28.1 %	-0.60 [-1.15, -0.05]
Total (95% CI)	567		292		•	100.0 %	-0.67 [-0.96, -0.38]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² :	= 0.0; Chi ² = 0.09, df =	I (P = 0.76); I ²	=0.0%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.5 (P < 0.0000))					
Test for subgroup diff	ferences: Not applicable						

-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 49.6. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 6 All Withdrawals:.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: 6 All Withdrawals:

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
Choy 2002	2/24	6/12		1.3 %	0.17 [0.04, 0.71]
NCT00791999 JRAPID (1)	36/167	52/77	+	10.9 %	0.32 [0.23, 0.44]
RAPID2 2007	137/492	110/127	•	16.1 %	0.32 [0.27, 0.38]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	34/116	96/114	•	11.9 %	0.35 [0.26, 0.47]
RAPIDI 2005	254/783	156/199	-	17.0 %	0.41 [0.37, 0.47]
FAST4WARD 2005	35/111	81/109	+	11.8 %	0.42 [0.32, 0.57]
CDP870-014 2009	28/126	56/121	+	9.5 %	0.48 [0.33, 0.70]
NCT00993317	25/85	21/42	-	8.0 %	0.59 [0.38, 0.92]
CERTAIN 2008	12/96	18/98		4.6 %	0.68 [0.35, 1.34]
REALISTIC 2008	80/85 I	28/212	-	9.0 %	0.71 [0.48, 1.07]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 643 (Certolizumab p Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04; Chi ² Test for overall effect: $Z = 10.16$	2851 begol), 624 (Control) = 26.60, df = 9 (P = 0.002) (P < 0.00001)	1111 ; I ² =66%	•	100.0 %	0.42 [0.36, 0.50]
Test for subgroup differences: No	t applicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100)	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

(1) Only for 200 and 400 mg of CTZ

Analysis 49.7. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 7 Withdrawals due to adverse events.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: 7 Withdrawals due to adverse events

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl	-	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
CDP870-014 2009	7/126	6/121		10.4 %	1.13 [0.37, 3.44]
CERTAIN 2008	6/96	6/98		9.5 %	1.02 [0.32, 3.28]
FAST4WARD 2005	5/111	2/109		5.7 %	2.37 [0.53, 10.64]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	8/116	2/114		8.1 %	3.42 [0.97, 12.13]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	13/239	3/77		9.5 %	1.38 [0.43, 4.44]
NCT00993317	4/85	2/42		4.3 %	0.99 [0.17, 5.60]
RAPIDI 2005	39/783	3/199		22.0 %	2.33 [1.08, 5.03]
RAPID2 2007	17/492	2/127		10.2 %	1.88 [0.61, 5.82]
REALISTIC 2008	33/851	6/212		20.3 %	1.34 [0.60, 2.99]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 132 (Certolizum Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 4.11$, or Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.7$ Test for subgroup differences	2899 hab pegol), 32 (Control) df = 8 (P = 0.85); I ² =0.0% 74 (P = 0.0061) : Not applicable	1099	•	100.0 %	1.66 [1.15, 2.37]
			0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10	1	

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 49.8. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 8 Deaths.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: 8 Deaths

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Placebo	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
l Certolizumab pegol 200 mg CERTAIN 2008	0/96	0/98			Not estimable
NCT00791921 HIKARI (1)	1/116	0/114		10.4 %	7.26 [0.14, 366.07]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	0/82	0/25			Not estimable
RAPID I 2005 (2)	3/392	1/100	_	26.8 %	0.75 [0.07, 8.60]
RAPID2 2007 (3)	1/246	0/63		6.8 %	3.51 [0.03, 455.29]
REALISTIC 2008 (4)	2/846	0/209		13.2 %	3.48 [0.11, 112.96]
Subtotal (95% CI)	1778	609	-	57.2 %	1.94 [0.36, 10.32]
Total events: 7 (Certolizumab peg Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.19, df = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.78 (F 2 Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	gol), I (Placebo) 3 (P = 0.76); I ² =0.0% P = 0.44)				
CDP870-014 2009	0/124	0/119			Not estimable
FAST4WARD 2005	0/111	0/109			Not estimable
NCT00791999 JRAPID	0/65	0/25			Not estimable
RAPID 1 2005 (5)	4/389	0/99		26.8 %	3.53 [0.31, 40.72]
RAPID2 2007 (6)	1/246	0/62		6.7 %	3.50 [0.03, 464.09]
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 5 (Certolizumab peg Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, df = Test for overall effect: Z = 1.13 (F	935 gol), 0 (Placebo) I (P = I.00); I ² =0.0% P = 0.26)	414		33.5 %	3.53 [0.40, 31.39]
Choy 2002	1/24	0/12		9.3 %	4.48 [0.07, 286.49]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	0/72	0/22			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: I (Certolizumab peg Heterogeneity: not applicable	96 gol), 0 (Placebo)	34		9.3 %	4.48 [0.07, 286.49]
	period). In	Favour Placebo I death (0.002 0.1 I I0 500 rs certolizumab pego Favours control (myocardial necrosis)		

to CZP

(Continued . . .)

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol n/N	Placebo n/N	Peto Odds Ratio Peto,Fixed,955	% CI	Weight	(Continued) Peto Odds Ratio Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.71$	(P = 0.48)					
Total (95% CI)	2809	1057	-		100.0 %	2.56 [0.72, 9.07]
Total events: 13 (Certolizumab	pegol), I (Placebo)					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.45, df =	= 6 (P = 0.96); l ² =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.46$	(P = 0.15)					
Test for subgroup differences: C	hi ² = 0.26, df = 2 (P = 0.88), I	2 =0.0%				
		(0.002 0.1 1 10	500		
		Favours cer	tolizumab pego Favo	ours control		
	period). In Pl	acebo I death (myo	cardial necrosis)			
			to CZP			

(1) I patient died of a rupture of a dissecting aortic aneurysm in the thoracic region, but UCB considered that in unlikely to have been related to study medication

(2) Two deaths: one patient (hepatic neoplasm), and the other (cardiac arrest). One more died (peritonitis, cirrhosis, and general deterioration of physical health during the posttreatment

(3) I patient died by myocardial infarction

-

(4) Two deaths in the CZP group: one case of sigmoid diverticulitis in a 73-year-old man with pancreatitis, and one of necrotizing pneumonia, both deaths were ruled as possibly related

(5) Four deaths: I patient (cerebral stroke, I myocardial necrosis, I by cardiac arrest and I more by atrial fibrillation)

(6) | patient died by fracture and shock

Analysis 49.9. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 9 Tuberculosis.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: 9 Tuberculosis

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Placebo	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
l Certolizumab pegol 200 m	ng				
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	0/98			Not estimable
NCT00993317	2/85	0/42		21.4 %	4.51 [0.23, 86.80]
RAPIDI 2005	2/392	0/100		→ 15.8 %	3.52 [0.11, 110.51]
RAPID2 2007	3/248	0/63		- 23.5 %	3.53 [0.21, 59.55]
REALISTIC 2008	0/846	0/209			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	1667	512	-	60.8 %	3.85 [0.66, 22.30]
Total events: 7 (Certolizuma	b pegol), 0 (Placebo)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.02$,	df = 2 (P = 0.99); $I^2 = 0.0\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.	50 (P = 0.13)				
2 Certolizumab pegol 400 m	ng				
FAST4WARD 2005	0/111	0/109			Not estimable
RAPID I 2005	3/389	0/99		- 23.6 %	3.52 [0.21, 59.11]
RAPID2 2007	2/246	0/62		→ 15.7 %	3.51 [0.11, 111.96]
Subtotal (95% CI)	746	270		39.2 %	3.52 [0.40, 31.33]
Total events: 5 (Certolizuma	b pegol), 0 (Placebo)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.00$,	df = $ (P = 1.00); ^2 = 0.0\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.	I 3 (P = 0.26)				
Total (95% CI)	2413	782	-	100.0 %	3.71 [0.94, 14.61]
Total events: 12 (Certolizum	ab pegol), 0 (Placebo)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.02$,	df = 4 (P = 1.00); $I^2 = 0.0\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.	.88 (P = 0.060)				
Test for subgroup differences	s: $Chi^2 = 0.00$, $df = 1$ (P = 0	.95), I ² =0.0%			
			0.01 0.1 1 10	100	
		Favour	s certolizumab pego Favours o	control	

