Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Tao Zhang, Xi'an Jiaotong University, China

REVIEWED BY Yang Sun, Nanjing University, China Jing Wang, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong University, China

*CORRESPONDENCE Feng Qin, ⊠ 174299227@qq.com

SPECIALTY SECTION This article was submitted to Inflammation Pharmacology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Pharmacology

RECEIVED 30 October 2022 ACCEPTED 01 February 2023 PUBLISHED 13 February 2023

CITATION

Feng H, Zhao Y, Kuang W, Dai Y, Cen X and Qin F (2023), Adverse events of tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitors for the treatment of ankylosing spondylitis: A meta-analysis of randomized, placebocontrolled trials. *Front. Pharmacol.* 14:1084614. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2023.1084614

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Feng, Zhao, Kuang, Dai, Cen and Qin. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License

(CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Adverse events of tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitors for the treatment of ankylosing spondylitis: A meta-analysis of randomized, placebo-controlled trials

Haihuan Feng^{1,2}, Ying Zhao¹, Weihong Kuang³, Yanping Dai¹, Xiaobo Cen¹ and Feng Qin^{1,4}*

¹State Key Laboratory of Biotherapy, Collaborative Innovation Center for Biotherapy, National Chengdu Center for Safety Evaluation of Drugs, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, ²Medical Insurance Office, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, ³Department of Psychiatry, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, ⁴Andrology Laboratory, Department of Urology, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

Objective: Tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitors (TNFi) have shown substantial efficacy in alleviating and treating ankylosing spondylitis (AS). However, the heightened interest is accompanied by concerns over adverse events. In this meta-analysis, we analyzed both serious and common adverse events in patients treated with tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitors compared with those in the placebo group.

Methods: We searched for clinical trials in PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang Data, and VIP Data. Studies were selected based on strict inclusion and exclusion criteria. Only randomized, placebo-controlled trials were included in the final analysis. RevMan 5.4 software was used for performing meta-analyses.

Results: A total of 18 randomized controlled trials recruiting 3,564 patients with ankylosing spondylitis were included, with overall moderate to high methodological quality. Compared with the placebo group, the incidences showed no difference and were only slightly increased numerically for serious adverse events, serious infections, upper respiratory tract infection, and malignancies in patients treated with tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitors. However, tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitor treatment significantly increased the incidence of overall adverse events, nasopharyngitis, headache, and injection-site reactions in ankylosing spondylitis patients when compared with placebo.

Conclusion: The available data indicated that ankylosing spondylitis patients who received tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitors had no significantly increased risks of serious adverse events when compared with the placebo group. However, tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitors significantly increased the incidence rate of common adverse events, including nasopharyngitis, headache, and injection-site reactions. Large-scale and long-term follow-up clinical trials are still necessary to further investigate the safety of tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitors in ankylosing spondylitis treatment.

KEYWORDS

ankylosing spondylitis, tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitors, randomized controlled trial, adverse events, infection

1 Introduction

Ankylosing spondylitis (AS) is a chronic inflammatory autoimmune disease that courses with the involvement of sacroiliac, axial, and peripheral joints (Zhu et al., 2019). The estimated global prevalence of AS ranges from 0.1 to 1.4% (Xiong et al., 2020). The prevalence of AS was 0.23% in the European population, 0.2%–0.5% in the United States, and 0.29% in China (Reveille, 2011; Dean et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2020). AS is more common in young men aged 30–45 years with the characteristics of hidden onset, long course of the disease, and high disability rate, which cause a severe economic burden to patients and their families (Raychaudhuri and Deodhar, 2014; Xiong et al., 2020). The treatment for AS mainly includes non-steroidal antiinflammatory drugs, tumor necrosis factor alpha inhibitors (TNFi), and interleukin-17A antagonists (Zhu et al., 2019; Shao et al., 2021).

As TNFi possess dramatic anti-inflammatory and immunomodulatory effects, they are widely used for the treatment of a range of inflammatory conditions, including rheumatoid arthritis, psoriatic arthritis, Crohn's disease, and AS (Burmester et al., 2013). Currently, there are five commercially available TNFi for treating AS patients: adalimumab and golimumab, fully humanized anti-tumor necrosis factor (TNF) alpha monoclonal antibodies; infliximab, a chimeric murine-human full-length monoclonal antibody; etanercept, a fusion protein of human immunoglobulin G and two p75 TNF receptors; and certolizumab pegol, a humanized Fab fragment conjugated to polyethylene glycol (Mitoma et al., 2018). To date, the long-term use of TNFi in AS patients remains necessary, which raises many serious concerns regarding the safety of TNFi in AS patients (Wroński and Fiedor, 2019). Although some adverse events (i.e., malignancies, serious infections, and all-cause withdrawals) were observed among patients receiving TNFi, no significant association was noticed (Liu et al., 2016; Ma Z. et al., 2017; Xu et al., 2017; Hou et al., 2018). All meta-analyses on AS patients showed that there are no statistically significant differences in serious adverse events, serious infections, and malignancies between TNFi and placebo groups (Fouque-Aubert et al., 2010; Machado et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2016; Ma Z. et al., 2017; Xu et al., 2017; Hou et al., 2018). Nonetheless, there is no meta-analysis for assessing the risk of common



Study selection process for the meta-analysis with specifications of reasons.

adverse events, such as upper respiratory tract infection, nasopharyngitis, headache, and diarrhea.

This study aimed to analyze the available evidence of TNFi in AS treatment and conducted a meta-analysis by using the Cochrane system evaluation method. Specifically, the present study assessed the risks of both serious and common adverse events of TNFi in AS patients. The information would be useful to physicians for selecting the appropriate medications by considering the risk profile.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Search strategy

To identify studies that reported the adverse events of TNFi in the treatment of AS, a systematic search in PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang Data, and VIP Data was performed. Dates ranged from the inception of the different databases through 31 Aug 2022. The search terms were as follows: TNF, TNF- α , anti-TNF, tumor necrosis factor alpha, anti-TNF-alpha, etanercept, infliximab, adalimumab, golimumab, certolizumab pegol, and ankylosing spondylitis. We also searched for the references of the retrieved articles to identify additional studies. This literature review was conducted independently by two authors (HF and FQ), with a third resolving any disputes as needed (YZ). This meta-analysis had been conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses statement.

2.2 Inclusion criteria

Studies were included if they explicitly met the following criteria: 1) study design: the patients were randomly allocated to intervention groups (TNFi and placebo), and both parallel and crossover studies were included for eligibility; 2) population: the participants were patients with AS; 3) comparison: studies should contain the comparison of TNFi and the placebo; and 4) outcome: overall adverse events were used as the primary outcome, and serious adverse events, serious infections, upper respiratory tract infection, nasopharyngitis, malignancies, headache, diarrhea, and injection-site reactions were used as outcome indicators.

2.3 Exclusion criteria

Studies were excluded for meeting the following criteria: 1) case reports, animal studies, editorial comments, non-clinical outcome studies, and literature reviews; 2) unverified randomized controlled trials; 3) irrelevant outcomes; and 4) repeated articles or results. Two authors (HF and FQ) independently determined whether the studies met the inclusion criteria, with a third (YZ) resolving any disputes as needed.

2.4 Data extraction

For each included study, basic information and outcome indicators were extracted. Basic information relevant to this

meta-analysis included: first author, year of publication, the country of the study, study design, sample size, age, gender, number of participants, duration of the follow-up, and intervention measures (the name and dosage of the medication and the type of placebo). Outcome indicators relevant to this meta-analysis included: overall adverse events, serious adverse events, serious infections, malignancies, upper respiratory tract infection, nasopharyngitis, injection-site reactions, headache, and diarrhea. The data were independently extracted by two authors (HF and FQ), with a third (YD) resolving any disputes as needed. If necessary, the reviewers would try to obtain incomplete information from the study investigators.

2.5 Bias assessment

The study quality was determined by using the Cochrane Collaboration bias risk tool, and the following factors were evaluated: 1) the study included a specific statement regarding randomization; 2) the method used to randomize patients was appropriate; 3) the study was conducted in a double-blinded manner; 4) the approach to double blinding was appropriately described; 5) information on any patients that withdrew from the study was provided; and 6) information on funding from the pharmaceutical companies.

2.6 Selected outcomes

A total of nine predefined outcomes were assessed. The primary outcome was the incidence of overall adverse events between TNFi and placebo groups in AS patients. The secondary outcomes were the incidence of serious adverse events, serious infections, upper respiratory tract infection, nasopharyngitis, injection-site reactions, malignancies, headache, and diarrhea between TNFi and placebo groups in AS patients.

2.7 Statistical analysis

RevMan 5.4 software (Cochrane Collaboration, London, United Kingdom) was used for all analyses. The risk of bias of the included studies was further evaluated by the Cochrane Collaboration's tool. The proper effect sizes and statistical analysis methods were chosen according to different data types and evaluation purposes. For discontinuous outcomes, the odds ratio (OR) and 95% CI were calculated. We used fixed-effects models if there was no significant heterogeneity ($I^2 \leq 50\%$ or p > 0.1). Otherwise, we used random-effects models. The publication bias was assessed using the funnel plot.

