Clinical trial results:
A Randomized, Double-blind, Placebo-and Active-controlled, Multicenter, Phase 3 Study to Assess the Efficacy and Safety of Filgotinib Administered for 52 Weeks Alone and in Combination with Methotrexate (MTX) to Subjects with Moderately to Severely Active Rheumatoid Arthritis Who Are Naïve to MTX Therapy

Summary

EudraCT number	2016-000570-37
Trial protocol	SK BE GB HU DE CZ ES PL BG
Global end of trial date	08 May 2019

Results information

Result version number	v2 (current)
This version publication date	21 May 2021
First version publication date	24 May 2020
Version creation reason	• New data added to full data set Added additional secondary endpoints.

Trial information

Trial identification

Sponsor protocol code	GS-US-417-0303

Additional study identifiers

ISRCTN number	-
ClinicalTrials.gov id (NCT number)	NCT02886728
WHO universal trial number (UTN)	-

Notes:

Sponsors

Sponsor organisation name	Gilead Sciences
Sponsor organisation address	333 Lakeside Drive, Foster City, CA, United States, 94404
Public contact	Gilead Clinical Study Information Center, Gilead Sciences, GileadClinicalTrials@gilead.com
Scientific contact	Gilead Clinical Study Information Center, Gilead Sciences, GileadClinicalTrials@gilead.com

Notes:

Paediatric regulatory details

Is trial part of an agreed paediatric investigation plan (PIP)	No
Does article 45 of REGULATION (EC) No 1901/2006 apply to this trial?	No
Does article 46 of REGULATION (EC) No 1901/2006 apply to this trial?	No

Notes:

Results analysis stage

Analysis stage	Final
Date of interim/final analysis	08 May 2019
Is this the analysis of the primary completion data?	Yes
Primary completion date	05 October 2018
Global end of trial reached?	Yes
Global end of trial date	08 May 2019
Was the trial ended prematurely?	No

Notes:

General information about the trial

Main objective of the trial:

The primary objective of this study was to evaluate the effects of filgotinib in combination with methotrexate (MTX) versus MTX alone for the treatment of signs and symptoms of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) as measured by the proportion of participants achieving an American College of Rheumatology 20% improvement response (ACR20) at Week 24.

Protection of trial subjects:

The protocol and consent/assent forms were submitted by each investigator to a duly constituted Independent Ethics Committee (IEC) or Institutional Review Board (IRB) for review and approval before study initiation. All revisions to the consent/assent forms (if applicable) after initial IEC/IRB approval were submitted by the investigator to the IEC/IRB for review and approval before implementation in accordance with regulatory requirements.

This study was conducted in accordance with recognized international scientific and ethical standards, including but not limited to the International Conference on Harmonization guideline for Good Clinical Practice (ICH GCP) and the original principles embodied in the Declaration of Helsinki.

Background therapy: -

Evidence for comparator: -

Actual start date of recruitment	08 August 2016
Long term follow-up planned	No
Independent data monitoring committee (IDMC) involvement?	Yes

Notes:

Population of trial subjects

Subjects enrolled per country

Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Slovakia: 8
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	South Africa: 19
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Spain: 34
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Taiwan: 23
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Thailand: 13
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Ukraine: 69
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	United Kingdom: 8
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	United States: 319
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Argentina: 40
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Australia: 18
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Belgium: 19
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Bulgaria: 54
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Canada: 21
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Chile: 14

Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Czech Republic: 20
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Germany: 30
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Hong Kong: 3
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Hungary: 18
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	India: 116
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Ireland: 2
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Israel: 2
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Italy: 3
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Japan: 71
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Korea, Republic of: 24
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Malaysia: 6
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Mexico: 116
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	New Zealand: 16
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Poland: 109
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Romania: 10
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Russian Federation: 31
Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Serbia: 16
Worldwide total number of subjects	1252
EEA total number of subjects	315

Notes:

Subjects enrolled per age group	
In utero	0
Preterm newborn - gestational age < 37 wk	0
Newborns (0-27 days)	0
Infants and toddlers (28 days-23 months)	0
Children (2-11 years)	0
Adolescents (12-17 years)	0
Adults (18-64 years)	997
From 65 to 84 years	253
85 years and over	2

Subject disposition

Recruitment

Recruitment details:

Participants were enrolled at study sites in Asia, Africa, Australia, Europe, North America, South America, and New Zealand. The first participant was screened on 08 August 2016. The last study visit occurred on 08 May 2019.

Pre-assignment

Screening details:

1855 participants were screened.

Period 1

Period 1 title	Overall Study (overall period)
Is this the baseline period?	Yes
Allocation method	Randomised - controlled
Blinding used	Double blind
Roles blinded	Subject, Investigator

Arms

Are arms mutually exclusive?	Yes
Arm title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX

Arm description:

Participants were administered filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + placebo to match (PTM) filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.

Arm type	Experimental
Investigational medicinal product name	Filgotinib
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	GS-6034, GLPG0634
Pharmaceutical forms	Film-coated tablet
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

200 mg administered once daily

Investigational medicinal product name	Placebo to match (PTM) filgotinib 100 mg
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Film-coated tablet
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

PTM filgotinib 100 mg administered once daily

Investigational medicinal product name	MTX
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Capsule
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

Up to 20 mg administered once weekly

Arm title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX

Arm description:

Participants were administered filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + PTM filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.

Arm type	Experimental

Investigational medicinal product name	Filgotinib
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	GS-6034, GLPG0634
Pharmaceutical forms	Film-coated tablet
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

100 mg administered once daily

Investigational medicinal product name	PTM filgotinib 200 mg
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Film-coated tablet
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

PTM filgotinib 200 mg administered once daily

Investigational medicinal product name	MTX
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Capsule
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

Up to 20 mg administered once weekly

Arm title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy

Arm description:

Participants were administered filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + PTM filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + PTM MTX orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.

Arm type	Experimental
Investigational medicinal product name	Filgotinib
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	GS-6034, GLPG0634
Pharmaceutical forms	Film-coated tablet
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

200 mg administered once daily

Investigational medicinal product name	PTM filgotinib 100 mg
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Film-coated tablet
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

PTM filgotinib 100 mg administered once daily

Investigational medicinal product name	PTM MTX
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Capsule
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

PTM MTX capsules administered once weekly

Arm title	MTX Monotherapy

Arm description:

Participants were administered PTM filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily+ PTM filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 56 weeks.

Arm type	Experimental

Investigational medicinal product name	PTM filgotinib 200 mg
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Film-coated tablet
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

PTM Filgotinib 200 mg administered once daily

Investigational medicinal product name	PTM filgotinib 100 mg
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Film-coated tablet
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

PTM Filgotinib 100 mg administered once daily

Investigational medicinal product name	MTX
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Capsule
Routes of administration	Oral use

Dosage and administration details:

Up to 20 mg administered once weekly

Number of subjects in period 1[1]	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy
Started	416	207	210
Completed	345	175	174
Not completed	71	32	36
Withdrew Consent	31	13	11
Adverse Event	13	5	5
Non-Compliance with Study Drug	1	-	1
Death	3	1	-
Pregnancy	-	-	1
Protocol Violation	-	-	-
Lost to follow-up	12	6	13
Investigator`s Discretion	11	7	5

Number of subjects in period 1[1]	MTX Monotherapy
Started	416
Completed	331
Not completed	85
Withdrew Consent	47
Adverse Event	11
Non-Compliance with Study Drug	-

Death	-
Pregnancy	-
Protocol Violation	4
Lost to follow-up	12
Investigator`s Discretion	11

Notes:

[1] - The number of subjects reported to be in the baseline period are not the same as the worldwide number enrolled in the trial. It is expected that these numbers will be the same.
Justification: Three participants who were randomised but did not receive the study drug are not included in analysis.