Analysis 49.10. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 10 Upper respiratory tract infections.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: 10 Upper respiratory tract infections

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Placebo	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
l Certolizumab pegol 200 mg					
CERTAIN 2008	6/96	4/98		5.8 %	1.55 [0.44, 5.53]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	3/116	4/114		4.1 %	0.73 [0.16, 3.29]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	2/82	3/38		2.5 %	0.26 [0.04, 1.75]
NCT00993317	12/85	5/42		8.0 %	1.21 [0.41, 3.56]
RAPIDI 2005	24/392	5/100	-	10.7 %	.22 [0.48, 3.]
RAPID2 2007	11/248	2/62		4.9 %	1.35 [0.34, 5.40]
REALISTIC 2008	112/846	19/209	-	44.3 %	1.46 [0.93, 2.32]
Subtotal (95% CI)	1865	663	•	80.3 %	1.28 [0.91, 1.80]
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.66, d Test for overall effect: Z = 1.4; 2 Certolizumab pegol 400 mg CDP870-014 2009	f = 6 (P = 0.72); ² =0.0% 2 (P = 0.16) 5 4/124	4/119		4.7 %	0.96 [0.23, 3.91]
	21/209	5/00		9.7 %	0.11 [0.07, 2.37]
	4040	2//2		2.7 %	0.44 [0.04 2.08]
	4/248	2/65		2.5 %	0.44 [0.06, 3.27]
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 32 (Certolizumal Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.30, d Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.61$	844 b pegol), 14 (Placebo) f = 3 (P = 0.73); I ² =0.0% 0 (P = 0.55)	320		19.7 %	0.81 [0.41, 1.61]
Total (95% CI)	2709	983	•	100.0 %	1.17 [0.86, 1.59]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 6.31$, d	$f = 10 (P = 0.79); I^2 = 0.0\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.0$	I (P = 0.31)				
Test for subgroup differences:	$Chi^2 = 1.36, df = 1 (P = 0.24)$	ł), l² =26%			
		F	0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

Analysis 49.11. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 11 Lower respiratory tract infections.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: II Lower respiratory tract infections

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Placebo	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl	-	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl
Certolizumab pegol 200 mg					
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	1/98	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3.8 %	0.14 [0.00, 6.96]
NCT00791921 HIKARI (1)	2/116	0/114		7.6 %	7.33 [0.46, 117.85]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	1/82	1/38		6.6 %	0.43 [0.02, 8.48]
NCT00993317	2/85	0/42		6.7 %	4.51 [0.23, 86.80]
RAPIDI 2005	3/392	0/100		7.4 %	3.53 [0.21, 59.02]
REALISTIC 2008	7/846	1/209		19.4 %	1.59 [0.28, 9.09]
Subtotal (95% CI)	1617	601	-	51.6 %	1.81 [0.62, 5.26]
Total events: 15 (Certolizumab pe	egol), 3 (Placebo)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 4.13$, df = $\frac{1}{2}$	5 (P = 0.53); $I^2 = 0.0\%$				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.08 (P	= 0.28)				
2 Certolizumab pegol 400 mg	,				
CDP870-014 2009	3/124	3/119		22.5 %	0.96 [0.19, 4.83]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	4/85	1/39		16.0 %	1.73 [0.25, 11.80]
RAPIDI 2005	4/389	0/99		9.9 %	3.53 [0.31, 40.72]
Subtotal (95% CI)	598	257	-	48.4 %	1.52 [0.50, 4.59]
Total events: 11 (Certolizumab pe	egol), 4 (Placebo)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.79$, df = 2	2 (P = 0.67); I ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.74 (P	= 0.46)				
Total (95% CI)	2215	858	•	100.0 %	1.66 [0.77, 3.58]
Total events: 26 (Certolizumab pe	egol), 7 (Placebo)				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.96, df = 3	8 (P = 0.76); I ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.30 (P	= 0.20)				
Test for subgroup differences: Chi	² = 0.05, df = 1 (P = 0.83),	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$			
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

(1) 2(1 pneumonia neumococcal and 1 pneumocystis jirobenzi pneumonia)

Analysis 49.12. Comparison 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX), Outcome 12 Malignancies including lymphoma.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 49 Summary of findings: certolizumab (with or without MTX) versus placebo (with or without MTX)

Outcome: 12 Malignancies including lymphoma

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Placebo	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio
	n/N	n/N	Peto,Fixed,95% Cl		Peto,Fixed,95% CI
l Certolizumab pegol 200 m	ng				
CERTAIN 2008	0/96	2/98	·	9.1 %	0.14 [0.01, 2.20]
NCT00791921 HIKARI	0/116	/ 4	·	4.6 %	0.13 [0.00, 6.70]
NCT00993317 (1)	0/85	0/42			Not estimable
RAPID 2005 (2)	7/392	1/199		32.3 %	2.61 [0.60, 11.41]
RAPID2 2007	1/248	1/125	·	8.1 %	0.48 [0.03, 9.01]
REALISTIC 2008	4/846	2/209	← →	17.4 %	0.43 [0.06, 3.18]
Subtotal (95% CI)	1783	787		71.5 %	0.79 [0.29, 2.12]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 5.32$, Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$. 2 Certolizumab pegol 400 m	$df = 4 (P = 0.26); l^{2} = 25\%$ $48 (P = 0.63)$				
FAST4WARD 2005	0/111	0/109			Not estimable
RAPID 2005 (3)	4/389	1/199	← >	20.4 %	1.86 [0.29, 11.96]
RAPID2 2007 (4)	1/246	1/125	·	8.2 %	0.48 [0.03, 9.06]
Subtotal (95% CI)	746	433		28.5 %	1.26 [0.26, 6.08]
Total events: 5 (Certolizumal Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.58, Test for overall effect: Z = 0.	b pegol), 2 (Placebo) df = 1 (P = 0.44); l ² =0.0% 29 (P = 0.77)				
Total (95% CI)	2529	1220		100.0 %	0.90 [0.39, 2.08]
Total events: 17 (Certolizum	ab pegol), 9 (Placebo)				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 6.16$,	df = 6 (P = 0.41); $I^2 = 3\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$.	25 (P = 0.81)				
Test for subgroup differences	s: $Chi^2 = 0.25$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.6	2), I ² =0.0%			
			0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2		

Favours certolizumab pego Favours control

system], one adrenal adenoma, one hepatic neoplasm one esophageal carcinoma, and uterine cancer

one papilloma.

(1) Data provided by UCB

(2) One patient in the arm of placebo suffered a thyroid neoplasm and 7 in the arm of certolizumab 200 mg sc suffered: three basal cell carcinomas [one with metastasis to the central nervous

(3) In the placebo arm one patient suffered a thyroid neoplasm and 4 in the certolizumab 400 mg sc suffered two tongue neoplasm, I extranodal marginal zone B cell limphoma and

(4) One case of malignant neoplasm was reported in each arm, namely bladder cancer in the placebo group and colon cancer in certolizumab pegol 400 mg group

Analysis 50.1. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome I Doses.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50

Outcome: I Doses

study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M- H.Random.95%	Weight	Risk Ratio M- H.Random.95
	n/N	n/N	Cl		Cl
certolizumab 100 mg sc NCT00791999 JRAPID	32/72	4/26		4.3 %	2.89 [1.13, 7.38]
Subtotal (95% CI)	72	26	•	4.3 %	2.89 [1.13, 7.38]
Total events: 32 (Certolizumab	pegol), 4 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.22	(P = 0.027)				
2 certolizumab 200 mg sc					
CERTAIN 2008	20/96	7/98		5.7 %	2.92 [1.29, 6.58]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	45/82	4/26		4.5 %	3.57 [1.42, 8.97]
NCT00993317	35/85	8/42		8.4 %	2.16 [1.10, 4.24]
RAPIDI 2005	144/393	15/100	+	16.2 %	2.44 [1.50, 3.96]
RAPID2 2007	80/246	4/64	— 	4.1 %	5.20 [1.98, 13.67]
REALISTIC 2008	226/851	21/212	+	21.4 %	2.68 [1.76, 4.08]
Subtotal (95% CI)	1753	542	•	60.1 %	2.73 [2.13, 3.51]
Total events: 550 (Certolizuma	b pegol), 59 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; Chi	² = 2.79, df = 5 (P = 0.73); I ²	=0.0%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 7.85	(P < 0.0001)				
3 certolizumab 400 mg sc					
CDP870-014 2009	22/126	7/121		5.7 %	3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
FAST4WARD 2005	25/111	4/109		3.6 %	6.14 [2.21, 17.05]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	46/85	5/25		5.8 %	2.71 [1.21, 6.07]
RAPIDI 2005	155/390	15/99	-	16.3 %	2.62 [1.62, 4.25]
RAPID2 2007	81/246	4/63		4.1 %	5.19 [1.98, 13.61]
Subtotal (95% CI)	958	417	•	35.6 %	3.18 [2.29, 4.41]
Total events: 329 (Certolizuma	b pegol), 35 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0; Chi	² = 3.42, df = 4 (P = 0.49); l ²	=0.0%			

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

(Continued . . .)