3 Results

3.1 Literature search

The flow chart of the study selection process is presented in Figure 1. In total, 18 studies with 3,564 patients (2,282 in the

TABLE 1 Characteristics of the included studies in the meta-analysis.

Study	Country	Eligibility	Follow- up	Numb cases	er of	Age of tl (Years)	ne cases	Intervention measure		Outcome indicator
			course	TNFi	Control	TNFi	Control	TNFi	Control	
Gorman et al. (2002)	Germany	AS	16 weeks	20	20	38 ± 10	39 ± 10	Etanercept, 25 mg, twice weekly	Placebo	2469
Davis et al. (2003)	United States	AS	24 weeks	138	139	42.1	41.9	Etanercept, 25 mg, twice weekly	Placebo	234689
Calin et al. (2004)	United Kingdom	AS	12 weeks	45	39	45.3 ± 9.5	40.7 ± 11.4	Etanercept, 25 mg, twice weekly	Placebo	689
van der Heijde et al. (2006a)	Netherlands	AS	12 weeks	A: 155	51	A. 41.5 ± 11	40.1 ± 10.9	A. Etanercept, 50 mg, once weekly	Placebo	1234569
(2000a)				B: 150		B. 39.8 ± 10.7		B. Etanercept,25 mg, twice weekly		
Dougados et al. (2010)	France	AS	12 weeks	39	43	46 ± 11	48 ± 10	Etanercept, 50 mg, once weekly	Placebo	0260
Huang et al. (2010)	China	AS	6 weeks	74	78	30.4 ± 9.8	31.8 ± 9.5	Etanercept, 50 mg, once weekly	Placebo	156
Huang et al. (2011)	China	AS	6 weeks	300	100	29.1 ± 8.7	28.4 ± 8.0	Etanercept, 50 mg, once weekly	Placebo	000
van der Heijde et al. (2006b)	Netherlands	AS	24 weeks	208	107	41.7 ± 11.7	43.4 ± 11.3	Adalimumab, 40 mg, every other week	Placebo	02356
Huang et al. (2014)	China	AS	12 weeks	229	115	30.1 ± 8.7	29.6 ± 7.5	Adalimumab, 40 mg, every other week	Placebo	0@3
van der Heijde et al. (2018)	Netherlands	AS	16 weeks	87	90	26.5 ± 8.6	26.4 ± 8.4	Adalimumab, 40 mg, every other week	Placebo	023456
Inman et al. (2008)	Canada	AS	24 weeks	A: 138	77	A: 30.0–47.0	31.0-50.0	A. Golimumab, 50 mg, every 4 weeks	Placebo	02345 6789
				B: 140		B: 29.0–46.0		B. Golimumab, 100 mg, every 4 weeks		
Bao et al. (2014)	China	AS	16 weeks	108	105	30.5 ± 10.27	30.6 ± 8.60	Golimumab, 50 mg, every 4 weeks	Placebo	123460
Ma Z. et al. (2017)	China	AS	24 weeks	13	12	28.2 ± 6.8	31.2 ± 5.6	Golimumab, 50 mg, every 4 weeks	Placebo	14
Deodhar et al. (2018)	United States	AS	12 weeks	105	103	38.4 ± 10.1	39.2 ± 10.8	Golimumab, 2 mg/kg at 0, 4, and 12 weeks	Placebo	0239
Deodhar et al. (2022)	United States	AS	12 weeks	59	53	28-54	25-51	Golimumab, 2 mg/kg at 0, 4, and 12 weeks	Placebo	02568
Braun et al. (2002)	Germany	AS	12 weeks	34	35	40.6 ± 8.0	39.0 ± 9.1	Infliximab, 5 mg/kg at 0, 2, and 6 weeks	Placebo	0234
van der Heijde et al. (2005)	Netherlands	AS	24 weeks	201	78	40.0	41.0	Infliximab, 5 mg/kg at 0, 2, 6, 12, and 18 weeks	Placebo	02345689
Inman et al. (2010)	Canada	AS	12 weeks	39	37	42.9 ± 10.4	39.3 ± 9.0	Infliximab, 3 mg/kg at 0, 2, and 6 weeks	Placebo	14568

Note: TNFi, tumor necrosis factor a inhibitors; AS, ankylosing spondylitis; ①, overall adverse event; ②, serious adverse event; ③, serious infection; ④, upper respiratory tract infection; ⑤, nasopharyngitis; ⑦, malignancy; ⑥, injection-site reaction; ③, headache; ③, diarrhea.

2000 200	TNF		Place	bo	1000	Odds Ratio	Odds	Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl
1.1.1 Etanercept vs Placebo								1212 1212
Dougados 2011	24	39	28	43	4.5%	0.86 [0.35, 2.11]		
Huang 2010	18	74	10	78	3.2%	2.19 [0.93, 5.11]		
Huang 2011	63	300	16	100	8.3%	1.40 [0.76, 2.55]		
Van der Heijde 2006 (25mg)	66	150	18	51	6.6%	1.44 [0.75, 2.78]	100	
Van der Heijde 2006 (50mg) Subtotal (95% CI)	55	155 718	18	51 323	7.6%	1.01 [0.52, 1.95] 1.31 [0.96, 1.80]		•
Total events	226		90					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2.97, df = Test for overall effect: Z = 1.69 (4 (P = 0.9) P = 0.09)	56); P =	: 0%					
1.1.2 Adalimumab vs Placebo								
Huang 2014	81	229	26	115	9.8%	1.87 [1.12, 3.13]		
Van der Heijde 2006	156	208	64	107	9.2%	2.02 [1.23, 3.32]		
van der Heijde 2018	44	90	34	86	7.8%	1,46 (0.80, 2,66)	-	
Subtotal (95% CI)		527		308	26.7%	1.80 [1.33, 2.45]		•
Total events	281	-	124					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.68, df = Test for overall effect: Z = 3.77 (2 (P = 0.1 P = 0.000	71); P: 12)	0%					
1.1.3 Golimumab vs Placebo								
Bao 2014	42	108	48	166	10.1%	1.56 [0.94, 2.61]		
Deodhar 2018	34	105	24	103	7.1%	1.58 (0.85, 2.91)		
Deodhar 2022 (Early)	10	35	3	25	1.1%	2.93 (0.71, 12.04)	-	
Deodhar 2022 (Late)	11	24	11	28	2.4%	1.31 (0.43. 3.95)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Inman 2008 (100mg)	120	140	59	77	4.7%	1.83 (0.90, 3.72)		
Inman 2008 (50mg)	117	138	59	77	5.0%	1.70 (0.84, 3.43)		
Ma 2017	3	13	1	12	0.3%	3.30 (0.29. 37.10)		
Subtotal (95% CI)		563		488	30.9%	1.68 [1.26, 2.24]		•
Total events	337		205		UUIUN			12
Heterogeneity Chil= 1 27 df=	6 (P = 0)	27) P	: 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.52 (P = 0.000	14)	•					
1.1.4 Infliximab vs Placebo								
Braun 2002	12	34	18	35	5.0%	0.52 [0.20, 1.35]		+
Inman 2010	36	39	33	37	1.1%	1.45 [0.30, 6.99]		
Van der Heijde 2005	166	202	54	75	6.1%	1.79 [0.97, 3.33]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		275	1. 1930	147	12.3%	1.24 [0.76, 2.03]		•
Total events	214		105					
Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = 4.57, df = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.86 (2 (P = 0. P = 0.39)	1 0); P =	56%					
Total (95% CI)		2083		1266	100.0%	1.55 [1.31, 1.82]		•
Total events	1058		524			tion (tion (tion)		1072320
Heterogeneity Chi?= 12.45 df	= 17 (P =	0.77	P= 0%				+ +	+ + +
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.20 (P < 0.000	101) 9 df -	3/P=0	29) B-	3.0%		0.01 0.1 Favours [TNFi]	1 10 100 Favours [Placebo]
rescion suburoup dilierences.	onn = 3.0	a. ui =	3 UP = 0.	50), I" =	3.0%			

odds ratio >1.0 indicates that the incidence of serious adverse events is higher in the TNFi group than that in the placebo group. The subheading "Events" refers to the number of overall adverse events. "Total" refers to the total number of individuals. CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel method of calculation.

TNFi group and 1,282 in the placebo group) were finally included in the present study. The studies were published between 2002 and 2022 and were primarily conducted in Europe (44.44%), North America (27.78%), and Asia (27.78%). All participants were AS patients. The main characteristics of the 18 studies are summarized in Table 1.