Baseline characteristics

Reporting groups	
Reporting group title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + placebo to match (PTM) filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.	
Reporting group title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + PTM filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.	
Reporting group title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + PTM filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + PTM MTX orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.	
Reporting group title	MTX Monotherapy
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered PTM filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily+ PTM filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 56 weeks.	

Reporting group values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy
Number of subjects	416	207	210
Age categorical Units: Subjects			
Age continuous Units: years			
arithmetic mean	53	54	52
standard deviation	± 13.8	± 12.6	± 13.9
Gender categorical Units: Subjects			
Female	325	158	166
Male	91	49	44
Race			
Not Permitted = local regulators did not allow collection of race information.			
Units: Subjects			
American Indian or Alaska Native	26	12	18
Asian: Japanese	23	11	12
Asian: Chinese/Taiwanese/Hong Kong Chinese	7	4	6
Asian: Vietnamese	1	0	0
Asian: Korean	6	8	2
Asian: Other	53	28	27
Black or African American	15	8	8
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	0	1
White	278	132	135
Other	6	4	0
Not Permitted	0	0	1
Ethnicity			
Not Permitted = local regulators did not allow collection of ethnicity information.			

Units: Subjects			
Hispanic or Latino	93	40	45
Not Hispanic or Latino	322	167	165
Not Permitted	1	0	0

Reporting group values	MTX Monotherapy	Total	
Number of subjects	416	1249	
Age categorical			
Units: Subjects			
Age continuous			
Units: years			
arithmetic mean	53		
standard deviation	± 13.7	-	
Gender categorical			
Units: Subjects			
Female	312	961	
Male	104	288	
Race			
Not Permitted = local regulators did not allow collection of race information.			
Units: Subjects			
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	89	
Asian: Japanese	25	71	
Asian: Chinese/Taiwanese/Hong Kong Chinese	10	27	
Asian: Vietnamese	0	1	
Asian: Korean	8	24	
Asian: Other	42	150	
Black or African American	14	45	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	3	5	
White	278	823	
Other	3	13	
Not Permitted	0	1	
Ethnicity			
Not Permitted = local regulators did not allow collection of ethnicity information.			
Units: Subjects			
Hispanic or Latino	84	262	
Not Hispanic or Latino	332	986	
Not Permitted	0	1	

End points

End points reporting groups

Reporting group title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + placebo to match (PTM) filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.	
Reporting group title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + PTM filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.	
Reporting group title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + PTM filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + PTM MTX orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.	
Reporting group title	MTX Monotherapy
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered PTM filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily+ PTM filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 56 weeks.	

Primary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved an American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 20% Improvement (ACR20) Response at Week 24

End point title	Percentage of Participants Who Achieved an American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 20% Improvement (ACR20) Response at Week 24
End point description:	
ACR20 response is achieved when the participant has: ≥20% improvement(reduction)from baseline in tender joint count based on 68 joints(TJC68),swollen joint count based on 66 joints(SJC66) and in at least 3 of the following 5 items:physician’s global assessment of disease activity(PGA) and subject’s global assessment of disease activity(SGA) assessed using visual analog scale(VAS) on a scale of 0-100(0 and 100 indicate no disease activity,maximum disease activity) participant`s pain assessment using VAS on a scale of 0-100 (0 and 100 indicate no pain,unbearable pain) health assessment questionnaire-disability index(HAQ-DI) score contains 20 questions, 8 components: dressing/grooming,arising,eating,walking,hygiene,reach,grip and activities and scored on a scale of 0-3 (0 and 3 indicate without difficulty and unable to do, respectively) high-sensitivity C-reactive protein(hsCRP). The Full Analysis Set included participants who were randomised and received at least 1	
End point type	Primary
End point timeframe:	
Week 24	

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of participants				
number (confidence interval 95%)	81.0 (77.1 to 84.9)	80.2 (74.5 to 85.9)	78.1 (72.3 to 83.9)	71.4 (66.9 to 75.9)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [1]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	9.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	3.6
upper limit	15.6

Notes:

[1] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.017 [2]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	8.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.5
upper limit	16.1

Notes:

[2] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.058 [3]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	6.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.7
upper limit	14.1

Notes:

[3] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in the Health Assessment Questionnaire-Disability Index (HAQ-DI) Score at Week 24

End point title	Change From Baseline in the Health Assessment Questionnaire-Disability Index (HAQ-DI) Score at Week 24

End point description:

The HAQ-DI score is defined as the average of the scores of eight functional categories (dressing and grooming, arising, eating, walking, hygiene, reach, grip, and other activities), usually administered by the participant. Responses in each functional category are collected as 0 (without any difficulty) to 3 (unable to do a task in that area), with or without aids or devices. The eight category scores are averaged into an overall HAQ-DI score on a scale from 0 (no disability) to 3 (completely disabled) when 6 or more categories are non-missing, total possible score is 3. If more than 2 categories are missing, the HAQ-DI score is set to missing. Negative change from baseline indicates improvement (less disability). Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Week 24

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=414,207,210,416)	1.52 (± 0.622)	1.56 (± 0.654)	1.56 (± 0.655)	1.60 (± 0.625)
Change at Week 24 (N=372,190,185,370)	-0.94 (± 0.722)	-0.90 (± 0.675)	-0.89 (± 0.631)	-0.79 (± 0.634)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Least squares (LS)-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from mixed effects model for repeated measures (MMRM). Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [4]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.19
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.27
upper limit	-0.11
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.041

Notes:

[4] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.009 [5]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.13
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.23
upper limit	-0.03
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.049

Notes:

[5] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.032 [6]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.11
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.2
upper limit	-0.01
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.05

Notes:

[6] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved Disease Activity Score for 28 Joint Count Using C-Reactive Protein [DAS28 (CRP)]< 2.6 at Week 24

End point title	Percentage of Participants Who Achieved Disease Activity Score for 28 Joint Count Using C-Reactive Protein [DAS28 (CRP)]< 2.6 at Week 24

End point description:

The DAS28 score is a measure of the participant's disease activity calculated using the tender joint counts (28 joints), swollen joint counts (28 joints), Patient's Global Assessment of Disease Activity (visual analog scale: 0 = no disease activity to 100 = maximum disease activity), and CRP for a total possible score of 1 to 9.4. Higher values indicate higher disease activity. Participants with missing outcomes were set as non-responders. Participants in the Full Analysis Set were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Week 24

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of participants				
number (confidence interval 95%)	54.1 (49.2 to 59.0)	42.5 (35.5 to 49.5)	42.4 (35.5 to 49.3)	29.1 (24.6 to 33.6)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [7]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	25
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	18.3
upper limit	31.7

Notes:

[7] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [8]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	13.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	5
upper limit	21.8

Notes:

[8] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [9]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	13.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	5
upper limit	21.6