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control		Risk Ratio M-	Weight	(Continued) Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,R	landom,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.9$	94 (P < 0.00001)					
Total (95% CI)	2783	985		•	100.0 %	2.89 [2.38, 3.51]
Total events: 911 (Certolizun	nab pegol), 98 (Control)					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0; C	$hi^2 = 6.73$, $df = 11$ (P = 0.82);	l ² =0.0%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 10$	0.69 (P < 0.00001)					
Test for subgroup differences	:: Chi ² = 0.52, df = 2 (P = 0.77)	, l ² =0.0%				
			0.01 0.1	I IO IOO		
			Favours control	Favours certoli	izumab pego	

Analysis 50.2. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 2 Size.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50

Outcome: 2 Size

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
l certolizumab < 200 patient	S				
CERTAIN 2008	20/96	7/98		5.7 %	2.92 [1.29, 6.58]
NCT00993317	35/85	8/42		8.4 %	2.16 [1.10, 4.24]
Subtotal (95% CI)	181	140	•	14.1 %	2.44 [1.45, 4.10]
Total events: 55 (Certolizuma	ıb pegol), 15 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; Ch	$hi^2 = 0.3 I$, $df = I$ (P = 0.58); I^2	2 =0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.3$	37 (P = 0.00074)				
2 certolizumab > 200 patient	IS .				
CDP870-014 2009	22/126	7/121		5.7 %	3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
FAST4WARD 2005	25/111	4/109		3.6 %	6.14 [2.21, 17.05]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	32/72	4/26		4.3 %	2.89 [1.13, 7.38]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	46/85	5/25		5.8 %	2.71 [1.21, 6.07]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	45/82	4/26		4.5 %	3.57 [1.42, 8.97]
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

(Continued . . .)

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	(Continued) Risk Ratio H-Danders 25%
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
RAPIDI 2005	144/393	15/100		16.2 %	2.44 [1.50, 3.96]
RAPIDI 2005	155/390	15/99	+	16.3 %	2.62 [1.62, 4.25]
RAPID2 2007	80/246	4/64		4.1 %	5.20 [1.98, 13.67]
RAPID2 2007	81/246	4/63		4.1 %	5.19 [1.98, 13.61]
REALISTIC 2008	226/851	21/212	+	21.4 %	2.68 [1.76, 4.08]
Subtotal (95% CI)	2602	845	•	85.9 %	2.97 [2.41, 3.67]
Total events: 856 (Certolizun	nab pegol), 83 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; C	2. Chi ² = 5.9 I, df = 9 (P = 0.75); I ²	=0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 10$	0.16 (P < 0.00001)				
Total (95% CI)	2783	985	•	100.0 %	2.89 [2.38, 3.51]
Total events: 911 (Certolizun	nab pegol), 98 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$; C	Chi ² = 6.73, df = 11 (P = 0.82);	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 10$	0.69 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup differences	s: $Chi^2 = 0.47$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.49)), l² =0.0%			
oup unerences	c = 0.77, d = 1 (r = 0.77)	0			

Favours control

trol Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 50.3. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 3 Use of MTX.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50

Outcome: 3 Use of MTX

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio M-
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% Cl
I With MTX					
CDP870-014 2009	22/126	7/121		5.7 %	3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
NCT00993317	35/85	8/42		8.4 %	2.16 [1.10, 4.24]
RAPIDI 2005	144/393	15/100	-	16.2 %	2.44 [1.50, 3.96]
RAPID 2005	155/390	15/99	+	16.3 %	2.62 [1.62, 4.25]
RAPID2 2007	81/246	4/63		4.1 %	5.19 [1.98, 13.61]
RAPID2 2007	80/246	4/64		4.1 %	5.20 [1.98, 13.67]
REALISTIC 2008	226/851	21/212	+	21.4 %	2.68 [1.76, 4.08]
Subtotal (95% CI)	2337	701	•	76.1 %	2.77 [2.21, 3.46]
2 Without MTX CERTAIN 2008 FAST4WARD 2005 NCT00791999 JRAPID	20/96 25/111 32/72	7/98 4/109 4/26	- •	5.7 % 3.6 % 4.3 %	2.92 [1.29, 6.58] 6.14 [2.21, 17.05] 2.89 [1.13, 7.38]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	46/85	5/25		5.8 %	2.71 [1.21, 6.07]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	45/82	4/26		4.5 %	3.57 [1.42, 8.97]
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 168 (Certolizur Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 5$. Total (95% CI) Total events: 911 (Certolizur Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0; C Total events: 911 (Certolizur	446 mab pegol), 24 (Control) Chi ² = 1.86, df = 4 (P = 0.76); 91 (P < 0.00001) 2783 mab pegol), 98 (Control) Chi ² = 6.73, df = 11 (P = 0.82) Chi ² = 6.73, df = 11 (P = 0.82)	284 1 ² =0.0% 985 ; 1 ² =0.0%	•	23.9 % 100.0 %	3.32 [2.23, 4.95] 2.89 [2.38, 3.51]
Test for subgroup differences	s: $Chi^2 = 0.62$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.42	3), I ² =0.0%			

0.01 0.1 1 10 100

Favours control Favours certolizumab pego

Analysis 50.4. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 4 Population.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50