3.2 Methodological quality of the included studies

The methodological quality item for the 18 included studies is described in Supplementary Figure S1. Of these studies, one study did not state whether it was a double-blinded designed trial (Braun et al., 2002). Four studies conducted randomization using a webbased system (Inman et al., 2008; Huang et al., 2014; Ma H. et al., 2017; Deodhar et al., 2018), two studies using a randomized block methodology (van der Heijde et al., 2005; Bao et al., 2014), two studies using a randomization table (Huang et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2011), two studies using a computer-generated random sequence (Braun et al., 2002; van der Heijde et al., 2018), and the remaining studies provided unclear information about the random sequence generation. A total of 15 studies were funded by pharmaceutical companies, so they were marked with an unclear risk of bias for other biases.

3.3 Assessment of the primary outcome

A total of 15 studies tested the incidence of overall adverse events between TNFi groups and placebo groups for AS treatment. As shown in Figure 2, a meta-analysis of the trials (n = 3,221) showed a

1.2.1 Elanercept vs Placebo Huang 2010 2 74 1 78 2.1% 2.14 [0.19, 24.10] Van der Heijde 2006 (25mg) 3 150 0 51 1.8% 2.44 [0.12, 48.12] Van der Heijde 2006 (26mg) 6 155 0 51 1.8% 4.48 [0.25, 80.89] Van der Heijde 2006 (26mg) 11 1 1 1 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 0.16, eff = 2 (P = 0.92); P = 0% 180 5.2% 2.93 [0.61, 14.04] Total events 11 1 1 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 0.16, eff = 2 (P = 0.92); P = 0% 1.24% 0.95 [0.29, 3.08] van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 20.1% 1.77 [0.77, 4.05] van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 2.1% 0.95 [0.29, 3.08] Subtotal (95 Cl) 298 193 32.5% 1.46 [0.75, 2.84] 1.46 [0.75, 2.84] Total events 32 14 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.06] 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Inman 2006 (10mg) 18 18 9 77 21.4% <th>Study or Subgroup</th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Weight</th> <th>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</th> <th>M-H, F</th> <th>ixed, 95% CI</th>	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, F	ixed, 95% CI
Huang 2010 2 74 1 78 2.1% 2.14 [0.19, 24.10] Van der Heijde 2006 (25mg) 3 150 0 51 1.6% 2.44 [0.12, 48.12] Van der Heijde 2006 (50mg) 6 155 0 51 1.6% 4.46 [0.25, 08.08] Subtotal (95% CI) 379 180 5.2% 2.93 [0.61, 14.04] Total events 11 1 1 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.16, df = 2 (P = 0.92); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.22 Adalimumab vs Placebo Van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 20.1% 1.77 [0.77, 4.05] Subtotal (95% CI) 298 193 32.5% 1.46 [0.75, 2.84] Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 (P = 0.27) 1.23 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (50mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.13 [1.074, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.93); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19) Total (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0%	1.2.1 Etanercept vs Placebo	and the second		1	1100	- Contra	A State State State State		
Van der Heijde 2006 (25mg) 3 150 0 51 1.6% 2.44 [0.12, 48.12] Van der Heijde 2006 (25mg) 6 155 0 51 1.6% 4.48 [0.25, 80.89] Total events 11 1 1 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.16, df = 2 ($P = 0.92$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18)$ 1.22 Adalimumab vs Placebo Van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 20.1% 1.77 [0.77, 4.05] van der Heijde 2018 6 90 6 86 12.4% 0.95 [0.29, 3.08] Total events 3 22 14 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.71, df = 1 ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10 (P = 0.27)$ 1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Early) 1 35 0 25 1.2% 2.22 [0.09, 56.69] Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% Cl) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.46, df = 3 ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30 (P = 0.36)$ 1.2.4 Infiximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% Cl) 2241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.49 (ff = 10 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30 (P = 0.05)$; $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30 (P = 0.05)$; $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30 (P = 0.05)$; $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30 (P = 0.03)$; $P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.82$); $P = 0\%$	Huang 2010	2	74	1	78	2.1%	2.14 [0.19, 24.10]		
Van der Heijde 2006 (50mg) 6 155 0 51 16% 448 [0.25, 80.89] Subtotal (95% CI) 379 180 5.2% 2.93 [0.61, 14.04] Total events 11 1 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.16, df = 2 ($P = 0.92$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 ($P = 0.18$) 1.2.2 Adalimumab vs Placebo Van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 20.1% 1.77 [0.77, 4.05] van der Heijde 2018 6 90 6 86 12.4% 0.95 [0.29, 3.08] Subtotal (95% CI) 298 193 32.5% 1.46 [0.75, 2.84] Total events 32 14 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.71, df = 1 ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 0.92 ($P = 0.38$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 0.92 ($P = 0.38$); $P = 0\%$ Total (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 3 ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 3 ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 42 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 3 ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 42 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 1 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Total events 42 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 3 ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.65$); $P = 74\%$ Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 7\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 7\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 7\%$	Van der Heijde 2006 (25mg)	3	150	0	51	1.6%	2.44 [0.12, 48.12]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Subtotal (95% CI) 379 180 5.2% 2.93 [0.61, 14.04] Total events 11 1 1 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.16, df = 2 ($P = 0.92$); $P = 0$ % Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 ($P = 0.18$) 1.2.2 Adalimumab vs Placebo Van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 20.1% 1.77 [0.77, 4.05] van der Heijde 2018 6 90 6 86 12.4% 0.055 [0.29, 3.08] Subtotal (95% CI) 298 193 32.5% 1.46 [0.75, 2.84] Total events 32 14 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.71, df = 1 ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 ($P = 0.27$) 1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.3% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (100mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (100mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 3 ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 0.92 ($P = 0.36$) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 3.82, df = 1 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.62$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.62$); $P = 0\%$	Van der Heijde 2006 (50mg)	6	155	0	51	1.6%	4.48 [0.25, 80.89]		
Total events 11 1 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 0.16, df = 2 (P = 0.92); P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.2.2 Adalimumab vs Placebo Van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 20.1% 1.77 [0.77, 4.05] van der Heijde 2018 6 90 6 86 12.4% 0.95 [0.29, 3.08] Subtotal (95% CI) 298 193 32.5% 1.46 [0.75, 2.84] Total events 32 14 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 0.71, df = 1 (P = 0.40); P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 (P = 0.27) 1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.05); P = 0\%$ Test for overail effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overail effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overail effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.05); P = 0% Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0\%$ Test for overail effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.05) Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0\%$	Subtotal (95% CI)		379		180	5.2%	2.93 [0.61, 14.04]		
Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 0.16$, $df = 2$ ($P = 0.92$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.35$ ($P = 0.18$) 1.22 Adalimumab vs Placebo Van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 20.1% 1.77 [0.77, 4.05] Subtotal (95% CI) 298 193 32.5% 1.46 [0.75, 2.84] Total events 32 14 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 0.71$, $df = 1$ ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10$ ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10$ ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 0.46$, $df = 3$ ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ ($P = 0.30$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ ($P = 0.30$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 5.91$, $df = 10$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 5.91$, $df = 10$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 5.91$, $df = 10$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 5.91$, $df = 10$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 5.91$, $df = 10$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 0\%$ Total events 109 41	Total events	11		1					
Test for overall effect $Z = 1.35$ (P = 0.18) 1.2.2 Adalimumab vs Placebo Van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 20.1% 1.77 [0.77, 4.05] van der Heijde 2018 6 90 6 86 12.4% 0.95 [0.29, 3.08] van der Heijde 2018 32 14 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.71, df = 1 (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10$ (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10$ (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10$ (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10$ (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.33); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.33); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.03); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 0% Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.05); P = 0%	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.16, df =	2(P = 0.1)	92); 1"=	: 0%					
1.2.2 Adalimumab vs Placebo Van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 20.1% 1.77 [0.77, 4.05] van der Heijde 2018 6 90 6 86 12.4% 0.95 [0.29, 3.08] Subtotal (95% CI) 298 193 32.5% 1.46 [0.75, 2.84] Total events 32 14 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.71, df = 1 ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Testfor overall effect $Z = 1.10$ ($P = 0.27$) 1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Early) 1 35 0 25 1.2% 2.22 [0.09, 56.69] Deodhar 2022 (Larle) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (100mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 3 ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.3$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.3$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.3$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.3$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.3$ ($P = 0.03$) Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.82$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for subrous (JHTERONES: Ch ² = 1.13, df = 3 ($P = 0.77$), $P = 0\%$	Test for overall effect: Z = 1.35 ((P = 0.18)							
Van der Heijde 2006 26 208 8 107 20.1% 1.77 [0.77, 4.05] van der Heijde 2018 6 90 6 86 12.4% 0.95 [0.29, 3.08] Total events 32 14 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.71, df = 1 ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.10 ($P = 0.27$) 1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Early) 1 35 0 25 1.2% 2.22 [0.09, 56.69] Deodhar 2022 (Early) 1 35 0 25 1.2% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (100mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 3 ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 0.92 ($P = 0.36$) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 3.82, df = 1 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 ($P = 0.15$); $P = 0\%$ Total (95% CI) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.82$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.9 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for subrouc differences: Ch ² = 1.13, df = 3 ($P = 0.77$), $P = 0\%$	1.2.2 Adalimumab vs Placebo								12430
van der Heijde 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events 132 14 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 0.71, df = 1 ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0$ % Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10$ ($P = 0.27$) 1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Early) 1 35 0 25 1.2% 2.22 [0.09, 56.69] Deodhar 2022 (Early) 1 33 0 5 37 1.3 [0.58, 2.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 2.1.8% 1.3 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Intest for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0$ % Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ ($P = 0.19$) Total (95% CI) 1.25 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.82$); $P = 0$ % Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for subrous differences: Chi ^P = 1.13, df = 3 ($P = 0.77$), $P = 0$ %	Van der Heijde 2006	26	208	8	107	20.1%	1.77 [0.77, 4.05]		
