



CONSORT 2010 checklist of information to include when reporting a randomised trial*

Section/Topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
Title and abstract			
	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	No randomization/allocation of subjects to different intervention group occurred. The only randomization which occurred for the IB1001 clinical trials was the randomization of subject videos for central, independent raters primary CI-CS assessment. Therefore, "randomization" was not included in the trial, as to not be misleading about subject allocation to different intervention arms.
	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	3
Introduction			
Background and objectives	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	4-5
	2b	Specific objectives or hypotheses	5
Methods			
Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	5
	3b	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	5
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	5, 14,15, 16
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	5
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	5
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed	6,7
	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial	No changes to the trial outcomes after the trial commenced

Sample size

7a commenced, with reasons

7a How sample size was determined

7b When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines

Separate document – Statistical Analysis Plan

No interim analyses occurred

Randomisation:
Sequence generation

8a Method used to generate the random allocation sequence

8b Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)

No randomization/allocation of subjects to different intervention group occurred. The only randomization which occurred for the IB1001 clinical trials was the randomization of subject videos for central, independent raters primary CI-CS assessment. This randomization/release to raters was performed by a third-party vendor and detailed in the Separate Document -Video Review Charter.

The following information is available in external documents (Video Review Charter): The primary Clinical Impression of Change in Severity (CI-CS) assessment was based on videos of subjects recorded at each study visit. These videos were uploaded directly from each study site to a third-party vendor, Medpace Core Laboratories (MCL). MCL was responsible for obtaining subject videos, performing quality control, and, once all applicable videos had been obtained for a subject, assigning the subject videos to randomized sequences for the pairs of videos for the CI-CS assessment.

In advance of any video review, MCL utilizes a number generator via RANDOM.ORG to generate a random number (1-6) for each of the participants. The generated number for each patient (1-6) corresponds to the CI-CS video review order assignments initially outlined in the video review charter (below)

	Video A	Video B	Video C
Order 1	2	4	6
Order 2	2	6	4
Order 3	4	2	6
Order 4	4	6	2
Order 5	6	2	4
Order 6	6	4	2

Once a subject's videos are randomized according to the generated order, these sets

were released via Clintrak Imaging System Portal for review by independent raters. The independent raters based their primary CI-CS on the review of these randomized video /pairs.

The procedures for acquiring subject videos, submitting the videos to MCL, and central video review are described in the separate documents (Video Acquisition Manual, Video Submission Manual, Video Review Charter).

Allocation concealment mechanism	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	The video randomization sequences for the CI-CS assessment was pre-defined by MCL and a biostatistician consultant (available in the video review charter). Only the MCL IB1001 study team had access to the randomization sequences. To ensure that central raters are blinded to study subject identifiers, each subject video was assigned a "barcode" and "reading number" that identify the video throughout the central review process. Usage of the "barcode" and "reading number" blinded the rater to any information (i.e., subject ID, DOB, visit identifier) that may introduce bias during central review.
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	The PI was responsible for enrolling all trial participants. No randomization/allocation of participants to different intervention group occurred.
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how	6
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	All patients received treatment with NALL followed by a post-treatment washout period.
Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	7
	12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses	7
Results			
Participant flow (a diagram is strongly recommended)	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary	8

		outcome	
	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	8
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	3
	14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	The trial was not ended or stopped prematurely
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	17
Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was by original assigned groups	20,21
Outcomes and estimation	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	8,9
	17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended	N/A
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory	9, 20,21
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	9
Discussion			
Limitations	20	Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses	10,11
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings	10,11
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	10,11
Other information			

Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	3,5
Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	N/A
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	3,12

*We strongly recommend reading this statement in conjunction with the CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also recommend reading CONSORT extensions for cluster randomised trials, non-inferiority and equivalence trials, non-pharmacological treatments, herbal interventions, and pragmatic trials. Additional extensions are forthcoming: for those and for up to date references relevant to this checklist, see www.consort-statement.org.