Outcome: 4 Population

//N /85 /82 /72 /85 24 0.85); I ² =0.0% 126 7 /96	H,F 1/12 1	Random,95% Cl 	5.8 % 4.5 % 4.3 % 8.4 % 22.9 % 5.7 %	H,Random,959 2.71 [1.21, 6.07] 3.57 [1.42, 8.97] 2.89 [1.13, 7.38] 2.16 [1.10, 4.24] 2.66 [1.77, 4.00] 3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
/85 /82 /72 /85 24 0.85); l ² =0.0% 126 7 /96	5/25 4/26 4/26 8/42 119 7/121 7/98		5.8 % 4.5 % 4.3 % 8.4 % 22.9 % 5.7 %	2.71 [1.21, 6.07] 3.57 [1.42, 8.97] 2.89 [1.13, 7.38] 2.16 [1.10, 4.24] 2.66 [1.77, 4.00] 3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
/85 /82 /72 /85 24 0.85); I ² =0.0% I26 7 /96	5/25 4/26 4/26 8/42 119 7/121 7/98	• • • •	5.8 % 4.5 % 4.3 % 8.4 % 22.9 %	2.71 [1.21, 6.07] 3.57 [1.42, 8.97] 2.89 [1.13, 7.38] 2.16 [1.10, 4.24] 2.66 [1.77, 4.00] 3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
/82 /72 /85 24 0.85); I ² =0.0% 126 7 /96	4/26 4/26 8/42 119 7/121 7/98	 	4.5 % 4.3 % 8.4 % 22.9 %	3.57 [1.42, 8.97] 2.89 [1.13, 7.38] 2.16 [1.10, 4.24] 2.66 [1.77, 4.00] 3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
/72 /85 24 0.85); I ² =0.0% 126 7 /96	4/26 8/42 1 19 7/121 7/98	• •	43 % 84 % 22.9 % 5.7 %	2.89 [1.13, 7.38] 2.16 [1.10, 4.24] 2.66 [1.77, 4.00] 3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
/85 24 0.85); I ² =0.0% 126 796 111 4	8/42 119 7/121 7/98	• •	8.4 % 22.9 % 5.7 %	2.16 [1.10, 4.24] 2.66 [1.77, 4.00] 3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
24)) 0.85); l ² =0.0% 126 7 /96 111 4	119 //121 7/98	• -+ 	22.9 % 5.7 % 5.7 %	2.66 [1.77, 4.00] 3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
)) 0.85); l ² =0.0% 126 7 /96 1111 4	7/121 7/98	- - -	5.7 %	3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
0.85); I ² =0.0% I26 7 /96 I I I 4	7/121 7/98	-	5.7 %	3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
126 7 /96	7/121 7/98	- -	5.7 %	3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
126 7 /96 111 4	7/121 7/98	- - -	5.7 %	3.02 [1.34, 6.81]
/96 4	7/98		5.7 %	5.02 [1.54, 0.01]
/96 4	7/98	_ _	57%	
4			5.7 70	2.92 [1.29, 6.58]
	/109		3.6 %	6.14 [2.21, 17.05]
390 I	5/99		16.3 %	2.62 [1.62, 4.25]
393 15	/100	-	16.2 %	2.44 [1.50, 3.96]
246	4/64		4.1 %	5.20 [1.98, 13.67]
246	4/63		4.1 %	5.19 [1.98, 13.61]
351 21	/212	-	21.4 %	2.68 [1.76, 4.08]
59	866	•	77.1 %	2.96 [2.37, 3.70]
)				
0.57); l ² =0.0%				
	~~~		100.00/	
83	985	•	100.0 %	2.89 [ 2.38, 3.51 ]
l)	<i>.</i>			
- 0.82); I ² =0.0%	ġ			
	20/			
	246 246 851 21 59 3 10 $(0.57); 1^2 = 0.0\%$ <b>783</b> 9 10 $(0.57); 1^2 = 0.0\%$ 10 $(0.57); 1^2 = 0.0\%$ $(0.57); 1^2 = 0.0\%$	246 4/64 246 4/63 851 21/212 <b>59 866</b> $^{(1)}$ $(0.57); 1^2 = 0.0\%$ <b>83 985</b> $^{(1)}$ $= 0.82); 1^2 = 0.0\%$ $P = 0.65), 1^2 = 0.0\%$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$246$ $4/64$ $4.1\%$ $246$ $4/63$ $4.1\%$ $851$ $21/212$ $21.4\%$ $59$ $866$ - $77.1\%$ $90$ $0.57$ ); $1^2 = 0.0\%$ -       100.0\% $985$ -       100.0\% $985$ -       - $985$ -       - $985$ -       - $985$ -       - $985$ -       - $985$ -       - $985$ -       - $985$ -       - $985$ -       - $985$ -       - $985$ -       - $910$ -       - $900$ -       -       - $985$ -       -       - $985$ -       -       - $986$ -       -       - $986$ -       -       - $986$ -       -       -

Favours control F

Favours certolizumab pego
## Analysis 50.5. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 5 Duration of previous disease.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50

Outcome: 5 Duration of previous disease

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M- H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,95% CI_
I Long previous disease du	ration (9 years or more)				
CDP870-014 2009	22/126	7/121		7.2 %	3.02 [ 1.34, 6.81 ]
FAST4WARD 2005	25/111	4/109		4.6 %	6.14 [ 2.21, 17.05 ]
Subtotal (95% CI)	237	230	•	11.7 %	4.02 [ 2.02, 7.98 ]
Total events: 47 (Certolizur	nab pegol), II (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.03$	; Chi ² = 1.15, df = 1 (P = 0.28)	$  ^2 =  3\% $			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$	3.97 (P = 0.000073)				
2 Short previous disease du	uration (less than 7 years)				
NCT00993317	35/85	8/42		10.5 %	2.16 [ 1.10, 4.24 ]
RAPID   2005	144/393	15/100	+	20.3 %	2.44 [ 1.50, 3.96 ]
RAPID   2005	155/390	15/99	-	20.5 %	2.62 [ 1.62, 4.25 ]
RAPID2 2007	81/246	4/63		5.1 %	5.19 [ 1.98, 13.61 ]
RAPID2 2007	80/246	4/64		5.1 %	5.20 [ 1.98, 13.67 ]
REALISTIC 2008	226/851	21/212	+	26.8 %	2.68 [ 1.76, 4.08 ]
Subtotal (95% CI)	2211	580	•	88.3 %	2.75 [ 2.18, 3.47 ]
Total events: 721 (Certolizu	ımab pegol), 67 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$ ;	Chi ² = 4.23, df = 5 (P = 0.52);	² =0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 8$	3.53 (P < 0.00001)				
Total (95% CI)	2448	810	•	100.0 %	2.87 [ 2.31, 3.57 ]
Total events: 768 (Certolizu	ımab pegol), 78 (Control)				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$ ;	Chi ² = 6.52, df = 7 (P = 0.48);	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 9$	9.47 (P < 0.00001)				
Test for subgroup difference	es: $Chi^2 = 1.05$ , $df = 1$ (P = 0.30	0), I ² =5%			
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100	D	
			Favours control Favours certo	lizumab pego	

## Analysis 50.6. Comparison 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50, Outcome 6 Published vs unpublished studies.

Review: Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults

Comparison: 50 Analysis of sensibility ACR50

Outcome: 6 Published vs unpublished studies

Study or subgroup	Certolizumab pegol	Control	Risk Ratio M-	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	H,Random,95% Cl		H,Random,959 Cl
I Published studies					
CDP870-014 2009	22/126	7/121		5.7 %	3.02 [ 1.34, 6.81 ]
FAST4WARD 2005	25/111	4/109		3.6 %	6.14 [ 2.21, 17.05 ]
RAPIDI 2005	144/393	15/100	+	16.2 %	2.44 [ 1.50, 3.96 ]
RAPIDI 2005	155/390	5/99	-	16.3 %	2.62 [ 1.62, 4.25 ]
RAPID2 2007	81/246	4/63		4.1 %	5.19 [ 1.98, 13.61 ]
RAPID2 2007	80/246	4/64		4.1 %	5.20 [ 1.98, 13.67 ]
REALISTIC 2008	226/851	21/212		21.4 %	2.68 [ 1.76, 4.08 ]
Subtotal (95% CI)	2363	768	•	71.3 %	2.97 [ 2.36, 3.73 ]
2 Unpublished studies CERTAIN 2008	20/96	7/98	-•-	5.7 %	2.92 [ 1.29, 6.58 ]
CERTAIN 2008	20/96	7/98		5.7 %	2.92 [ 1.29, 6.58 ]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	45/82	4/26		4.5 %	3.57 [ 1.42, 8.97 ]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	46/85	5/25		5.8 %	2.71 [ 1.21, 6.07 ]
NCT00791999 JRAPID	32/72	4/26		4.3 %	2.89 [ 1.13, 7.38 ]
NCT00993317	35/85	8/42		8.4 %	2.16 [ 1.10, 4.24 ]
<b>Subtotal (95% CI)</b> Total events: 178 (Certolizumab f Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0; Chi ² = Test for overall effect: Z = 5.38 (F	<b>420</b> begol), 28 (Control) = 0.83, df = 4 (P = 0.93); l ² P < 0.00001)	<b>217</b> 2 =0.0%	*	28.7 %	2.71 [ 1.89, 3.90 ]