Subtotal (95% CI) 298 193 32.5% 1.46 [0.75, 2.84] Total events 32 14 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.71, df = 1 (P = 0.40); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10$ (P = 0.27) 1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (100mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.93); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.05) Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.81, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.05) Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.81, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.05) Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.81, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.05) Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.81, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.05) Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.81, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.05) Test for subroup differences: Ch ² = 1.13, df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0%	van der Heijde 2018	6	90	6	86	12.4%	0.95 [0.29, 3.08]		
Total events 32 14 Heterogeneity: $Chi^{2} = 0.71$, $df = 1$ ($P = 0.40$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10$ ($P = 0.27$) 1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Early) 1 35 0 25 1.2% 2.22 [0.09, 56.69] Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (100mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: $Chi^{2} = 0.46$, $df = 3$ ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ ($P = 0.36$) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: $Chi^{2} = 3.82$, $df = 1$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ ($P = 0.19$) Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: $Chi^{2} = 5.91$, $df = 10$ ($P = 0.82$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for subgroup differences: $Ch^{2} = 1.13$, $df = 3$ ($P = 0.77$), $P = 0\%$	Subtotal (95% CI)		298		193	32.5%	1.46 [0.75, 2.84]		+
Heterogeneity: $Ch^{\mu} = 0.71, df = 1 (P = 0.40); P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10 (P = 0.27)$ 1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Earhy) 1 35 0 25 1.2% 2.22 [0.09, 56.69] Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (100mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Chi ^p = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.93); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92 (P = 0.36)$ 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ^p = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19)$ Total (95% CI) 125 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ^p = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03)$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03)$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03)$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03)$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03)$	Total events	32		14					
Test for overall effect $Z = 1.10 (P = 0.27)$ 1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Early) 1 35 0 25 1.2% 2.22 [0.09, 56.69] Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Imman 2008 (100mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Imman 2008 (100mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.93); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92 (P = 0.36)$ 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Imman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19)$ Total (95% CI) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03)$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03)$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03)$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03)$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03)$ Test for subroug differences: Chi ² = 5.91, df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0%	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.71, df =	1 (P = 0.	40); P=	: 0%					
1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo Deodhar 2022 (Early) 1 35 0 25 1.2% 2.22 [0.09, 56.69] Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Imman 2008 (100mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Imman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtoal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Ch ^P = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.93); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Imman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtoal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ^P = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ (P = 0.19) Total (95% CI) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ^P = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for subroup differences: Ch ^P = 1.13. df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0%	Test for overall effect: Z = 1.10 ((P = 0.27)							
Deodhar 2022 (Early) 1 35 0 25 1.2% 2.22 [0.09, 56.69] Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (100mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% Cl) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.93); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 0.92 (P = 0.36) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% Cl) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19) Total (95% Cl) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for subroup differences: Ch ² = 1.13, df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0%	1.2.3 Golimumab vs Placebo								
Deodhar 2022 (Late) 2 24 1 28 1.8% 2.45 [0.21, 28.89] Inman 2008 (100mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.93); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ (P = 0.19) Total (95% CI) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for subproue differences: Chi ² = 1.13. df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0%	Deodhar 2022 (Early)	1	35	0	25	1.2%	2.22 [0.09, 56.69]		
Inman 2008 (100mg) 21 140 9 77 21.4% 1.33 [0.58, 3.08] Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.93); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ (P = 0.19) Total (95% CI) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for subroup od freernees: Ch ² = 1.13, df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0%	Deodhar 2022 (Late)	2	24	1	28	1.8%	2.45 [0.21, 28.89]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Inman 2008 (50mg) 18 138 9 77 21.8% 1.13 [0.48, 2.66] Subtotal (95% Cl) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Ch ^P = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.93); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% Cl) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Ch ^P = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ (P = 0.19) Total (95% Cl) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Ch ^P = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.77), P = 0%	inman 2008 (100mg)	21	140	9	77	21.4%	1.33 [0.58, 3.08]		
Subtotal (95% CI) 337 207 46.3% 1.31 [0.74, 2.31] Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.46, df = 3 ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 0.92 ($P = 0.36$) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.82, df = 1 ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 ($P = 0.19$) Total (95% CI) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.91, df = 10 ($P = 0.82$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect Z = 1.13. df = 3 ($P = 0.77$), $P = 0\%$	Inman 2008 (50mg)	18	138	9	77	21.8%	1.13 [0.48, 2.66]	-	
Total events 42 19 Heterogeneity: $Chi^{2} = 0.46$, $df = 3$ ($P = 0.93$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ ($P = 0.36$) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% Cl) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: $Chi^{2} = 3.82$, $df = 1$ ($P = 0.05$); $P = 74\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ ($P = 0.19$) Total (95% Cl) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: $Chi^{2} = 5.91$, $df = 10$ ($P = 0.82$); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ ($P = 0.03$) Test for suborous differences: $Chi^{2} = 1.13$, $df = 3$ ($P = 0.77$), $P = 0\%$	Subtotal (95% CI)		337		207	46.3%	1.31 [0.74, 2.31]		-
Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 0.46, df = 3 (P = 0.93); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% Cl) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ (P = 0.19) Total (95% Cl) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for subproue differences: Chi ^P = 1.13. df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0%	Total events	42		19					
Test for overall effect $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36) 1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Imman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% CI) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.30$ (P = 0.19) Total (95% CI) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect $Z = 2.19$ (P = 0.77), P = 0%	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.46, df =	3 (P = 0.	93); P=	: 0%					
1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo Inman 2010 3 39 5 37 10.3% 0.53 [0.12, 2.41] Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% Cl) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% 74% Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) 0.01 0.1 1 Test for overall efferences: Chi ^P = 1.13, df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0% Favours [TINFi] Favours [Placebo]	Test for overall effect: Z = 0.92 ((P = 0.36)							
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1.2.4 Infliximab vs Placebo								
Van der Heijde 2005 21 202 2 75 5.7% 4.23 [0.97, 18.52] Subtotal (95% Cl) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19) Total (95% Cl) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for overall effect Z = 0.77), P = 0%	Inman 2010	3	39	5	37	10.3%	0.53 [0.12, 2.41]		
Subtotal (95% Cl) 241 112 16.0% 1.85 [0.73, 4.67] Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% 74% Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19) 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% 0.01 0.1 1 Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) 100 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] 100.01 Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) 10 1 10 Test for overall effect Z = 0.03 Favours [TINFi] Favours [Placebo]	Van der Heijde 2005	21	202	2	75	5.7%	4.23 [0.97, 18.52]		
Total events 24 7 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 3.82, df = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19) Total (95% Cl) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% 0.01 0.1 1 Test for overall effect Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) 0.01 0.1 1 10 Fest for suboroup differences: Chi ^P = 1.13. df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0% Favours [TNFi] Favours [Placebo]	Subtotal (95% CI)	100	241		112	16.0%	1.85 [0.73, 4.67]		
Heterogeneity: Chi [#] = 3.82, off = 1 (P = 0.05); P = 74% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19) Total (95% Cl) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi [#] = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for suboroup differences: Chi [#] = 1.13. df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0%	Total events	24		7					
Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% Test for overall effect. Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for subarous differences: Chi ² = 1.13. df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0%	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.82, df =	1 (P = 0.	05); P*=	: 74%					
Total (95% CI) 1255 692 100.0% 1.53 [1.05, 2.23] Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); P = 0% 0.01 0.1 1 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) 0.01 0.1 1 10 Fest for subroup offferences: Chi ² = 1.13. df = 3 (P = 0.77), P = 0% Favours [TNFi] Favours [Placebo]	Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.30$ ((P = 0.19)							2,00
Total events 109 41 Heterogeneity: Chi² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); l² = 0% 0.01 0.1 1 Test for overall effect: Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) 0.01 0.1 1 10 Test for subroup offerences: Chi² = 1.13. df = 3 (P = 0.77), l² = 0% Favours [TNFi] Favours [Placebo]	Total (95% CI)		1255		692	100.0%	1.53 [1.05, 2.23]		•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.91, df = 10 (P = 0.82); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 1.13, df = 3 (P = 0.77), I ² = 0% Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 1.13, df = 3 (P = 0.77), I ² = 0%	Total events	109		41				° 10	
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.19 (P = 0.03) Test for subgroup differences: ChiP = 1.13, df = 3 (P = 0.77), IP = 0%	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.91, df =	10(P = 0).82); P	= 0%				0.01 0.1	1 10 100
Test for subgroup differences: ChP = 1.13. df = 3 (P = 0.77). P = 0%	Test for overall effect: Z = 2.19 ((P = 0.03)						Eavours ITM	Fil Eavours (Placebol
	Test for subaroup differences:	Chi*= 1.1	3. df=	3 (P = 0.)	77), [*=	:0%		i arous [iii	d i avono (r incene)

ratio >1.0 indicates that the incidence of nasopharyngitis is higher in the TNFi group than that in the placebo group. The subheading "Events" refers to the number of incidences of nasopharyngitis. "Total" refers to the total number of individuals. CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel method of calculation.