Notes:

[9] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Modified Total Sharp Score (mTSS) at Week 24

End point title	Change From Baseline in Modified Total Sharp Score (mTSS) at Week 24

End point description:

Participant`s radiographs of bilateral hands, wrists and feet are taken and evaluated through central review using the mTSS method. The mTSS (range [0, 448]) is defined as the erosion score (range [0, 280]) plus the joint space narrowing (JSN) score (range [0, 168]). An erosion score of 0 to 5 is given to each joint in the hands and wrists, and a score of 0 to 10 is given to each joint in the feet where 0 indicates no erosion while 5 or 10 indicates extensive loss of bone (maximum erosion). JSN is scored from 0 to 4, with 0 indicating no/normal JSN and 4 indicating complete loss of joint space. The maximal TSS is 448. Positive change in value indicates progression of disease (more erosion of bone, less joint spaces). Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Week 24

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=410,204,204,408)	11.35 (± 19.922)	13.31 (± 26.980)	16.53 (± 32.372)	13.72 (± 29.168)
Change at Week 24 (N=355,184,173,356)	0.21 (± 1.684)	0.22 (± 1.526)	-0.04 (± 1.710)	0.51 (± 2.887)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.068 [10]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.29
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.61
upper limit	0.02
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.161

Notes:

[10] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.14 [11]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.29
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.67
upper limit	0.1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.195

Notes:

[11] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.006 [12]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.55
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.94
upper limit	-0.16
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.199

Notes:

[12] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in mTSS at Week 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in mTSS at Week 52

End point description:

Participant`s radiographs of bilateral hands, wrists and feet are taken and evaluated through central review using the mTSS method. The mTSS (range [0-448]) is defined as the erosion score (range [0-280]) plus the joint space narrowing (JSN) score (range [0-168]). An erosion score of 0 to 5 is given to each joint in the hands and wrists, and a score of 0 to 10 is given to each joint in the feet [where 0 indicates no erosion while 5 or 10 indicates extensive loss of bone (maximum erosion]). JSN is scored from 0 to 4 [0 indicating no/normal JSN and 4 indicating complete loss of joint space]. The maximal TSS is 448. Positive change in value indicates progression of disease (more erosion of bone, less joint spaces). Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Week 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=411,205,204,408)	11.31 (± 19.273)	12.76 (± 24.363)	15.89 (± 31.813)	13.36 (± 27.736)
Change at Week 52 (N=345,176,166,330)	0.31 (± 1.808)	0.23 (± 1.111)	0.33 (± 1.902)	0.81 (± 3.089)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [13]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.65
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.03
upper limit	-0.27
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.195

Notes:

[13] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, campaign groups, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.008 [14]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.63
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.09
upper limit	-0.16
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.236

Notes:

[14] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, campaign groups, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.006 [15]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.66
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.14
upper limit	-0.19
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.242

Notes:

[15] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, campaign groups, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved ACR 50% Improvement (ACR50) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Percentage of Participants Who Achieved ACR 50% Improvement (ACR50) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

ACR50 response is achieved when the participant has: ≥ 50% improvement (reduction) from baseline in

TJC68, SJC66 and in at least 3 of the following 5 items: PGA and SGA assessed using VAS on a scale of 0-100 [0 and 100 indicating no disease activity and maximum disease activity]; subject`s pain assessment using VAS on a scale of 0-100 [0 and 100 indicating no pain and unbearable pain]; HAQ-DI score contains 20 questions,8 components: dressing/grooming, arising, eating, walking, hygiene, reach, grip and activities and scored on a scale of 0-3 [0 and 3 indicating without difficulty and unable to do]; hsCRP. Participants with missing outcomes were set as non-responders. Participants in the Full Analysis Set were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of participants				
number (confidence interval 95%)				
Week 2	13.0 (9.6 to 16.3)	9.2 (5.0 to 13.4)	16.2 (11.0 to 21.4)	2.9 (1.2 to 4.6)
Week 4	29.3 (24.8 to 33.8)	20.8 (15.0 to 26.5)	25.7 (19.6 to 31.9)	9.4 (6.5 to 12.3)
Week 12	53.1 (48.2 to 58.0)	44.4 (37.4 to 51.5)	45.7 (38.7 to 52.7)	28.4 (23.9 to 32.8)
Week 24	61.5 (56.7 to 66.3)	57.0 (50.0 to 64.0)	58.1 (51.2 to 65.0)	45.7 (40.8 to 50.6)
Week 36	60.6 (55.8 to 65.4)	55.6 (48.5 to 62.6)	58.6 (51.7 to 65.5)	48.6 (43.6 to 53.5)
Week 52	62.3 (57.5 to 67.0)	59.4 (52.5 to 66.4)	61.4 (54.6 to 68.3)	48.3 (43.4 to 53.2)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [16]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	10.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	6.2
upper limit	13.9

Notes:

[16] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.001 [17]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	6.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.7
upper limit	10.9

Notes:

[17] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [18]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	13.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	7.7
upper limit	18.9

Notes:

[18] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 4	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [19]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	20
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	14.5
upper limit	25.4

Notes:

[19] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [20]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	11.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	4.8
upper limit	18

Notes:

[20] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [21]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	16.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	9.4
upper limit	23.2

Notes:

[21] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 12	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [22]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	24.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	18.1
upper limit	31.5

Notes:

[22] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 12	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [23]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	16.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	7.7
upper limit	24.5

Notes:

[23] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 12	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [24]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	17.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	9
upper limit	25.7

Notes:

[24] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [25]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	15.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	8.9
upper limit	22.8

Notes:

[25] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.006 [26]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	11.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.7
upper limit	20

Notes:

[26] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 24	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.002 [27]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	12.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	3.9
upper limit	21

Notes:

[27] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 36	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [28]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	12
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	5.1
upper limit	19

Notes:

[28] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 36	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.09 [29]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.7
upper limit	15.7

Notes:

[29] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.014 [30]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	10
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.4
upper limit	18.6

Notes:

[30] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [31]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	13.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	7
upper limit	20.9

Notes:

[31] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.008 [32]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	11.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.5
upper limit	19.7

Notes:

[32] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.001 [33]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	13.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	4.6
upper limit	21.6

Notes:

[33] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved ACR 70% Improvement (ACR70) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Percentage of Participants Who Achieved ACR 70% Improvement (ACR70) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

ACR70 response is achieved when the participant has: ≥ 70% improvement (reduction) from baseline in TJC68, SJC66 and in at least 3 of the following 5 items: PGA and SGA assessed using VAS on a scale of 0-100 [0 and 100 indicating no disease activity and maximum disease activity]; subject`s pain assessment using VAS on a scale of 0-100 [0 and 100 indicating no pain and unbearable pain]; HAQ-DI score contains 20 questions, 8 components: dressing/grooming, arising, eating, walking, hygiene, reach, grip and activities and scored on a scale of 0-3 [0 and 3 indicating without difficulty and unable to do];

hsCRP. Participants with missing outcomes were set as non-responders. Participants in the Full Analysis Set were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of participants				
number (confidence interval 95%)				
Week 2	3.1 (1.3 to 4.9)	1.9 (0.0 to 4.0)	4.3 (1.3 to 7.3)	0.7 (0.0 to 1.7)
Week 4	13.0 (9.6 to 16.3)	6.3 (2.7 to 9.8)	11.4 (6.9 to 16.0)	3.8 (1.9 to 5.8)
Week 12	32.9 (28.3 to 37.6)	27.1 (20.8 to 33.3)	29.0 (22.7 to 35.4)	13.2 (9.8 to 16.6)
Week 24	43.8 (38.9 to 48.6)	40.1 (33.2 to 47.0)	40.0 (33.1 to 46.9)	26.0 (21.6 to 30.3)
Week 36	45.9 (41.0 to 50.8)	37.2 (30.4 to 44.0)	39.5 (32.7 to 46.4)	32.2 (27.6 to 36.8)
Week 52	47.8 (42.9 to 52.8)	40.1 (33.2 to 47.0)	45.2 (38.3 to 52.2)	29.8 (25.3 to 34.3)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.018 [34]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	2.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.3
upper limit	4.5