Total (95% CI)	2783	985	•	100.0 %	2.89 [ 2.38, 3.51 ]
Total events: 911 (Certolizumab p Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0; Chi ² = Test for overall effect: Z = 10.69 Test for subgroup differences: Chi	pegol), 98 (Control) = 6.73, df = 11 (P = 0.82); (P < 0.00001) $i^2 = 0.17$ df = 1 (P = 0.68)	$ ^2 = 0.0\%$			

Favours control

Favours certolizumab pego

# ADDITIONAL TABLES

Study	FAST4WAR n = 220	CDP870- 8 014 n = 247	RAPID1 n = 982	RAPID2 n = 619	CT0099333 n = 127	CERTAIN l n = 194	REALIS- TIC n = 1063	HIKARI n =230	JRAPID n = 316
Age (years) Mean ± (SD)	53.8 (12. 2) CZP 400mg 52. 7 (12.7) Placebo 54.0 (11. 6)	CZP 400mg plus MTX 53 (12.0) Placebo plus MTX 55.6 (11.7)	52.0 (11. 6) CZP 200mg plus MTX 51.4 (11.6) CZP 400 mg plus MTX 52.4 (11.7) Placebo plus MTX 52.2 (11.2)	51.9 (11. 5) CZP 200mg plus MTX 52.2 (11.1) CZP 400 mg plus MTX 51.9 (11.8) Placebo plus MTX 51.5 (11.8)	CZP 200mg plus MTX 18- 65 years= 72; > 65 years =13 Placebo plus MTX 18- 65 years= 38; > 65 years =4	CZP 200mg 53. 6 (11.9) Placebo 54.0(12.4)	55.1 (12. 49) CZP 200mg 55. 4 (12.4) Placebo 53.9 (12. 7)	55.7 (10. 0) CZP 200mg 56. 0 (10.2) Placebo 55.4 (9.8)	53.0 (11. 0) CZP 100mg 54. 3 (10.6) CZP 200mg 50. 6 (11.4) CZP 400 mg 55. 4 (10.3) Placebo 51.9 (11. 1)
Follow up	24 weeks	24 weeks	52 weeks	24 weeks	24 weeks	24 weeks	12 weeks	12 and 24 weeks	12 and 24 weeks
Female n (%)	184 (83. 6%)	CZP 400mg plus MTX 72% Placebo plus MTX 66.1 %	817 (83. 2%) CZP 200mg 324 (82. 4%) CZP 400 mg 326 (83.6%) Placebo 167 (83. 9%)	505 (81. 6%) CZP 200mg 206 (83. 7%) CZP 400 mg 192 (78%) Placeb∽ 107 (84. 3%)	112 (88. 2%) CZP 200mg 75 (59.1%) Placebo 37 (29.13%)	156 (80. 4%) CZP 200mg 81 (41.8%) Placebo 75 (38.7%)	829 (78%) CZP 200mg 660 (62. 1%) Placebo 169 (15. 9%)	171 (74. 3%) CZP 200mg 83 (36.1%) Placebo 88 (38.3 %)	CZP 100mg 58 (18.4%) CZP 200mg 69 (21.8%) CZP 400 mg 69 (21. 8%) Placebo 66 (20.9%)
Disease duration (years) Mean (SD)	9.5 (NC) CZP 400mg 8.7 (8.2) Placebo 10.4 (9.6)	CZP plus MTX 9.4 (7.5) Placebo plus MTX 9.9 (7.8)	6.1 (4.3) CZP 200mg 6.1 (4.2) CZP 400 mg 6.2 (4. 4) Placebo 6. 2 (4.4)	6.2 (4.2) CZP 200mg 6.1 (4.1) CZP 400 mg 6.5 (4. 3) Placebo 5. 6 (3.9)	CZP 200mg 6.4 (4.2) Placebo 6 (5.1)		6.2 (4.2) CZP 200mg 8.6 (8.8) Placebo 8. 9 (9.1)		

Table 1. Demographic and disease characteristics of the retrieved phase III trials

RF positive ( ³ 14 IU/ml) (%)	100% CZP 400mg 110 (99. 9%) Placebo 109 (100%)	78%	81.8% CZP 200mg 312 (79. 6%) CZP 400 mg 326 (83.6%) Placebo 164 (82. 8%)	76.9% CZP 200mg 186 (77. 5%) CZP 400 mg 179 (75.5%) Placebo 97 (78.2%)			CZP 200mg 555 (73. 9%) Placebo 137 (78. 2%)		
MTX con- comitant dose (mg/ week) Mean (SD)	N/A	CZP plus MTX 16.9 (3.9) Placebo plus MTX 16.6 (3.6)	13.6 CZP 200mg 13. 6 (4.3) CZP 400 mg 13. 6 (4) Placebo 13.4 (4.2)	12.5 CZP 200mg 12. 5 (3.6) CZP 400 mg 12. 6 (3.7) Placebo 12.2 (3.3)	CZP 200mg 13. 4 (2.5) Placebo 13.6 (2.8)	N/A	CZP 200mg 17. 2 (5.7) Placebo 16.3 (5.3)	N/A	N/A
Num- ber of previous DMARDS Mean (SD)	2.0 CZP 400mg 2.0 (1.2) Placebo 2. 0 (1.3)	1.3	1.3 CZP 200mg 1.3 (1.3) CZP 400 mg 1.3 (1. 3) Placebo 1. 4 (1.4)	1.2 CZP 200mg 1.2 (1.3) CZP 400 mg 1.3 (1. 2) Placebo 1. 2 (1.2)	1.2 CZP 200mg 3.3 (1.3) Placebo 3. 2 (1.5)				
Ten- der Joint count Mean (0- 66) (SD)	29.0 (13. 13)	CZP plus MTX 29 (11.6) Placebo plus MTX 31 (12.9)	30.7 (12. 9)	30.2 (14. 0)	CZP 200mg 25. 04 (14.94) Placebo 25.05 (14. 61)		CZP 200mg 14. 7 (6.6) Placebo 14.7 (6.6)		
Swollen Joint Count Mean (0- 66) (SD)	20.5 (9. 67)	CZP plus MTX 22.8 (9.4) Placebo plus MTX 22.2 (9.6)	21.5 (9.8)	21.0 (9.8)	CZP 200mg 15. 96 (8.86) Placebo 17.31 (11. 18)		CZP 200mg 11. 8 (5.6) Placebo 11.1 (5.2)		
HAQ- DI mean (SD)	1.5 (0.64)	CZP plus MTX 1.4 (0.6)	1.7 (0.60)	1.6 (0.59)	CZP 200mg 1.		CZP 200mg 1.5		

 Table 1. Demographic and disease characteristics of the retrieved phase III trials (Continued)

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

		Placebo plus MTX 1.5 (0.7)			43 (0.67) Placebo 1. 53 (0.74)	(0.6) Placebo 1. 6 (0.6)	
CRP (mg/ L) Geo- metric mean (CV)	11.5 (NC)	CZP plus MTX 11.9 Placebo plus MTX 13.1	14.7 (144. 2)	13.6 (180. 9)		CZP 200mg 9 Placebo 10	
DAS- 28 (ESR) Mean (SD)	6.3 (1.00)	6.2 (0.99)	6.9 (0.8)	6.8 (0.83)		CZP 200mg 6.4 (0.9) Placebo 6. 4 (0.9)	

#### Table 1. Demographic and disease characteristics of the retrieved phase III trials (Continued)

Notes: CZP = certolizumab pegol; CV = coefficient of variation; DAS = disease activity score; DMARD = disease-modifying an- Notes: CZP = certolizumatic drug; ESR = erythrocyte sedimentation rate; IU = international units; L = litre; mg = milligrams; mL = millilitres; RF= gol; CV = coefficient of factor; SD = standard deviation; Y = years; NC = not calculated; N/A = not applicable. All randomised subjects; the ation; DAS = actual numbers vary slightly across parameters score; DMARD

score; DMARD fying antirheuma erythrocyte sedi IU = internatio litre; mg = mil millilitres; RF= n tor; SD = stand Y = years; NC lated; N/A = nor randomised subj numbers vary sli rameters

#### Table 2. Flow of patients in the phase III trials retrieved

Study	Placebo	Certolizumab pegol 100 mg	Certolizumab pegol 200 mg	Certolizumab pegol 400 mg
RAPID1 n = 982	ITT n = 199 Safety n = 199		ITT n = 393 Safety ^{<i>a</i>} n = 392	ITT n = 390 Safety n = 389
	Withdrawn at week 16 due to lack of efficacy n = 125 (62.8%)		Withdrawn at week 16 due to lack of efficacy n = 83 (21.1%)	Withdrawn at week 16 due to lack of efficacy n = 68 (17.4%)
	All withdrawn n = 156 (78.4%)		All withdrawn n = 138 (35.1)	All withdrawn n = 116 (39.7%)

Table 2.	Flow of	patients in	n the	phase III	trials	retrieved	(Continued)
----------	---------	-------------	-------	-----------	--------	-----------	-------------

	Completed n = 43 (21.6%)	Completed n = 255 (64.9%)	Completed n = 274 (70.3%)
RAPID2 n = 619	ITT n = 127 ^c Safety n = 125	ITT n = 246 Safety n = 248	ITT n = 246 Safety n = 246
	Withdrawn at week 16 due to lack of efficacy n = 103 (81%)	Withdrawn at week 16 due to lack of efficacy n = 52 (21.1%)	Withdrawn at week 16 due to lack of efficacy n = 52 (21.1%)
	All withdrawn n = 110 (86%)	All withdrawn n = 72 (29.3%)	All withdrawn n = 65 (26.4%)
	Completed n = 17 (13.4%)	Completed n = 174 (70.7%)	Completed n = 181 (73.6%)
FAST4WARD	ITT n = 109 Safety n = 109		ITT n = 111 Safety n = 111
	All withdrawn n = 81 (74%) 75 (68.8%) Lack of effi- cacy 2 (1.8%) Adverse event 1 (0.9%) Protocol viola- tion 3 (2.8) Lost to follow-up		All withdrawn n = 35 (31.5%) 24 (21.6%) Lack of effi- cacy 5 (4.5%) Adverse event 4 (3.6%) Protocol viola- tion 2 (1.8%) Consent with- drawn
	Completed n = 28 (25.7%)		Completed n = 76 (68.5%)
CDP870-014	ITT n = 121 ^d Safety n = 119		ITT n = $126^d$ Safety n = $124$