significant increase in the incidence of overall adverse events for TNFi groups, compared to placebo groups (OR = 1.55, 95% CI: 1.31–1.82; p < 0.0001). The chi-squared test for homogeneity indicates that there were no statistical differences in the results among the trials (Chi² = 12.45; df = 17; p = 0.77) with an I² of 0% (I² is typically considered low for <25%, modest for 25%–50%, and large for >50%), using the fixed-effects model. The subgroup results showed that there was a significant difference between adalimumab and placebo groups (OR = 1.80, 95% CI: 1.33–2.45; p = 0.0002) and between golimumab and placebo groups (OR = 1.68, 95% CI: 1.24–2.24; p = 0.0004), while no significant difference was found between etanercept and placebo groups (OR = 1.31, 95% CI: 0.96–1.80; p = 0.09) and between infliximab and placebo groups (OR = 1.24, 95% CI: 0.76–2.03; p = 0.39) in AS patients.

3.4 Assessment of the secondary outcome

A total of 12 studies tested the incidence of serious adverse events between TNFi groups and placebo groups for AS treatment. As shown in Supplementary Figure S2, a meta-analysis of the trials (n = 2,603) showed no significant difference in the incidence of serious adverse events between the two groups (OR = 1.37, 95% CI: 0.88–2.13; p = 0.17). The subgroup results showed that there was no significant difference in all the subgroups (etanercept *vs* placebo, adalimumab *vs* placebo, golimumab *vs* placebo, and infliximab *vs* placebo) in the incidences of serious adverse effects.

A total of 10 studies tested the incidence of serious infections between TNFi groups and placebo groups for AS treatment. As shown in Supplementary Figure S3, a meta-analysis of the trials (n =2,590) showed no significant difference in the incidence of serious infections between the two groups (OR = 1.44, 95% CI: 0.66–3.16; p = 0.36). The subgroup results showed that there was no significant difference in all the subgroups (etanercept *vs* placebo, adalimumab *vs* placebo, golimumab *vs* placebo, and infliximab *vs* placebo) in the incidences of serious infections.

A total of 10 studies tested the incidence of upper respiratory tract infection between TNFi groups and placebo groups for AS treatment. As shown in Supplementary Figure S4, a meta-analysis of the trials (n = 1828) showed no significant difference in the

Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
1.3.1 Etanercept vs Placebo							
Calin 2004	6	45	4	39	8.1%	1.35 [0.35, 5.17]	
Davis 2003	19	138	16	139	30.0%	1.23 [0.60, 2.50]	
Van der Heijde 2006 (25mg)	4	150	0	51	1.6%	3.16 [0.17, 59.78]	
Van der Heijde 2006 (50mg)	6	155	0	51	1.6%	4.48 [0.25, 80.89]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		488		280	41.3%	1.45 [0.80, 2.61]	+
Total events	35		20				61 J 22
Heterogeneity: Chi2 = 1.08, df =	3 (P = 0.)	78); P=	:0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.23 (P = 0.22)						
1.3.2 Adalimumab vs Placebo							
Van der Heijde 2006	20	208	9	107	23.5%	1.16 [0.51, 2.64]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		208		107	23.5%	1.16 [0.51, 2.64]	•
Total events	20		9				
Heterogeneity: Not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.35 (P = 0.73)						
1.3.3 Golimumab vs Placebo							
Deodhar 2022 (Early)	2	35	0	25	1.2%	3.81 [0.17, 82.79]	
Deodhar 2022 (Late)	1	24	1	28	1.9%	1.17 [0.07, 19.83]	
Inman 2008 (100mg)	11	140	2	77	5.2%	3.20 [0.69, 14.82]	
Inman 2008 (50mg)	11	138	2	77	5.2%	3.25 [0.70, 15.05]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		337		207	13.5%	2.98 [1.15, 7.70]	-
Total events	25		5				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.46, df =	3 (P = 0.9	93); P=	: 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.26 (P = 0.02)						
1.3.4 Infliximab vs Placebo							
Inman 2010	1	39	2	37	4.4%	0.46 [0.04, 5.30]	
Van der Heijde 2005	18	202	6	75	17.4%	1.13 [0.43, 2.95]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		241		112	21.8%	0.99 [0.41, 2.39]	-
Total events	19		8				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.44, df =	1 (P = 0.9)	51); l² =	: 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.02 (P = 0.99)						1.11
Total (95% CI)		1274		706	100.0%	1.49 [1.02, 2.18]	◆
Total events	99		42				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.01, df =	10 (P = 0	.89); P	= 0%				0.01 0.1 1 10 100
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.04 (P = 0.04)		and a state	in indi	10000000		Favours (TNFi) Favours (Placebo)
Test for subaroup differences: (Chi*= 3.2	2. df =	3 (P = 0.3	36), (*=	6.7%		areas from a receipt income

ratio >1.0 indicates that the incidence of headache is higher in the TNFI group than that in the placebo group. The subheading Events refers to the number of incidences of headache. "Total" refers to the total number of individuals. Cl, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel method of calculation.

incidence of upper respiratory tract infection between the two groups (OR = 1.22, 95% CI: 0.93–1.61; p = 0.16). The subgroup results also showed that there was no significant difference in all the subgroups (etanercept *vs* placebo, adalimumab *vs* placebo, golimumab *vs* placebo, and infliximab *vs* placebo) in the incidences of upper respiratory tract infection.

A total of 8 studies tested the incidence of nasopharyngitis between TNFi groups and placebo groups for AS treatment. As shown in Figure 3, a meta-analysis of the trials (n = 1828) showed a significant difference in the incidence of nasopharyngitis between the two groups (OR = 1.53, 95% CI: 1.05–2.23; p = 0.03). However, the subgroup results showed that there was no significant difference in all the subgroups (etanercept *vs* placebo, adalimumab *vs* placebo, golimumab *vs* placebo, and infliximab *vs* placebo) in the incidences of nasopharyngitis.

A total of 4 studies tested the incidence of malignancy between TNFi groups and placebo groups for AS treatment (Inman et al., 2008; Dougados et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2011; Bao et al., 2014). As shown in Supplementary Figure S5, a meta-analysis of the trials (n = 650) showed no significant difference in the incidence of malignancy

between the two groups (OR = 1.18, 95% CI: 0.34–4.11; p = 0.78). The subgroup results showed that there was no significant difference in all subgroups (etanercept *vs* placebo and golimumab *vs* placebo) in the incidences of malignancy events.

A total of 8 studies tested the incidence of headache between TNFi groups and placebo groups for AS treatment. As shown in Figure 4, a meta-analysis of the trials (n = 1,852) showed a significant difference in the incidence of headache between the two groups (OR = 1.49, 95% CI: 1.02–2.18; p = 0.04). The subgroup results showed that a significant difference in the incidence of headache between golimumab and placebo (OR = 2.98, 95% CI: 1.15–7.70; p = 0.02) was found, while no significant differences in the other three subgroups (etanercept *vs* placebo, adalimumab *vs* placebo, and infliximab *vs* placebo) were found in the incidences of headache.

