Blinding in randomised clinical trials of psychological interventions: a retrospective study of published trial reports

Sophie Juul, Christian Gluud, Sebastian Simonsen, Frederik Weischer Frandsen, Irving Kirsch, Janus Christian Jakobsen

Supplementary file 1. Recent meta-epidemiological studies assessing the association between blinding status and outcome

Meta-epidemiological study	**Data source**	**Number of meta-analyses included**	**Number of trials included**	**Which trial key persons' blinding status were studied?**	**ROR* in blinding domains**	**Were risk of bias assessments copied from the meta-analyses or reassessed?**
Savović et al. (2018)	Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (Issue 4, April 2011)	228	2,443	Participants, personnel, outcome assessors	ROR for lack of blinding of participants, personnel and outcome assessors ROR 0.87, 95% CrI** 0.80 to 0.93	Copied
Moustgaard et al. (2020)	Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (2013-14)	142	1,153	Patients, healthcare providers, outcome assessors	ROR for lack of blinding of patients: 0.91, 95% CrI 0.61 to 1.34, on patient reported outcomes and 0.98, 95% CrI 0.69 to 1.39, on outcomes reported by blinded observers ROR for lack of blinding of healthcare providers: 1.01, 95% CrI 0.84 to 1.19, on healthcare provider decision outcomes and 0.97, 95% CrI 0.64 to 1.45 on outcomes reported by blinded patients or observers ROR for lack of blinding of observers: 1.01, 95% CrI 0.86 to 1.18 on subjective observer reported outcomes	Reassessed

* ROR; Relative odds ratio, **CrI; Credible interval