	All withdrawn n = 56 (46.3%) 45 (37.2%) Lack of effi- cacy 6 (5%) Adverse event 5 (4.1%) Other reasons		All withdrawn n = 28 (22.2%) 16 (12.7%) Lack of effi- cacy 7 (5.6%) Adverse event 5 (4%) Other reasons
	Completed n = 65 (53.7%)		Completed n = 98 (77.8%)

NCT00993317	ITT n =42 Safety n = 42	ITT n = 85 Safety n = 85	
	All withdrawn n = 21 (50%) 18 (42%) Lack of efficacy 2 (4.76%) Adverse event 1 (2.38%) Other reasons	All withdrawn n = 25 (29.41%) 18 (21.8%) Lack of effi- cacy 4 (4.70%) Adverse event 3 (3.52%) Other reasons	
	Completed n = 21 (50%)	Completed n = 60 (70.58%)	
CERTAIN	ITT n = 98 Safety n = 98	ITT n = 96 Safety n = 96	
	All withdrawn n = 18 (18.36%) 7 (7.14%) Lack of efficacy 6 (6.12 %) Adverse event 5 (5.10%) Other reasons	All withdrawn n = 12 (12.5%) 2 (2.08 %) Lack of efficacy 6 (6.25%) Adverse event 4 (4.16%) Other reasons	
	Completed n = 80 (81.63%)	Completed n = 84 (87.5%)	
REALISTIC	ITT n = 212 Safety n =	ITT n = 851 Safety n =	
	All withdrawn n = 28 (13.20%) 6 (2.83%) Lack of efficacy 6 (2.83%) Adverse event 16 (7.54%) Other reasons	All withdrawn n = 80 (9.41%) 6 (0.70%) Lack of efficacy 33 (3.87%) Adverse event 41 (4.81%) Other reasons	
	Completed n = 184 (86.79%)	Completed n = 771 (90.59%)	
HIKARI	ITT n = 114 Safety n = 114	ITT n = 116 Safety n = 116	
	All withdrawn n = 96 (84.2%) 2 (1.75%) Lack of efficacy 2 (1.75%) Adverse event 94 (82%) Other reasons (protocol planned n =88)	All withdrawn n = 34 (29.31%) 0 (0%) Lack of efficacy 8 (6.9%) Adverse event 26 (22.4%) Other reasons (protocol planned n =24)	

# Table 2. Flow of patients in the phase III trials retrieved (Continued)

### Table 2. Flow of patients in the phase III trials retrieved (Continued)

	Completed n = 18 (15.8%)		Completed n = 82 (70.69%)	
JRAPID	ITT n = 77	ITT n = 72	ITT n = 82	ITT n = 85
	Safety n = 77	Safety n = 72	Safety n = 82	Safety n = 85
	All withdrawn	All withdrawn	All withdrawn	All withdrawn
	n = 52 (67.53%)	n = 21 (29.17%)	n = 16 (19.51%)	n = 20 (23.53%)
	2 (2.98%) Lack of efficacy	3 (4.17%) Lack of efficacy	1 (1.22%) Lack of efficacy	0 (0%) Lack of efficacy
	3 (3.90%) Adverse event	0 (0%) Adverse event	3 (3.66%) Adverse event	7 (8.23%) Adverse event
	47 (61.04%) Other rea-	18 (25%) Other reasons	12 (14.63%) Other rea-	13 (15.29%) Other rea-
	sons (Protocol planned	(Protocol planned with-	sons (Protocol planned	sons (Protocol planned
	withdrawal 45)	drawal 14)	withdrawal 11)	withdrawal 11)
	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
	n = 25 (32.47%)	n = 51 (70.83%)	n = 66 (80.49%)	n = 65 (76.47%)

a One patient withdrew by her own decision

b One patient was discontinued due to the ESR/CRP not meeting criteria

c Two patients in the placebo group received certolizumab pegol and were included for safety in the 200 mg group

d Two patients in the each of treatment groups did not take study medication. Manufactures reported efficacy calculations from to the ES placebo n = 119 and certolizumab pegol n = 124 ria

decision
b One patient wa
to the ESR/CRP
ria
c Two patients in
received certoliz
were included fo
mg group
d Two patients i
ment groups di
ment groups di medication. Mar
ment groups di medication. Mar efficacy calculation
ment groups di medication. Mar efficacy calculati = 119 and certo

a One patient wi

Table 3. Beneficial ACR50

	Follow up	Doses/study	<b>Response rate</b> certolizumab pegol	Response rate placebo	RR (IC95%)	% RD	NNT
ACR50							
Analysis 2.2	24 weeks	200 mg/ CERTAIN 2008; NCT00791999 JRAPID; NCT00993317;	36%	9%	3.80 (2.42 to 5. 95)	27 (20 to 33)	4 (3 to 8)

Certolizumab pegol (CDP870) for rheumatoid arthritis in adults (Review)

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

## Table 3. Beneficial ACR50 (Continued)

		RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007					
Analysis 3.2	24 weeks	400 mg/ CDP870- 014 2009; FAST4WARD 2005; NCT00791999 JRAPID; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	34%	7%	4.65 (3.09 to 6. 99)	27 (17 to 34)	4 (3 to 7)
Analysis 5.2	52 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005,	38%	8%	5.03 (3.04 to 8. 32)	30 (24 to 36)	4 (2 to 7)
Analysis 6.2	52 weeks	400 mg/ RAPID1 2005	40%	8%	5.27 (3.19 to 8. 71)	32 (26 to 38)	3 (2 to 6)

## Table 4. Health-related quality of life

	Follow-up	Doses/study	Mean differences
HAQ (0-3) (Best=0; Worst 3)			
Analysis 11.1	24 weeks	200 mg/ CERTAIN 2008; NCT00993317; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	-0.35 (-0.43 to -0.26)
Analysis 11.2	24 weeks	400 mg/ CDP870-014 2009; FAST4WARD 2005; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	-0.38 (-0.48 to -0.28)
	52 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005	-0.42 (-0.54 to -0.30)
	52 weeks	400 mg/ RAPID1 2005	-0.45 (-0.57 to -0.33)
SF-36 PCS (0-100) (Worst=0; Best=100)			
Analysis 14.1	24 weeks	200 mg/ CERTAIN 2008; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	5.03 (3.90 to 6.16)
Analysis 14.2	24 weeks	400 mg/ CDP870-014 2009; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	5.54 (4.11 to 6.97)

# Table 4. Health-related quality of life (Continued)

SF-36 MCS (0-100) (Worst=0; Best=100)			
Analysis 15.1	24 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	4.18 (2.70 to 5.66)
Analysis 15.2	24 weeks	400 mg/ CDP870-014 2009; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	4.05 (2.77 to 5.34)
SF-36 PCS			
Analysis 16.1	52 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005	6.06 (4.59 to 7.53)
Analysis 16.2	52 weeks	400 mg/ RAPID1 2005	6.88 (5.42 to 8.34)
SF-36 MCS (0-100) (Worst=0; Best=100)			
	52 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005	4.3 (2.4 to 6.2)
	52 weeks	400 mg/ RAPID1 2005	4.3 (2.4 to 6.2)
Patients VAS score (0-100)			
	24 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	-20.48 (-24.26 to -16.69)
		400 mg/ RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; FAST4WARD 2005	-21.35 (-25.08 to -17.61)
	52 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005	-22.20 (-27.37 to -17.03)
		400 mg/ RAPID1 2005	-24.70 (-29.73 to -19.67)
DAS-28 remission (< 2.6)			
Analysis 25.2	24 weeks	200 mg/CERTAIN 2008; NCT00791921 HIKARI; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	8.47 (4.15 to 17.28)
Analysis 25.3		400 mg/ CDP870-014 2009; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	7.18 (3.12 to 16.50)
Analysis 25.4	52 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005	10.36 (3.29 to 32.58)
Analysis 25.5		400 mg/ RAPID1 2005	12.49 (3.99 to 39.12)

# Table 5. Radiological changes

	Follow up	Doses/study	Mean differences
Modified Total Sharp Scores (mTTS) is the sum of the ero- sion score (ES) and the joint space narrowing (JSN) score and has a range of 0 to 398			
Analysis 44.1	24 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	-1.06 (-1.58 to -0.55)