A total of 12 studies tested the incidence of injection-site reactions between TNFi groups and placebo groups for AS treatment. As shown in Figure 5, a meta-analysis of the trials (n = 2,580) showed a significant difference in the incidence of injection-site reactions between TNFi groups and placebo groups (OR = 2.44, 95% CI: 1.81–3.29; p < 0.00001). The subgroup

	INF		Place	00		Odds Rauo		Odus Rado
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
1.4.1 Etanercept vs Placebo								
Calin 2004	15	45	6	39	6.9%	2.75 [0.95, 8.00]		
Davis 2003	41	138	13	139	14.6%	4.10 [2.08, 8.07]		
Dougados 2011	3	39	0	43	0.7%	8.34 [0.42, 166.84]		
Gorman 2002	5	20	1	20	1.2%	6.33 [0.67, 60.16]		
Huang 2010	3	74	0	78	0.7%	7.69 [0.39, 151.38]		
Van der Heijde 2006 (25mg)	34	150	6	51	11.1%	2.20 [0.86, 5.59]		
Van der Heijde 2006 (50mg)	32	155	6	51	11.5%	1.95 [0.76, 4.98]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		621		421	46.7%	3.10 [2.04, 4.70]		•
Total events	133		32					
Heterogeneity: Chi? = 3.32, df:	= 6 (P = 0.)	77); P=	0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.32	(P < 0.000	01)						
1.4.2 Adalimumab vs Placebo	,							
Van der Heijde 2006	21	208	3	107	5.7%	3 89 [1.13 13 36]		
van der Heijde 2018	7	90	4	86	6.0%	1 73 10 49 6 131		
Subtotal (95% CI)		298		193	11.8%	2,78 [1.17, 6.61]		-
Total events	28		7					1.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.1
Heterogeneity Chil-0.93 df-	- 1 (P - 0	261-18-	0%					
Test for overall effect: 7 - 2.21	(P = 0.02)	50),1 -	.0.0					
restion overall ellect. 2 = 2.51	(F = 0.02)							
1.4.3 Golimumab vs Placebo								
Rao 2014		109	0	166	0.6%	4 65 10 10 115 111		
Deadbar 2022 (Earba	10	26	2	25	4.0%	2 02 10 71 12 041		
Deodhar 2022 (Early)	10	20		20	4.0 %	1 00 10 24 2 021		
lemon 2009 (100mg)		140		20	2.0%	2 50 10 54 12 24		
Inman 2008 (Toonig)	10	120	2	77	3.370	2.56 [0.54, 12.24]		
Subtotal (06% CI)	12	138	2	373	3.8%	3.57 [0.78, 10.39]		-
Subtotal (95% CI)	10	443		313	23.0%	2.12 [1.15, 4.01]		-
Total events	43		18					
Heterogeneity: Chi* = 2.83, df	= 4 (P = 0.9	59); I* =	0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.32	(P = 0.02)							
d d dadiwimah wa Diasaha								
1.4.4 infliximab vs Placebo								
Inman 2010	0	39	2	37	4.1%	0.18 [0.01, 3.87]	-	
van der Heijde 2005	22	202	7	75	14.6%	1.19 [0.49, 2.91]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		241	1 8.2	112	18.6%	0.97 [0.43, 2.19]		
Total events	22		9					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.36, df:	= 1 (P = 0.)	24); P=	26%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.08	(P = 0.94)							
Tabal (OFF CD		4000		4000	400.00			
Total (95% CI)		1609		1099	100.0%	2.44 [1.81, 3.29]		· · ·
Total events	226		66				12	
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 13.68, d	= 15 (P =	0.55);	P= 0%				0.01	0,1 1 10 100
Test for overall effect 7 = 5.86	(P < 0.000)	001)					4.4.	

FIGURE 5

Pooled estimate of the incidence of injection-site reactions between TNFi and placebo groups in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. The odds ratio >1.0 indicates that the incidence of injection-site reactions is higher in the TNFi group than that in the placebo group. The subheading "Events" refers to the number of injection-site reactions. "Total" refers to the total number of individuals. CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel method of calculation.

results also showed that there were significant differences between etanercept and placebo (OR = 3.10, 95% CI: 2.04-4.70; p < 0.00001), between adalimumab and placebo (OR = 2.78, 95% CI: 1.78-6.61; p = 0.02), and between golimumab and placebo (OR = 2.12, 95% CI: 1.13-4.01; p = 0.02), while no significant difference was found between infliximab and placebo (OR = 0.97, 95% CI: 0.43-2.19; p = 0.94) in AS patients.

A total of 7 studies tested the incidence of diarrhea between TNFi groups and placebo groups for AS treatment. As shown in Supplementary Figure S6, a meta-analysis of the trials (n = 1,441) showed no significant difference in the incidence of diarrhea between the two groups (OR = 1.25, 95% CI: 0.77–2.01; p = 0.36). The subgroup results showed that there is no significant difference in all three subgroups in the incidences of nasopharyngitis.

3.5 Publication bias

The publication bias is important for interpreting the conclusions. As shown in Supplementary Figure S7, the funnel plots of the incidence of overall adverse events showed that there was no publication bias.

4 Discussion

TNFi (first FDA approval in 2003) has been successfully used for the clinical treatment of AS for two decades, and surprisingly few systematic reports on common adverse events are presently available. This study conducted a meta-analysis of the included studies to comprehensively evaluate the safety of TNFi *vs* the placebo in AS patients. According to the predefined criteria, 18 studies with 3,564 patients were included. The quality assessment showed that the majority of the studies selected had moderate to high methodological quality. This meta-analysis indicated that there was an increased risk of overall adverse events in the TNFi-treated group as compared to the placebo group (OR = 1.55, p < 0.0001). Similar to previous meta-analyses (Machado et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2016; Ma H. et al., 2017; Hou et al., 2018), our results also indicated that there was no significant difference in serious adverse events in AS patients (OR = 1.37, p = 0.17).

An increasing number of studies showed that TNF is the key mediator of the host response to infection and is indispensable in the process of immune response to many viral infections, suggesting that TNF inhibitors may increase the risk of infections (Germano et al., 2014; Fernández-Ruiz and Aguado, 2018; Singh et al., 2020). The previous meta-analysis on patients with rheumatoid arthritis reported a higher risk of infection and serious infections after TNFi treatment than without TNFi treatment (Bongartz et al., 2006; Michaud et al., 2014). The present study compared the incidences of serious infections, upper respiratory tract infection, and nasopharyngitis in AS patients. Similar to other meta-analyses (Liu et al., 2016; Ma Z. et al., 2017; Xu et al., 2017; Hou et al., 2018), our results showed that there were no significantly increased risks of serious infections in AS patients following TNFi therapies (OR = 1.44, p = 0.36). The occurrence rate of upper respiratory tract infection in AS patients treated with TNFi is 14.19%, which is slightly but not significantly increased (OR = 1.22, p = 0.16) compared to that treated with the placebo (13.75%). However, the occurrence rate of nasopharyngitis in AS patients treated with TNFi is 8.69%, which is significantly higher (OR = 1.53; p =0.03) than that treated with the placebo (5.67%). With the given small sample sizes and few studies, the subgroup results showed that there was no significant difference in all the subgroups (etanercept vs placebo, adalimumab vs placebo, golimumab vs placebo, and infliximab vs placebo) in the incidences of upper respiratory tract infection and nasopharyngitis.

Given the role of TNF in mediating tumor growth, the risk of malignancy with TNFi treatment has been a concern (Pereira et al., 2015). Dougados et al. (2010) reported that one AS patient treated with etanercept was diagnosed with a lung neoplasm after the first injection. Bao et al. (2014) reported that one AS patient treated with golimumab was diagnosed with ovarian cancer after the first injection, which occurred in a 56-year-old woman with a 10-year history of ovarian cysts. Inman et al. (2008) reported that two patients were diagnosed with a malignancy: one in the placebo group and one in the 100-mg golimumab group. In the present meta-analysis, there was no statistical difference in the incidences of malignancies between TNFi groups and placebo groups (OR = 1.18; p = 0.79).

It is interesting to note that the occurrence rate of headache in AS patients treated with TNFi is 7.77%, which is statistically higher (OR = 1.49; p = 0.04) than that treated with the placebo (5.95%). Subgroup analysis showed that golimumab is significantly associated with a markedly increased risk of headache (OR = 2.98, p = 0.02). Traditionally, the pro-inflammatory cytokine TNF- α plays a role in migraine pathophysiology (Kraig et al., 2010; Rainero et al., 2014). However, Rozen and Swidan (2007) found that cerebrospinal fluid TNF- α levels were high, but serum TNF- α levels were normal in patients with new daily persistent headache. TNFi are the

macromolecules that cannot cross the blood-brain barrier; they could not reflect the levels of TNF- α in cerebrospinal fluid (Pardridge, 2010). Therefore, golimumab treatment is able to alleviate back pain symptoms, but it may also attract patient's attention in alleviating symptoms from back pain to headache.

Injection-site reactions are a major complication for all FDAapproved injectable biological agents (Thomaidou and Ramot, 2019). The previous meta-analysis on AS patients reported a higher risk of injection-site reactions after TNFi treatment than without TNFi treatment (Ma H. et al., 2017). Similar to the previous meta-analyses, the occurrence rate of injection-site reactions in AS patients treated with TNFi is 14.05%, which is markedly higher (OR = 2.44, p < 0.00001) than that treated with the placebo (5.98%). However, no significant difference was found between infliximab and placebo in the incidences of injection-site reactions, which may be due to the insufficient sample size.

The results indicated that there was an increased risk of overall adverse events in the TNFi-treated group compared to the placebo group. However, there was no significant difference in serious adverse events, malignancy events, and upper respiratory tract infection in AS patients between TNFi and placebo groups. It was probably due to the increased risk of common adverse events after TNFi treatment (i.e., injection-site reactions, nasopharyngitis, and headache), and these adverse events are the probable factors affecting medication compliance and persistence.