Notes:

[34] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:	
Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.17 [35]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	1.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.2
upper limit	3.6

Notes:

[35] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.004 [36]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	3.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.3
upper limit	6.8

Notes:

[36] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 4	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [37]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	9.1

Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	5.2
upper limit	13.1

Notes:

[37] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.18 [38]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	2.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.7
upper limit	6.6

Notes:

[38] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [39]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.5
upper limit	12.6

Notes:

[39] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [40]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	19.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	13.9
upper limit	25.5

Notes:

[40] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [41]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	13.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	6.6
upper limit	21.1

Notes:

[41] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [42]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	15.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	8.5
upper limit	23.1

Notes:

[42] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 24	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [43]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	17.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	11.2
upper limit	24.4

Notes:

[43] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 24	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [44]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	14.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	5.9
upper limit	22.4

Notes:

[44] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 24	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [45]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	14
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	5.8
upper limit	22.2

Notes:

[45] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [46]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	13.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	6.9
upper limit	20.5

Notes:

[46] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.2 [47]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.3
upper limit	13.3

Notes:

[47] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 36	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.056 [48]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	15.7

Notes:

[48] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [49]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	18
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	11.3
upper limit	24.8

Notes:

[49] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.01 [50]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	10.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.9
upper limit	18.6

Notes:

[50] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [51]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	15.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	7
upper limit	23.8

Notes:

[51] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved ACR20 Response at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 36, and 52

End point title	Percentage of Participants Who Achieved ACR20 Response at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 36, and 52

End point description:

ACR20 response is achieved when the participant has: ≥ 20% improvement (reduction) from baseline in TJC68, SJC66 and in at least 3 of the following 5 items: PGA and SGA assessed using VAS on a scale of 0-100 [0 and 100 indicating no disease activity and maximum disease activity]; subject`s pain assessment using VAS on a scale of 0-100 [0 and 100 indicating no pain and unbearable pain]; HAQ-DI score contains 20 questions,8 components: dressing/grooming, arising, eating, walking, hygiene, reach, grip and activities and scored on a scale of 0-3 [0 and 3 indicating without difficulty and unable to do]; hsCRP. Participants with missing outcomes were set as non-responders. Participants in the Full Analysis Set were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4, 12, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of participants				
number (confidence interval 95%)				
Week 2	42.1 (37.2 to 46.9)	37.2 (30.4 to 44.0)	39.5 (32.7 to 46.4)	16.6 (12.9 to 20.3)
Week 4	62.3 (57.5 to 67.0)	55.6 (48.5 to 62.6)	52.4 (45.4 to 59.4)	33.4 (28.8 to 38.1)
Week 12	76.7 (72.5 to 80.9)	72.0 (65.6 to 78.3)	71.4 (65.1 to 77.8)	59.4 (54.5 to 64.2)
Week 36	75.5 (71.2 to 79.7)	73.4 (67.2 to 79.7)	76.2 (70.2 to 82.2)	68.3 (63.7 to 72.9)
Week 52	75.0 (70.7 to 79.3)	73.4 (67.2 to 79.7)	74.8 (68.6 to 80.9)	61.8 (57.0 to 66.6)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description: Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [52]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	25.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	19.3
upper limit	31.7

Notes:

[52] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description: Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [53]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	20.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	12.8
upper limit	28.5

Notes:

[53] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [54]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	22.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	15.1
upper limit	30.8

Notes:

[54] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [55]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	28.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	22.1
upper limit	35.6

Notes:

[55] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 4	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [56]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	22.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	13.6
upper limit	30.7

Notes:

[56] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 4	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [57]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	19
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	10.5
upper limit	27.5

Notes:

[57] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 12	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [58]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	17.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	10.8
upper limit	23.8

Notes:

[58] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.002 [59]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	12.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	4.5
upper limit	20.7

Notes:

[59] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.002 [60]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	12.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	4
upper limit	20.1

Notes:

[60] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 36	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.016 [61]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.9
upper limit	13.5

Notes:

[61] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 36	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.18 [62]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	5.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2.7
upper limit	13

Notes:

[62] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 36	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.03 [63]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.3
upper limit	15.6

Notes:

[63] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [64]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	13.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	6.7
upper limit	19.7

Notes:

[64] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.003 [65]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	11.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	3.7
upper limit	19.6

Notes:

[65] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [66]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	13
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	5.1
upper limit	20.8

Notes:

[66] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: HAQ-DI at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: HAQ-DI at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 36, and 52

End point description:

The HAQ-DI score is defined as the average of the scores of eight functional categories (dressing and grooming, arising, eating, walking, hygiene, reach, grip, and other activities), usually completed by the participant. Responses in each functional category are collected as 0 (without any difficulty) to 3 (unable to do a task in that area), with or without aids or devices. The eight category scores are averaged into an overall HAQ-DI score on a scale from 0 (no disability) to 3 (completely disabled). A negative change from baseline indicates improvement (less disability). Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 2, 4, 12, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=414,207,210,416)	1.52 (± 0.622)	1.56 (± 0.654)	1.56 (± 0.655)	1.60 (± 0.625)
Change at Week 2 (N=400,202,202,405)	-0.37 (± 0.495)	-0.36 (± 0.490)	-0.32 (± 0.442)	-0.18 (± 0.426)
Change at Week 4 (N=405,200,205,403)	-0.57 (± 0.587)	-0.45 (± 0.547)	-0.51 (± 0.526)	-0.32 (± 0.511)

Change at Week 12 (N=389,197,193,389)	-0.85 (± 0.698)	-0.77 (± 0.670)	-0.76 (± 0.625)	-0.61 (± 0.582)
Change at Week 36 (N=348,178,179,327)	-0.96 (± 0.725)	-0.93 (± 0.700)	-0.91 (± 0.673)	-0.89 (± 0.675)
Change at Week 52 (N=332,169,171,307)	-1.00 (± 0.728)	-0.97 (± 0.719)	-0.95 (± 0.688)	-0.88 (± 0.685)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [67]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.23
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.29
upper limit	-0.17
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.031

Notes:

[67] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [68]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.28
upper limit	-0.13

Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.038

Notes:

[68] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [69]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.17
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.24
upper limit	-0.09
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.038

Notes:

[69] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [70]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.29
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.35
upper limit	-0.22
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.035

Notes:

[70] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [71]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.15
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.23
upper limit	-0.06
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.043

Notes:

[71] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [72]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.21
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.29
upper limit	-0.12
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.042

Notes:

[72] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [73]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.28
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.35
upper limit	-0.2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.039

Notes:

[73] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [74]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.18
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.28
upper limit	-0.09
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.048

Notes:

[74] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [75]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.17
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.26
upper limit	-0.07
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.048

Notes:

[75] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.002 [76]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.13
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.22
upper limit	-0.05
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.043

Notes:

[76] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.23 [77]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.06
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.17
upper limit	0.04
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.052

Notes:

[77] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.24 [78]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.06
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.16
upper limit	0.04
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.052

Notes:

[78] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [79]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.17
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.25
upper limit	-0.08
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.045

Notes:

[79] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.077 [80]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.2
upper limit	0.01
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.054

Notes:

[80] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.039 [81]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.11
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.22
upper limit	-0.01
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.054

Notes:

[81] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: Tender Joint Count Based on 68 Joints (TJC68) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: Tender Joint Count Based on 68 Joints (TJC68) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

TJC was examined on 68 joints of the fingers, elbows, hips, knees, ankles, and toes distal for pain in response to pressure or passive motion at the study time points. Joint pain was scored as 0 = Absent; 1 = Present for each joint. The overall Tender Joint Count ranged from 0 to 68. A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: tender joint count				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline	26 (± 14.5)	25 (± 13.9)	26 (± 13.7)	26 (± 13.8)
Change at Week 2 (N=402,202,201,405)	-9 (± 10.2)	-8 (± 9.8)	-9 (± 11.2)	-5 (± 9.8)
Change at Week 4 (N=408,201,205,404)	-13 (± 12.1)	-12 (± 10.1)	-13 (± 11.8)	-8 (± 11.5)
Change at Week 12 (N=390,197,193,387)	-18 (± 12.5)	-17 (± 12.4)	-18 (± 12.4)	-15 (± 12.2)
Change at Week 24 (N=374,190,186,370)	-20 (± 12.5)	-20 (± 13.0)	-22 (± 12.4)	-19 (± 12.9)
Change at Week 36 (N=348,178,179,327)	-21 (± 12.6)	-21 (± 12.8)	-23 (± 11.9)	-21 (± 12.7)
Change at Week 52 (N=332,170,171,307)	-22 (± 12.4)	-21 (± 13.0)	-23 (± 12.3)	-21 (± 12.6)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [82]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	-3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.8

Notes:

[82] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [83]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.9

Notes:

[83] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [84]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7
upper limit	-3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.9

Notes:

[84] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [85]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7
upper limit	-4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.7

Notes:

[85] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [86]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	-3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.9

Notes:

[86] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [87]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7
upper limit	-3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.9

Notes:

[87] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [88]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.7

Notes:

[88] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [89]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.8

Notes:

[89] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [90]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.8

Notes:

[90] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [91]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.5

Notes:

[91] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.005 [92]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[92] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [93]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[93] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.063 [94]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.5

Notes:

[94] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.64 [95]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[95] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [96]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[96] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [97]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.5

Notes:

[97] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.095 [98]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[98] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [99]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[99] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: Swollen Joint Count Based on 66 Joints (SJC66) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: Swollen Joint Count Based on 66 Joints (SJC66) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The total SJC66 was based on 66 joints (same 68 joints counted in TJC68 minus hips). It was derived as the sum of all "1s" thus collected with no penalty considered for the joints not assessed or those which had been replaced. The range for SJC66 is 0 to 66. A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: swollen joint count				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline	16.0 (± 9.8)	16.0 (± 9.3)	16.0 (± 9.7)	16.0 (± 9.4)
Change at Week 2 (N=402,202,201,405)	-7.0 (± 8.0)	-6.0 (± 6.9)	-7.0 (± 8.1)	-4.0 (± 7.5)
Change at Week 4 (N=408,201,205,404)	-9.0 (± 8.7)	-9.0 (± 7.6)	-9.0 (± 8.3)	-6.0 (± 9.2)
Change at Week 12 (N=390,197,193,387)	-13.0 (± 8.9)	-12.0 (± 8.1)	-13.0 (± 9.1)	-11.0 (± 8.9)
Change at Week 24 (N=374,190,186,370)	-14.0 (± 8.9)	-14.0 (± 8.8)	-15.0 (± 9.5)	-13.0 (± 8.8)
Change at Week 36 (N=348,178,179,327)	-14.0 (± 9.1)	-14.0 (± 9.4)	-15.0 (± 9.7)	-14.0 (± 8.7)
Change at Week 52 (N=332,170,171,307)	-15.0 (± 9.2)	-14.0 (± 8.9)	-16.0 (± 9.8)	-14.0 (± 9.0)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [100]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[100] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.002 [101]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.7

Notes:

[101] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [102]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.7

Notes:

[102] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [103]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.5

Notes:

[103] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [104]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[104] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [105]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[105] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [106]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.4

Notes:

[106] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [107]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.5

Notes:

[107] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [108]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.5

Notes:

[108] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [109]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.3

Notes:

[109] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [110]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.4

Notes:

[110] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [111]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.4

Notes:

[111] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [112]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.2

Notes:

[112] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.12 [113]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.3

Notes:

[113] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.019 [114]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.3

Notes:

[114] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [115]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.2

Notes:

[115] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.032 [116]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.3

Notes:

[116] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [117]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.3

Notes:

[117] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: Subject's Global Assessment of Disease Activity (SGA) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: Subject's Global Assessment of Disease Activity (SGA) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

SGA was assessed by the participant using a VAS on a scale of 0 (no disease activity) to 100 (maximum disease activity). A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline	65.0 (± 21.0)	66.0 (± 21.6)	68.0 (± 19.2)	66.0 (± 21.0)
Change at Week 2 (N=401,201,202,407)	-17.0 (± 20.8)	-13.0 (± 18.9)	-14.0 (± 20.7)	-7.0 (± 18.9)
Change at Week 4 (N=407,200,205,404)	-26.0 (± 24.7)	-20.0 (± 22.5)	-22.0 (± 24.6)	-14.0 (± 22.2)
Change at Week 12 (N=391,196,192,389)	-37.0 (± 26.7)	-30.0 (± 26.1)	-32.0 (± 27.7)	-25.0 (± 25.9)
Change at Week 24 (N=374,190,184,370)	-42.0 (± 26.8)	-36.0 (± 27.4)	-38.0 (± 26.6)	-34.0 (± 27.4)
Change at Week 36 (N=348,178,179,327)	-43.0 (± 27.2)	-39.0 (± 27.8)	-39.0 (± 24.3)	-38.0 (± 28.0)
Change at Week 52 (N=332,170,171,307)	-45.0 (± 27.0)	-41.0 (± 28.1)	-43.0 (± 25.4)	-38.0 (± 28.3)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	MTX Monotherapy v Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [118]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-11
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-13
upper limit	-8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.3

Notes:

[118] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [119]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-10
upper limit	-4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[119] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [120]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-10
upper limit	-3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[120] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [121]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-12
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-15
upper limit	-10
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.5

Notes:

[121] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.001 [122]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-10
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.8

Notes:

[122] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [123]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-11
upper limit	-4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.8

Notes:

[123] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [124]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-12
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-15
upper limit	-9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[124] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.009 [125]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-9
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2

Notes:

[125] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.003 [126]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-10
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2

Notes:

[126] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [127]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-13
upper limit	-6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[127] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.11 [128]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7
upper limit	1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2