Analysis 44.2	24 weeks	400 mg/ RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	-1.32 (-1.85 to -0.78)
	52 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005	-2.4 (-4.11 to -0.69)
	52 weeks	400 mg/ RAPID1 2005	-2.6 (-4.29 to -0.91)
Erosion Score is the sum of joint scores collected for 46 joints and has a range of 0 to 230			
Analysis 33.1	24 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	-0.67 (-0.96 to -0.38)
Analysis 33.2	24 weeks	400 mg/ RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	-0.76 (-1.14 to -0.37)
	52 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005	-1.4 (-2.32 to -0.48)
	52 weeks	400 mg/ RAPID1 2005	-1.5 (-2.44 to -0.56)
Joint space narrowing (JSN) is the sum of joint scores collected for 42 joints and has a range of 0 to 168			
Analysis 36.1	24 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	-0.45 (-0.77 to -0.13)
Analysis 36.2	24 weeks	400 mg/ RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	-0.55 (- 0.86 to -0.24)
	52 weeks	200 mg/ RAPID1 2005	-1 (-1.85 to -0.15)
	52 weeks	400 mg/ RAPID1 2005	-1.2 (-1.98 to -0.42)

# Table 6. Adverse events

	Studies	Response rate in % (num- ber of events) certolizumab pegol	Response rate in % (num- ber of events) placebo	RR	% RD	NNTH
Serious adverse events (doses)				Peto OR		
Analysis 8.6 200 mg certolizumab pegol	CERTAIN 2008; NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00791999 JRAPID; NCT00993317; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; REALISTIC 2008	7% (145)	4% (38)	1.77 (1.27 to 2. 46)	4 (2 to 6)	35 (19 to 98)
Analysis 9.7 400 mg certolizumab pegol	CDP870-014 2009; FAST4WARD 2005; NCT00791999 JRAPID; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	10% (95)	4% (31)	1.98 (1.36 to 2. 9)	5 (2 to 7)	28 (15 to 74)
Adverse events leading to with- drawal				Peto OR		
Analysis 8.9 200 mg certolizumab pegol	CERTAIN 2008; NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00791999 JRAPID; NCT00993317; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; REALISTIC 2008	4% (90)	3% (26)	1.62 (1.07 to 2. 44)	2 (0 to 4)	57 (25 to 492)
Analysis 9.9 400 mg certolizumab	CDP870-014 2009; FAST4WARD	5% (48)	2% (16)	2.01 (1.20 to 3. 36)	3 (1 to 5)	52 (23 to 257)

pegol	2005; NCT00791999 JRAPID; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007					
Death				Peto OR		
Analysis 8.10 200 mg certolizumab pegol	CERTAIN 2008; NCT00791921 HIKARI; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; REALISTIC 2008	0.3% (6)	0.1% (1)	2.56 (0.56 to 11. 6)	0 (-1 to 1)	NS
Analysis 9.10 400 mg certolizumab pegol	CDP870-014 2009; FAST4WARD 2005; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	0.5% (5)	0% (0)	2.16 (0.40 to 11. 79)	0 (-1 to 1)	NS
See analysis 49.8. 3 Other doses	Choy 2002; NCT00791999 JRAPID	0.01 (1)	0% (0)	4.48 (0.07 to 286.49)	0.01 (-0.05 to 0. 08)	NS
Malignan- cies (neoplasias including lym- phoma) Analysis 49.12				Peto OR 0.90 (0.39 to 2. 08)		NS
200 mg certolizumab pegol	CERTAIN 2008; NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00993317; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; REALISTIC 2008	0.6% (12)	0.9% (7)	0.79 (0.29 to 2. 12)	0 (-1 to 1)	NS
400 mg certolizumab pegol	FAST4WARD 2005; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	0.6 % (5)	0.4% (2)	1.26 (0.26 to 6. 08)	0 (-1 to 1)	NS

Table 6.	Adverse e	vents (	Continued)
----------	-----------	---------	------------

Infections and infestations				RR		
Analysis 8.33 200 mg certolizumab pegol	CERTAIN 2008; NCT00791921 HIKARI; NCT00791999 JRAPID; NCT00993317; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; REALISTIC 2008	32% (559)	25% (247)	1.29 (1.07 to 1. 56)	7 (1 to 13)	14 (8 to 58)
Analysis 9.40 400 mg certolizumab pegol	CDP870-014 2009; NCT00791999 JRAPID; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	34% (293)	21% (111)	1.49 (1.11 to 1. 99)	10 (1 to 20)	10 (5 to 44)
Tuberculosis				<b>Peto OR</b> 3.71 (0.94 to 14.61)	Not calculated	NS
Analysis 49.9	Overall	0.5% (12)	0% (0)	3.71 (0.94 to 14. 61)	Not calculated	NS
Analysis 8.11 200 mg certolizumab pegol	CERTAIN 2008; NCT00993317; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007; REALISTIC 2008	0.4% (7)	0% (0)	4.53 (0.94 to 21. 85)	Not calculated	NS
Analysis 9.13 400 mg certolizumab pegol	FAST4WARD 2005; RAPID1 2005; RAPID2 2007	0.6% (5)	0% (0)	4.55 (0.71 to 29. 11)	Not calculated	NS

# APPENDICES

## Appendix I. MEDLINE search strategy

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations and Ovid MEDLINE(R) <1946 to Present> Search Strategy:

1 (CDP870 or CDP 870 or "certolizumab pegol" or certolizumab or CDP-870 or cimzia).mp. (393)

2 ("Rheumatoid Arthritis" or (Caplan\$ and Syndrome?) or (Felty\$ and S?ndrome) or (Rheumatoid and Nodule?) or (Sjogren\$ and S? ndrome?) or (Sicca\$ and S?ndrome?) or (Ankylos\$ and Spondylit\$) or (Spondylarthritis and Ankylopoietica) or (Rheumatoid\$ and Spondylit\$) or (Bechterew\$ and Disease?) or (Marie-Struempell and Disease?) or (Adult and Onset and Still\$ and Disease?)).mp. (98824)

3 exp Arthritis, Rheumatoid/ (94528)

4 2 or 3 (126632) 5 1 and 4 (131) 6 Clinical trial.pt. (473242) 7 randomized.ab. (256728) 8 Placebo.ab. (140242) 9 dt.fs. (1573096) 10 randomly.ab. (187872) 11 trial.ab. (264547) 12 groups.ab. (1216413) 13 or/6-12 (3112539) 14 5 and 13 (114) 15 limit 14 to yr="2009 -Current" (99) Search date: 2009-February 12, 2013

#### Appendix 2. EMBASE search strategy

'rheumatoid arthritis'/exp/
 'certolizumab pegol'/exp/
 (CDP870 OR 'CDP 870' OR CDP-870 OR 'certolizumab pegol' OR certolizumab OR cimzia).mp.
 2 OR 3
 4 AND 1
 random:.tw.
 clinical trial:.mp.
 exp health care quality
 or/6-8
 5 AND 9
 Search date: 2009-February 12, 2013

## Appendix 3. CINAHL search strategy

'rheumatoid arthritis'/exp/
 "rheumatoid arthritis".mp.
 (CDP870 OR 'CDP 870' OR CDP-870 OR 'certolizumab pegol' OR certolizumab OR cimzia).mp.
 (1 or 2) and 3
 5.exp prognosis
 6.exp study design
 7.random:.mp.
 8.or/ 5-7
 9.4 and 8
 Search date: 2009-February 12, 2013

## Appendix 4. Search strategy for CDSR and CENTRAL, HTA, DARE, NHS EED

Last search on November 2009 #1 certolizumab or cimzia #2 cdp870 #3 cdp next 870 #4 (#1 OR #2 OR #3) #5 rheumatoid next arthritis #6 MeSH descriptor Arthritis, Rheumatoid explode all trees #7 (#5 OR #6) #8 (#4 AND #7) Search date: 2009-February 12, 2013

## Appendix 5. SCOPUS search strategy

Search strategy for benefits: SCOPUS will be searched up to August of 2007, without limits of years: KEY((certolizumab OR cimzia OR CDP-870 OR CDP870 OR "CDP 870") AND ("rheumatoid arthritis" )) Web of Knowledge (WOK), was searched up to August of 2007, without limits of years. The search strategy is as follows: topic=((certolizumab OR cimzia OR CDP-870 OR CDP870 OR "CDP 870") AND ("rheumatoid arthritis" ) Databases=MEDLINE, Current Contents Connect, Web of Science, Derwent Innovations Index, ISI Proceedings; Timespan=All Years Search date: 2009-February 12, 2013