Given that there is no randomized placebo-controlled trial comparing certolizumab pegol with the placebo in patients with only AS, the other four TNFi (etanercept, adalimumab, golimumab, and infliximab) were included in the present study. Landewé et al. (2014) reported the similar adverse events between TNFi and placebo in patients with AS or non-radiographic axial spondyloarthritis, and the most common adverse events were nasopharyngitis and upper respiratory tract infection. In addition, Babuna Kobaner et al. (2018) presented a case treated with certolizumab pegol that induced a generalized psoriasiform eruption in an AS patient.

Finally, this study still has some limitations, which should be addressed. First, the present study was not able to compare the exact incidence of "serious adverse events" and "serious infections" in AS patients, due to the incongruent definition across studies and the small number of patients with serious adverse events or serious infections. Thus, it was unclear on the risk of bias for this domain in those studies. Second, all included studies were of fairly short duration (6–24 weeks), with a median duration of 12 weeks. Further research is needed to evaluate the long-term safety. Third, the type of placebo was not stated in detail for most of the included studies; different placebos probably have different mechanisms of action that could in turn influence the outcomes. Fourth, as this study analyzed only the adverse events in patients treated with TNFi compared with the placebo group, further research is needed to examine the adverse events among the five TNFi.

5 Conclusion

The present meta-analysis indicated that there was no significant difference in serious adverse events, serious infections, upper respiratory tract infection, malignancies, and diarrhea in AS patients between TNFi and placebo groups. However, the patients who received TNFi experienced more injection-site reactions, nasopharyngitis, and headache than those who received the placebo. Considering the limitations of the included studies, large-scale and long-term followup clinical trials are expected to further quantify the safety of TNFi in AS treatment.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material; further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Author contributions

HF, XC, WK, and FQ conceived and designed the study. HF, YZ, YD, and FQ contributed to the literature search, data extraction, and quality assessment. HF and YZ contributed to the data analysis and manuscript drafting for this work. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (82071494 and 81871043), Sichuan Science and Technology Program (2022YFS0028 and 2021YFS0145), and "1-3-5 Project for Disciplines of Excellence, West China Hospital, Sichuan University."

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors, and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References

Babuna Kobaner, G., Polat Ekinci, A., Yilmaz, Z., and Copur, S. (2018). Psoriasiform skin eruption in a patient receiving certolizumab-pegol for ankylosing spondylitis: Report of a case and review of the literature. *Dermatol. Ther.* 31, e12693. doi:10.1111/dth.12693

Bao, C., Huang, F., Khan, M. A., Fei, K., Wu, Z., Han, C., et al. (2014). Safety and efficacy of golimumab in Chinese patients with active ankylosing spondylitis: 1-year results of a multicentre, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase III trial. *Rheumatol. Oxf.* 53, 1654–1663. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/keu132

Bongartz, T., Sutton, A. J., Sweeting, M. J., Buchan, I., Matteson, E. L., and Montori, V. (2006). 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* 295, 2275–2285. doi:10.1001/jama.295.19.2275

Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphar.2023.1084614/ full#supplementary-material

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE S1

Methodological quality assessment of trials using the Cochrane risk of bias tool. The symbols show a low risk of bias (+) or unclear risk of bias (?).

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE S2

Pooled estimate of the incidence of serious adverse events between TNFi groups and placebo groups in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. The odds ratio >1.0 indicates that the incidence of serious adverse events is higher in the TNFi group than that in the placebo group. The subheading "Events" refers to the number of serious adverse events. "Total" refers to the total number of individuals. CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel method of calculation.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE S3

Pooled estimate of the incidence of serious infections between TNFi groups and placebo groups in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. The odds ratio >1.0 indicates that the incidence of serious infections is higher in the TNFi group than that in the placebo group. The subheading "Events" refers to the number of serious infections. "Total" refers to the total number of individuals. Cl, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel method of calculation.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE S4

Pooled estimate of the incidence of upper respiratory tract infection between TNFi and placebo groups in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. The odds ratio >1.0 indicates that the incidence of upper respiratory tract infection is higher in the TNFi group than that in the placebo group. The subheading "Events" refers to the number of upper respiratory tract infections. "Total" refers to the total number of individuals. CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel method of calculation.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE S5

Pooled estimate of the incidence of malignancy events between TNFi and placebo groups in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. The odds ratio >1.0 indicates that the incidence of malignancy events is higher in the TNFi group than that in the placebo group. The subheading "Events" refers to the number of malignancy events. "Total" refers to the total number of individuals. CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel method of calculation.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE S6

Pooled estimate of the incidence of diarrhea between TNFi and placebo groups in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. The odds ratio > 1.0 indicates that the incidence of diarrhea is higher in the TNFi group than that in the placebo group. The subheading "Events" refers to the number of incidences of diarrhea. "Total" refers to the total number of individuals. CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel method of calculation.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE S7

Funnel plots of randomized controlled trials.

Braun, J., Brandt, J., Listing, J., Zink, A., Alten, R., Golder, W., et al. (2002). Treatment of active ankylosing spondylitis with infliximab: A randomised controlled multicentre trial. *Lancet* 359, 1187–1193. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(02)08215-6

Burmester, G. R., Panaccione, R., Gordon, K. B., McIlraith, M. J., and Lacerda, A. P. (2013). Adalimumab: Long-term safety in 23 458 patients from global clinical trials in rheumatoid arthritis, puvenile idiopathic arthritis, ankylosing spondylitis, psoriatic arthritis, psoriasis and Crohn's disease. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* 72, 517–524. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2011-201244

Calin, A., Dijkmans, B. A., Emery, P., Hakala, M., Kalden, J., Leirisalo-Repo, M., et al. (2004). Outcomes of a multicentre randomised clinical trial of etanercept to treat ankylosing spondylitis. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* 63, 1594–1600. doi:10.1136/ard.2004.020875

Davis, J. C., Jr, Van Der Heijde, D., Braun, J., Dougados, M., Cush, J., Clegg, D. O., et al. (2003). Recombinant human tumor necrosis factor receptor (etanercept) for treating ankylosing spondylitis: A randomized, controlled trial. *Arthritis Rheum.* 48, 3230–3236. doi:10.1002/art.11325

Dean, L. E., Jones, G. T., Macdonald, A. G., Downham, C., Sturrock, R. D., and Macfarlane, G. J. (2014). Global prevalence of ankylosing spondylitis. *Rheumatol.* (*United Kingdom*). 53, 650–657. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/ket387

Deodhar, A. A., Shiff, N. J., Gong, C., Hsia, E. C., Lo, K. H., Kim, L., et al. (2022). Efficacy and safety of intravenous golimumab in ankylosing spondylitis patients with early and late disease through one year of the GO-ALIVE study. *J. Clin. Rheumatol.* 28, 270–277. doi:10.1097/RHU.00000000001853

Deodhar, A., Reveille, J. D., Harrison, D. D., Kim, L., Lo, K. H., Leu, J. H., et al. (2018). Safety and efficacy of golimumab administered intravenously in adults with ankylosing spondylitis: Results through week 28 of the GO-ALIVE study. *J. Rheumatol.* 45, 341–348. doi:10.3899/jrheum.170487

Dougados, M., Braun, J., Szanto, S., Combe, B., Elbaz, M., Geher, P., et al. (2010). Efficacy of etanercept on rheumatic signs and pulmonary function tests in advanced ankylosing spondylitis: Results of a randomised double-blind placebo-controlled study (SPINE). Ann. Rheum. Dis. 70, 799–804. doi:10.1136/ard.2010.139261

Fernández-Ruiz, M., and Aguado, J. M. (2018). Risk of infection associated with anti-TNFa therapy. *Expert Rev. Anti Infect. Ther.* 16, 939–956. doi:10.1080/14787210.2018.1544490

Fouque-Aubert, A., Jette-Paulin, L., Combescure, C., Basch, A., Tebib, J., and Gossec, L. (2010). Serious infections in patients with ankylosing spondylitis with and without TNF blockers: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised placebo-controlled trials. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* 69, 1756–1761. doi:10.1136/ard.2008.098822

Germano, V., Cattaruzza, M. S., Osborn, J., Tarantino, A., Di Rosa, R., Salemi, S., et al. (2014). Infection risk in rheumatoid arthritis and spondyloarthropathy patients under treatment with DMARDs, corticosteroids and TNF-α antagonists. *J. Transl. Med.* 12, 77. doi:10.1186/1479-5876-12-77

Gorman, J. D., Sack, K. E., and Davis, J. C., Jr. (2002). Treatment of ankylosing spondylitis by inhibition of tumor necrosis factor alpha. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 346, 1349–1356. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa012664

Hou, L. Q., Jiang, G. X., Chen, Y. F., Yang, X. M., Meng, L., Xue, M., et al. (2018). The comparative safety of TNF inhibitors in ankylosing spondylitis-a meta-analysis update of 14 randomized controlled trials. *Clin. Rev. Allergy. Immunol.* 54, 234–243. doi:10. 1007/s12016-017-8623-6

Huang, F., Gu, J., Zhu, P., Bao, C., Xu, J., Xu, H., et al. (2014). Efficacy and safety of adalimumab in Chinese adults with active ankylosing spondylitis: Results of a randomised, controlled trial. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* 73, 587–594. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2012-202533

Huang, F., Zhang, J., Huang, J. L., Wu, D. H., Li, Z. G., Chen, S. L., et al. (2010). A multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized, phase III clinical study of etanercept in treatment of ankylosing spondylitis. *Zhonghua Nei Ke Za Zhi* 49, 741–745.