Notes:

[128] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.066 [129]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-8
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2

Notes:

[129] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [130]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-11
upper limit	-4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.7

Notes:

[130] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.4 [131]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.1

Notes:

[131] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.24 [132]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.1

Notes:

[132] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [133]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-12
upper limit	-5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.7

Notes:

[133] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.17 [134]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7
upper limit	1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.1

Notes:

[134] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.008 [135]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-10
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.1

Notes:

[135] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: Physician’s Global Assessment of Disease Activity (PGA) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: Physician’s Global Assessment of Disease Activity (PGA) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

PGA was assessed by the physician using a VAS on a scale of 0 (no disease activity) to 100 (maximum disease activity). A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline	66.0 (± 17.0)	68.0 (± 16.3)	66.0 (± 14.4)	67.0 (± 16.8)
Change at Week 2 (N=397,200,201,401)	-24.0 (± 20.3)	-21.0 (± 19.4)	-23.0 (± 19.9)	-15.0 (± 18.9)
Change at Week 4 (N=402,201,198,402)	-34.0 (± 22.3)	-32.0 (± 22.5)	-30.0 (± 21.9)	-23.0 (± 20.7)
Change at Week 12 (N=388,196,192,385)	-47.0 (± 21.4)	-43.0 (± 22.5)	-42.0 (± 20.8)	-38.0 (± 21.9)
Change at Week 24 (N=372,187,185,364)	-51.0 (± 21.1)	-51.0 (± 22.2)	-49.0 (± 19.5)	-46.0 (± 21.4)
Change at Week 36 (N=347,177,178,324)	-53.0 (± 20.5)	-51.0 (± 22.3)	-52.0 (± 18.6)	-51.0 (± 20.6)
Change at Week 52 (N=332,169,171,307)	-56.0 (± 20.0)	-54.0 (± 20.7)	-55.0 (± 17.5)	-51.0 (± 20.2)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [136]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-12
upper limit	-6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.3

Notes:

[136] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [137]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-9
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[137] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	MTX Monotherapy v Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [138]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-11
upper limit	-5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[138] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [139]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-11
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-13
upper limit	-8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.4

Notes:

[139] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [140]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-11
upper limit	-4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.7

Notes:

[140] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [141]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-11
upper limit	-5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.7

Notes:

[141] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [142]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-12
upper limit	-7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.3

Notes:

[142] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [143]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-9
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[143] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.001 [144]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-8
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[144] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [145]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-8
upper limit	-3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.2

Notes:

[145] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.007 [146]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.5

Notes:

[146] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.046 [147]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.5

Notes:

[147] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.002 [148]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.2

Notes:

[148] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.44 [149]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4
upper limit	2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.4

Notes:

[149] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.21 [150]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5
upper limit	1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.4

Notes:

[150] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	MTX Monotherapy v Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [151]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7
upper limit	-3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.1

Notes:

[151] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.029 [152]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.4

Notes:

[152] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.01 [153]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.4

Notes:

[153] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: Subject`s Pain Assessment at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: Subject`s Pain Assessment at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The participant assessed their pain severity using a VAS on a scale of 0 (no pain) to 100 (severe pain). A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=414,207,210,416)	64.0 (± 22.0)	67.0 (± 22.1)	67.0 (± 18.4)	66.0 (± 21.4)
Change at Week 2 (N=400,202,202,405)	-18.0 (± 22.2)	-15.0 (± 20.3)	-17.0 (± 21.6)	-7.0 (± 20.1)
Change at Week 4 (N=405,200,205,403)	-26.0 (± 24.8)	-22.0 (± 23.7)	-24.0 (± 25.3)	-14.0 (± 23.6)
Change at Week 12 (N=389,197,193,389)	-37.0 (± 27.1)	-31.0 (± 26.9)	-32.0 (± 28.3)	-26.0 (± 27.0)
Change at Week 24 (N=372,190,185,370)	-41.0 (± 28.0)	-37.0 (± 27.8)	-39.0 (± 26.1)	-34.0 (± 27.6)
Change at Week 36 (N=348,178,179,326)	-43.0 (± 28.0)	-40.0 (± 28.8)	-38.0 (± 25.6)	-38.0 (± 29.3)
Change at Week 52 (N=332,169,171,307)	-45.0 (± 27.9)	-43.0 (± 27.9)	-44.0 (± 24.2)	-37.0 (± 30.5)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [154]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-12
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-15
upper limit	-9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.4

Notes:

[154] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [155]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-11
upper limit	-5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.7

Notes:

[155] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [156]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-13
upper limit	-6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.7

Notes:

[156] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [157]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-13
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-16
upper limit	-10
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.5

Notes:

[157] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [158]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-11
upper limit	-4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.9

Notes:

[158] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [159]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-13
upper limit	-6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.9

Notes:

[159] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [160]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-12
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-15
upper limit	-8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.7

Notes:

[160] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.019 [161]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-9
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.1

Notes:

[161] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.007 [162]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-10
upper limit	-2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.1

Notes:

[162] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [163]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-12
upper limit	-5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.7

Notes:

[163] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.13 [164]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7
upper limit	1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2

Notes:

[164] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.047 [165]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-8
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2

Notes:

[165] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [166]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-11
upper limit	-4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.8

Notes:

[166] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.34 [167]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.1

Notes:

[167] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.46 [168]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6
upper limit	3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.1

Notes:

[168] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [169]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-12
upper limit	-5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.8

Notes:

[169] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.03 [170]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-9
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.2

Notes:

[170] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [171]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-12
upper limit	-3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.2

Notes:

[171] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: High-Sensitivity C-Reactive Protein (hsCRP) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in Individual ACR Component: High-Sensitivity C-Reactive Protein (hsCRP) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: mg/L				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline	18.04 (± 25.289)	17.72 (± 27.419)	17.32 (± 23.228)	16.86 (± 24.353)
Change at Week 2 (N=404,200,204,400)	-12.89 (± 23.401)	-9.40 (± 18.930)	-10.97 (± 20.249)	-0.99 (± 14.392)
Change at Week 4 (N=404,200,203,402)	-13.79 (± 23.569)	-11.53 (± 20.596)	-10.95 (± 23.319)	-3.18 (± 18.534)
Change at Week 12 (N=388,196,190,383)	-13.77 (± 23.585)	-11.02 (± 20.272)	-12.04 (± 24.690)	-7.23 (± 21.823)
Change at Week 24 (N=374,190,186,368)	-13.43 (± 27.086)	-10.85 (± 24.458)	-12.66 (± 24.525)	-7.47 (± 23.511)
Change at Week 36 (N=348,177,177,321)	-12.99 (± 26.823)	-12.64 (± 22.736)	-11.52 (± 26.863)	-8.74 (± 23.579)
Change at Week 52 (N=332,170,170,307)	-13.84 (± 25.180)	-11.61 (± 23.857)	-12.29 (± 23.090)	-7.96 (± 23.835)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	MTX Monotherapy v Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [172]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-10.78
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-12.71
upper limit	-8.85
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.983

Notes:

[172] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [173]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-8.76
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-11.13
upper limit	-6.39
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.207

Notes:

[173] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [174]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-9.64
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-12
upper limit	-7.29
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.2

Notes:

[174] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [175]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-9.92
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-11.65
upper limit	-8.19
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.884