## Appendix 6. TOXLINE (TOXNET) search strategy

Search strategy for safety: TOXLINE (TOXNET) will be searched up to October 2007. The search strategy will combine index and text terms for CDP870: #1. certolizumab OR "certolizumab pegol" OR CDP870 OR CDP-870 OR "CDP 870" OR cimzia Search date: 2009-February 12, 2013

## Appendix 7. Web of Knowledge

Web of Knowledge (Science Citation Index and Social Science Citation Index) 1900 - February 2013

Search terms: TS= (certolizumab OR cimzia OR or CDP870 OR cdp 870) and ("rheumatoid arthritis") Search date: 2009-February 12, 2013

#### **Appendix 8. Results of searches**

Database name and coverage	Search date	Total Retrieved
Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations and Ovid MED- LINE(R) 1946 to present	2009-February 12, 2013	315
Ovid Embase Classic+Embase 1947 to 2013 January 16	2009- February 12, 2013	1365

(Continued)

Wiley Cochrane Library - CENTRAL Issue 1 of 12- Jan. 2013	2009- February 12, 2013	11
EbscoHost CINAHL 1982-January 2013	2009- February 12, 2013	32
Toxline (TOXNET)	2007- February 12, 2013	34
Web of Knowledge	2009- February 12, 2013	189
SCOPUS 1966 to 2013 January	2009- February 12, 2013	814
	Total	2760
	Total without Duplicates	1300

# Appendix 9. Searches updated to June 2014

Database name and coverage	Search date	Total Retrieved	Total without Duplicates
Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Pro- cess & Other Non-Indexed Ci- tations and Ovid MEDLINE (R) 2013-2014	June 5, 2014	29	28
Ovid Embase Classic+Embase 2013-2014	June 5, 2014	208	192
EbscoHost CINAHL 2013-2014	June 5, 2014	1	1
Wiley Cochrane Library - CENTRAL 2013-2014	June 6, 2014	4	4
SCOPUS 2013-2014	June 10, 2014	233	124
Web of Knowledge 2013-2014	June 10, 2014	94	54

(Continued)

		Total	569	403
--	--	-------	-----	-----

# WHAT'S NEW

Last assessed as up-to-date: 5 June 2014.

Date	Event	Description
5 June 2014	New citation required but conclusions have not changed	In the current update, we changed some authors in the team: Sylvia Bort, Paloma Vela and Francis Kynaston are new
5 June 2014	New search has been performed	<ul> <li>Eleven trials were included (10 trials for benefits, 5 more than previously, and 10 for harms, 4 more than previously). We have more information regarding the quality of trials because UCB gave us data about this. This information has been used to update the assessment of the quality of trials.</li> <li>New data from clinical trial 014, as Disease Activity Score (DAS) remission and SF-36 physical and mental domains or pain assessment, were added. We also added more data on the quality of the two phase II (004 and Choy) trials.</li> <li>We got unpublished information on new trials for quality and results including withdrawals and serious adverse events from http://clinicaltrials.gov. We checked this information with UCB.</li> </ul>

# HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 1, 2009

Review first published: Issue 2, 2011

Date	Event	Description
3 April 2008	New search has been performed	CMSG ID: C001-R

# CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

Design the protocol: Juan Cabello; Vicente Ruiz; Amanda Burls

Write up the background: Paloma Vela

Develop the search strategy: Tamara Rader

Trial search (2 people): Vicente Ruiz; Sylvia Bort

Obtain copies of the trials: Sylvia Bort

Selection of trials for inclusion (2 + 1): Vicente Ruiz; P Jobanputra. If data discrepancies were to be resolved by involvement of a third person: FJB Kynaston-Pearson

Retrieval of trial data on benefits (two people): Vicente Ruiz; P Jobanputra. If data discrepancies were to be resolved by involvement of a third person: Francis JB Kynaston-Pearson

Data input in Revman: Sylvia Bort

Carry out analyses: Vicente Ruiz;

Interpret analyses: P Jobanputra

Write up results: Vicente Ruiz; P Jobanputra; P Vela; Amanda Burls; Juan Cabello; Sylvia Bort; FJB Kynaston-Pearson

Update review: Vicente Ruiz; P Jobanputra; P Vela

# DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

UCB paid Dr Vicente Ruiz's registration for the Cochrane meeting in Madrid 2011 to. In 2011 and 2012 he attended the UCB Advisory Board meetings in Madrid when the sponsor explained details and preliminary results for the new trials of certolizumab pegol. He did not receive any economic or other kind of compensation for these meetings.

Paresh Jo: UCB arranged and paid for travel and accommodation for the American College for Rheumatology meeting in Philadelphia in 2009.

Burls A: none known.

Cabello JB: none known.

Vela Casasempere P: I have participated as a member of advisory boards for Roche and Pfizer. I have also received fees for development of educational presentations for Roche, Abbvie, UCB, BMS and MSD, and travel and accommodations expenses to attend scientific meetings from Pfizer, Abbvie and Roche.

Bort-Marti S: none known.

Kynaston-Pearson FJB: none known.

# SOURCES OF SUPPORT

#### Internal sources

• Grant from, Spain.

Instituto de Salud Carlos III. Ministerio de Sanidad. FIS number PI08'90617 in the first previous systematic review.

#### **External sources**

• No sources of support supplied

# DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW

#### Data synthesis

We decided to perform a random-effects model analysis despite low values of the I² statistic. Although it was the same drug, there is clear clinical heterogeneity (different doses, allowing MTX or not, different follow-up, different duration of RA, etc.).

#### Subgroup analysis

Subgroup analyses were planned for the duration of the illness (approximately three years evolution), patients' sex, drug dose and administration, and methodological quality; but only subgroup analysis regarding the dose of certolizumab pegol was performed. All phase III trials were performed in patients with a long mean duration of RA (from 6.1 to 9.5 years) and we could not obtain any data categorized by sex. All phase III trials allowed previous DMARD treatment (mean 1.2 to 2 years). All the phase III trials included in the meta-analysis were rated as high quality and so we did not perform subgroup analysis based on methodological quality.

#### INDEX TERMS

#### Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)

Antibodies, Monoclonal, Humanized; Antirheumatic Agents [*therapeutic use]; Arthritis, Rheumatoid [*drug therapy]; Immunoglobulin Fab Fragments [*therapeutic use]; Methotrexate [therapeutic use]; Polyethylene Glycols [*therapeutic use]; Randomized Controlled Trials as Topic

#### MeSH check words

Adult; Humans