Huang, F., Zhang, J., Zheng, Y., Xu, J. H., Li, X. F., Wu, H. X., et al. (2011). A multicenter, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trial of etanercept treatment of Chinese patients with active ankylosing spondylitis. *Zhonghua Nei Ke Za Zhi* 50, 1043–1047.

Inman, R. D., Davis, J. C., Jr, Heijde, Dv., Diekman, L., Sieper, J., Kim, S. I., et al. (2008). Efficacy and safety of golimumab in patients with ankylosing spondylitis: Results of a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase III trial. *Arthritis Rheum.* 58, 3402–3412. doi:10.1002/art.23969

Inman, R. D., and Maksymowych, W. P.CANDLE Study Group. (2010). A doubleblind, placebo-controlled trial of low dose infliximab in ankylosing spondylitis. *J. Rheumatol.* 37, 1203–1210. doi:10.3899/jrheum.091042

Kraig, R. P., Mitchell, H. M., Christie-Pope, B., Kunkler, P. E., Whit, e. D. M., Tang, Y. P., et al. (2010). TNF-A and microglial hormetic involvement in neurological health & migraine. *Dose Response* 8, 389–413. doi:10.2203/dose-response.09-056.Kraig

Landewé, R., Braun, J., Deodhar, A., Dougados, M., Maksymowych, W. P., Mease, P. J., et al. (2014). Efficacy of certolizumab pegol on signs and symptoms of axial spondyloarthritis including ankylosing spondylitis: 24-week results of a double-blind randomised placebo-controlled phase 3 study. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* 73, 39–47. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2013-204231

Liu, W., Wu, Y. H., Zhang, L., Liu, X. Y., Xue, B., Liu, B., et al. (2016). Efficacy and safety of TNF- α inhibitors for active ankylosing spondylitis patients: Multiple treatment comparisons in a network meta-analysis. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 32768. doi:10.1038/srep32768

Ma, H., Sun, F., Zhang, Y. M., Zhang, H., Zhu, J., Deng, X. H., et al. (2017). The safety and efficacy of golimumab in treatment of 25 patients with active ankylosing spondylitis. *Zhonghua Nei Ke Za Zhi* 56, 935–939. doi:10.3760/cma.j.issn.0578-1426.2017.12.009

Ma, Z., Liu, X., Xu, X., Jiang, J., Zhou, J., Wang, J., et al. (2017). Safety of tumor necrosis factor-alpha inhibitors for treatment of ankylosing spondylitis: A meta-analysis. *Med. Baltim.* 96, e7145. doi:10.1097/MD.00000000007145

Machado, M. A., Barbosa, M. M., Almeida, A. M., de Araújo, V. E., Kakehasi, A. M., Andrade, E. I., et al. (2013). Treatment of ankylosing spondylitis with TNF blockers: A meta-analysis. *Rheumatol. Int.* 33, 2199–2213. doi:10.1007/s00296-013-2772-6

Michaud, T. L., Rho, Y. H., Shamliyan, T., Kuntz, K. M., and Choi, H. K. (2014). The comparative safety of tumor necrosis factor inhibitors in rheumatoid arthritis: A metaanalysis update of 44 trials. *Am. J. Med.* 127, 1208–1232. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2014. 06.012

Mitoma, H., Horiuchi, T., Tsukamoto, H., and Ueda, N. (2018). Molecular mechanisms of action of anti-TNF- α agents - Comparison among therapeutic TNF- α antagonists. Cytokine 101, 56–63. doi:10.1016/j.cyto.2016.08.014

Pardridge, W. M. (2010). Biologic TNFa-inhibitors that cross the human blood-brain barrier. Bioeng. Bugs 1, 231–234. doi:10.4161/bbug.1.4.12105

Pereira, R., Lago, P., Faria, R., and Torres, T. (2015). Safety of anti-TNF therapies in immune-mediated inflammatory diseases: Focus on infections and malignancy. *Drug Dev. Res.* 76, 419–427. doi:10.1002/ddr.21285

Rainero, I., Grimaldi, L. M., Salani, G., Valfrè, W., Rivoiro, C., Savi, L., et al. (2014). Association between the tumor necrosis factor-alpha -308 G/A gene polymorphism and migraine. *Neurology* 62, 141–143. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000101717.16799.8f

Raychaudhuri, S. P., and Deodhar, A. (2014). The classification and diagnostic criteria of ankylosing spondylitis. *J. Autoimmun.* 48-49, 128–133. doi:10.1016/j.jaut.2014. 01.015

Reveille, J. D. (2011). Epidemiology of spondyloarthritis in North America. Am. J. Med. Sci. 341, 284–286. doi:10.1097/MAJ.0b013e31820f8c99

Rozen, T., and Swidan, S. Z. (2007). Elevation of CSF tumor necrosis factor alpha levels in new daily persistent headache and treatment refractory chronic migraine. *Headache* 47, 1050–1055. doi:10.1111/j.1526-4610.2006.00722.x

Shao, F., Liu, Q., Zhu, Y., Fan, Z., Chen, W., Liu, S., et al. (2021). Targeting chondrocytes for arresting bony fusion in ankylosing spondylitis. *Nat. Commun.* 12, 6540. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-26750-6

Singh, S., Facciorusso, A., Dulai, P. S., Jairath, V., and Sandborn, W. J. (2020). Comparative risk of serious infections with biologic and/or immunosuppressive therapy in patients with inflammatory bowel diseases: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin. Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* 18, 69–81. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2019.02.044

Thomaidou, E., and Ramot, Y. (2019). Injection site reactions with the use of biological agents. *Dermatol. Ther.* 32, e12817. doi:10.1111/dth.12817

van der Heijde, D., Cheng-Chung Wei, J., Dougados, M., Mease, P., Deodhar, A., Maksymowych, W. P., et al. (2018). Ixekizumab, an interleukin-17a antagonist in the treatment of ankylosing spondylitis or radiographic axial spondyloarthritis in patients previously untreated with biological disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (COAST-V): 16 week results of a phase 3 randomised, double-blind, activecontrolled and placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 392, 2441–2451. doi:10.1016/ S0140-6736(18)31946-9

van der Heijde, D., Da Silva, J. C., Dougados, M., Geher, P., van der Horst-Bruinsma, I., Juanola, X., et al. (2006a). Etanercept 50 mg once weekly is as effective as 25 mg twice weekly in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* 65, 1572–1577. doi:10. 1136/ard.2006.056747

van der Heijde, D., Dijkmans, B., Geusens, P., Sieper, J., DeWoody, K., Williamson, P., et al. (2005). Efficacy and safety of infliximab in patients with ankylosing spondylitis: Results of a randomized, placebo-controlled trial (ASSERT). *Arthritis Rheum.* 52, 582–591. doi:10.1002/art.20852

van der Heijde, D., Kivitz, A., Schiff, M. H., Sieper, J., Dijkmans, B. A., Braun, J., et al. (2006b). Efficacy and safety of adalimumab in patients with ankylosing spondylitis: Results of a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Arthritis Rheum.* 54, 2136–2146. doi:10.1002/art.21913

Wroński, J., and Fiedor, P. (2019). The safety profile of tumor necrosis factor inhibitors in ankylosing spondylitis: Are TNF inhibitors safer than we thought? *J. Clin. Pharmacol.* 59, 445–462. doi:10.1002/jcph.1348

Xiong, J. H., Liu, J., and Chen, J. (2020). Clinical significance and prognostic value of tumor necrosis factor-α and dickkopf related protein-1 in ankylosing spondylitis. *World J. Clin. Cases* 8, 1213–1222. doi:10.12998/wjcc.v8.i7.1213

Xu, Z., Xu, P., Fan, W., Yang, G., Wang, J., Cheng, Q., et al. (2017). Risk of infection in patients with spondyloarthritis and ankylosing spondylitis receiving antitumor necrosis factor therapy: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Exp. Ther. Med.* 14, 3491–3500. doi:10.3892/etm.2017.5003

Zhao, J., Huang, C., Huang, H., Pan, J. K., Zeng, L. F., Luo, M. H., et al. (2020). Prevalence of ankylosing spondylitis in a Chinese population: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Rheumatol. Int.* 40, 859–872. doi:10.1007/s00296-020-04537-0

Zhu, W., He, X., Cheng, K., Zhang, L., Chen, D., Wang, X., et al. (2019). Ankylosing spondylitis: Etiology, pathogenesis, and treatments. *Bone Res.* 7, 22. doi:10.1038/s41413-019-0057-8