Notes:

[175] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [176]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-8.34
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-10.47
upper limit	-6.21
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.086

Notes:

[176] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [177]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-7.33
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-9.45
upper limit	-5.21
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.08

Notes:

[177] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [178]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5.98
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.56
upper limit	-4.39
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.808

Notes:

[178] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [179]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4.21
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6.14
upper limit	-2.27
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.987

Notes:

[179] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [180]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4.34
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6.29
upper limit	-2.39
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.993

Notes:

[180] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [181]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5.27
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.24
upper limit	-3.31
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.003

Notes:

[181] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.007 [182]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3.29
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5.68
upper limit	-0.89
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.222

Notes:

[182] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [183]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4.61
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.02
upper limit	-2.2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.229

Notes:

[183] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [184]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3.44
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5.35
upper limit	-1.53
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.974

Notes:

[184] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.004 [185]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5.72
upper limit	-1.09
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.18

Notes:

[185] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.072 [186]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2.12
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.44
upper limit	0.19
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.18

Notes:

[186] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [187]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4.79
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6.34
upper limit	-3.24
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.789

Notes:

[187] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.002 [188]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3.01
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.88
upper limit	-1.13
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.957

Notes:

[188] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [189]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3.77
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5.65
upper limit	-1.89
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.957

Notes:

[189] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved an Improvement (Decrease) in the HAQ-DI Score ≥ 0.22 at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Percentage of Participants Who Achieved an Improvement (Decrease) in the HAQ-DI Score ≥ 0.22 at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The HAQ-DI score is defined as the average of the scores of eight functional categories (dressing and grooming, arising, eating, walking, hygiene, reach, grip, and other activities), usually completed by the participant. Responses in each functional category are collected as 0-3 [0 (without any difficulty) to 3 (unable to do a task in that area), with or without aids or devices. The eight category scores are averaged into an overall HAQ-DI score on a scale from 0-3 [0 (no disability) to 3 (completely disabled)] when 6 or more categories are non-missing, so total possible score is 3. Improvement is defined as reduction in HAQ-DI, (baseline value - postbaseline value) ≥ 0.22. If more than 2 categories are missing, the HAQ-DI score is set to missing. Participants with missing outcomes were set as non-responders. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of participants				
number (confidence interval 95%)				
Week 2 (N=402,200,204,410)	61.9 (57.1 to 66.8)	58.5 (51.4 to 65.6)	53.9 (46.8 to 61.0)	42.2 (37.3 to 47.1)
Week 4 (N=402,200,204,410)	72.4 (67.9 to 76.9)	61.0 (54.0 to 68.0)	68.6 (62.0 to 75.2)	53.9 (49.0 to 58.8)
Week 12 (N=402,200,204,410)	80.3 (76.3 to 84.4)	74.5 (68.2 to 80.8)	74.0 (67.8 to 80.3)	69.8 (65.2 to 74.3)
Week 24 (N=402,200,204,410)	76.6 (72.4 to 80.9)	78.5 (72.6 to 84.4)	77.0 (70.9 to 83.0)	73.9 (69.5 to 78.3)
Week 36 (N=402,200,204,410)	73.4 (68.9 to 77.8)	76.5 (70.4 to 82.6)	73.5 (67.2 to 79.8)	67.1 (62.4 to 71.7)

Week 52 (N=402,200,204,410)	70.9 (66.3 to 75.5)	71.5 (65.0 to 78.0)	70.6 (64.1 to 77.1)	61.0 (56.1 to 65.8)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 2	
Comparison groups	MTX Monotherapy v Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [190]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	19.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	12.8
upper limit	26.7

Notes:

[190] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [191]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	16.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	7.6
upper limit	25

Notes:

[191] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.004 [192]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	11.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	3
upper limit	20.4

Notes:

[192] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [193]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	18.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	11.7
upper limit	25.2

Notes:

[193] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.083 [194]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.6
upper limit	15.8

Notes:

[194] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 4	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [195]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	14.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	6.4
upper limit	23.1

Notes:

[195] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 12	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [196]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	10.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	4.4
upper limit	16.7

Notes:

[196] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 12	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.22 [197]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	4.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.1
upper limit	12.6

Notes:

[197] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.25 [198]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	4.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.6
upper limit	12.1

Notes:

[198] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.35 [199]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	2.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.5
upper limit	8.9

Notes:

[199] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 24	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.2 [200]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	4.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2.9
upper limit	12.1

Notes:

[200] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 24	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.36 [201]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	3.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.5
upper limit	10.6

Notes:

[201] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 36	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.043 [202]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	6.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.2
upper limit	12.8

Notes:

[202] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.015 [203]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	9.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.6
upper limit	17.2

Notes:

[203] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36

Comparison groups	MTX Monotherapy v Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.085 [204]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	6.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.5
upper limit	14.4

Notes:

[204] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.002 [205]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	9.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	3.2
upper limit	16.6

Notes:

[205] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.01 [206]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	10.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.3
upper limit	18.7

Notes:

[206] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.014 [207]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	9.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.4
upper limit	17.8

Notes:

[207] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in DAS28 (CRP) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in DAS28 (CRP) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The DAS28 score is a measure of the participant's disease activity calculated using the TJC (28 joints), SJC (28 joints), Patient's Global Assessment of Disease Activity (VAS: 0 = no disease activity to 100 = maximum disease activity), and CRP for a total possible score of 1 to 9.4. Higher values indicate higher disease activity. A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline	5.7 (± 0.99)	5.7 (± 1.04)	5.8 (± 0.94)	5.7 (± 1.00)
Change at Week 2 (N=399,199,200,396)	-1.3 (± 1.06)	-1.1 (± 0.92)	-1.4 (± 1.12)	-0.6 (± 0.87)
Change at Week 4 (N=403,199,202,401)	-1.9 (± 1.26)	-1.6 (± 1.14)	-1.8 (± 1.20)	-1.0 (± 1.04)
Change at Week 12 (N=386,195,189,380)	-2.7 (± 1.31)	-2.5 (± 1.28)	-2.6 (± 1.26)	-1.9 (± 1.21)
Change at Week 24 (N=374,190,183,368)	-3.2 (± 1.31)	-2.9 (± 1.30)	-3.0 (± 1.16)	-2.5 (± 1.29)
Change at Week 36 (N=347,177,177,321)	-3.3 (± 1.28)	-3.0 (± 1.26)	-3.2 (± 1.12)	-2.9 (± 1.22)
Change at Week 52 (N=332,170,169,307)	-3.4 (± 1.23)	-3.1 (± 1.24)	-3.3 (± 1.11)	-2.8 (± 1.29)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [208]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.9
upper limit	-0.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.07

Notes:

[208] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	MTX Monotherapy v Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [209]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.7
upper limit	-0.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.08

Notes:

[209] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the

repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [210]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.9
upper limit	-0.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.08

Notes:

[210] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [211]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.1
upper limit	-0.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.08

Notes:

[211] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [212]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.9
upper limit	-0.5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.09

Notes:

[212] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [213]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	-0.7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.09

Notes:

[213] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [214]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	-0.7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.08

Notes:

[214] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [215]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.8
upper limit	-0.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.1

Notes:

[215] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [216]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.9
upper limit	-0.5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.1

Notes:

[216] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [217]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.9
upper limit	-0.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.08

Notes:

[217] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [218]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.7
upper limit	-0.3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.1

Notes:

[218] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [219]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.7
upper limit	-0.3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.1

Notes:

[219] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [220]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.6
upper limit	-0.3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.08

Notes:

[220] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.033 [221]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.4
upper limit	0
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.1

Notes:

[221] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [222]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.6
upper limit	-0.2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.1

Notes:

[222] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [223]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.8
upper limit	-0.5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.08

Notes:

[223] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [224]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.6
upper limit	-0.2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.1

Notes:

[224] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [225]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.7
upper limit	-0.3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.1

Notes:

[225] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved DAS28 (CRP) ≤ 3.2 at Weeks 4, 12, 24, and 52

End point title	Percentage of Participants Who Achieved DAS28 (CRP) ≤ 3.2 at Weeks 4, 12, 24, and 52

End point description:

The DAS28 score is a measure of the participant's disease activity calculated using the tender joint counts (28 joints), swollen joint counts (28 joints), Patient's Global Assessment of Disease Activity (visual analog scale: 0 = no disease activity to 100 = maximum disease activity), and CRP for a total possible score of 1 to 9.4. Higher values indicate higher disease activity. Participants with missing outcomes were set as non-responders. Participants in the Full Analysis Set were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 4, 12, 24, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of participants				
number (confidence interval 95%)				
Week 4	30.8 (26.2 to 35.3)	23.7 (17.6 to 29.7)	31.9 (25.4 to 38.4)	12.0 (8.8 to 15.3)
Week 12	55.8 (50.9 to 60.7)	50.2 (43.2 to 57.3)	48.1 (41.1 to 55.1)	28.6 (24.1 to 33.1)
Week 24	68.8 (64.2 to 73.3)	62.8 (56.0 to 69.6)	60.0 (53.1 to 66.9)	46.2 (41.2 to 51.1)
Week 52	69.0 (64.4 to 73.6)	59.9 (53.0 to 66.8)	65.7 (59.1 to 72.4)	47.6 (42.7 to 52.5)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 4	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [226]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	18.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	13.1
upper limit	24.4

Notes:

[226] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 4	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [227]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	11.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	4.7
upper limit	18.6

Notes:

[227] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [228]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	19.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	12.5
upper limit	27.3

Notes:

[228] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [229]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	27.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	20.5
upper limit	33.9

Notes:

[229] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 12	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [230]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	21.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	13.2
upper limit	30.1

Notes:

[230] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 12	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [231]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	19.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	11.1
upper limit	27.9

Notes:

[231] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 24	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [232]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	22.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	15.8
upper limit	29.4

Notes:

[232] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [233]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	16.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	8.1
upper limit	25.2

Notes:

[233] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [234]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	13.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	5.3
upper limit	22.4

Notes:

[234] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [235]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	21.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	14.6
upper limit	28.2

Notes:

[235] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.003 [236]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	12.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	3.7
upper limit	20.9

Notes:

[236] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	MTX Monotherapy v Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [237]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	18.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	9.7
upper limit	26.5

Notes:

[237] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved DAS28 (CRP) < 2.6 at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 36, and 52

End point title	Percentage of Participants Who Achieved DAS28 (CRP) < 2.6 at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 36, and 52

End point description:

The DAS28 score is a measure of the participant's disease activity calculated using the tender joint counts (28 joints), swollen joint counts (28 joints), Patient's Global Assessment of Disease Activity (visual analog scale: 0 = no disease activity to 100 = maximum disease activity), and CRP for a total possible score of 1 to 9.4. Higher values indicate higher disease activity. Participants with missing outcomes were set as non-responders. Participants in the Full Analysis Set were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4, 12, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of participants				
number (confidence interval 95%)				
Week 2	7.2 (4.6 to 9.8)	4.3 (1.3 to 7.4)	10.0 (5.7 to 14.3)	1.0 (0.0 to 2.0)
Week 4	16.6 (12.9 to 20.3)	15.0 (9.9 to 20.1)	19.5 (13.9 to 25.1)	4.8 (2.6 to 7.0)
Week 12	39.7 (34.8 to 44.5)	31.9 (25.3 to 38.5)	29.5 (23.1 to 35.9)	17.1 (13.3 to 20.8)
Week 36	52.6 (47.7 to 57.6)	42.0 (35.1 to 49.0)	43.3 (36.4 to 50.3)	34.4 (29.7 to 39.1)
Week 52	53.4 (48.5 to 58.3)	43.0 (36.0 to 50.0)	46.2 (39.2 to 53.2)	31.5 (26.9 to 36.1)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [238]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	6.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	3.4
upper limit	9.1

Notes:

[238] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.01 [239]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	3.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.1
upper limit	6.7

Notes:

[239] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 2	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [240]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	9

Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	4.5
upper limit	13.6

Notes:

[240] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	MTX Monotherapy v Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [241]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	11.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	7.4
upper limit	16.1

Notes:

[241] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [242]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	10.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	4.5
upper limit	15.8

Notes:

[242] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [243]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	14.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	8.6
upper limit	20.8

Notes:

[243] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [244]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	22.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	16.4
upper limit	28.8

Notes:

[244] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [245]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	14.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	7.1
upper limit	22.5

Notes:

[245] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 12	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [246]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	12.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	4.9
upper limit	20

Notes:

[246] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 36	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [247]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	18.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	11.4
upper limit	25.1

Notes:

[247] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 36	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.056 [248]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.8
upper limit	16.1

Notes:

[248] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.023 [249]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.5
upper limit	17.4

Notes:

[249] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [250]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	21.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	15.1
upper limit	28.7

Notes:

[250] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.004 [251]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	11.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	3.1
upper limit	20

Notes:

[251] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [252]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	14.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	6.3
upper limit	23.1

Notes:

[252] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups and stratification factors in the model.

Secondary: ACR N Percent Improvement (ACR-N) Response at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	ACR N Percent Improvement (ACR-N) Response at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

ACR-N is defined as the smallest percentage improvement from baseline in swollen joints, tender joints and the median of the following 5 items (PGA, SGA, subject`s pain assessment, HAQ-DI and CRP). It has a range between 0 and 100%. PGA and SGA assessed using VAS on a scale of 0-100 [0 and 100 indicating no disease activity and maximum disease activity]; subject`s pain assessment using VAS on a scale of 0-100 [0 and 100 indicating no pain and unbearable pain]; HAQ-DI score contains 20 questions,8 components: dressing/grooming, arising, eating, walking, hygiene, reach, grip and activities

scored on a scale of 0-3 [0 and 3 indicating without difficulty and unable to do]. If this calculation results in a negative value, then the ACR-N is set to 0. The ACR-N value indicates an improvement of N%, with higher numbers indicating greater improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percent improvement				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Week 2 (N=386,191,197,387)	20.8 (± 21.42)	17.8 (± 20.07)	20.9 (± 23.19)	8.9 (± 14.95)
Week 4 (N=389,192,193,395)	34.1 (± 27.78)	27.6 (± 24.81)	29.4 (± 27.86)	17.2 (± 21.43)
Week 12 (N=377,188,185,375)	52.6 (± 29.91)	46.1 (± 31.46)	48.6 (± 30.50)	34.3 (± 28.07)
Week 24 (N=365,181,180,359)	62.8 (± 28.40)	58.1 (± 30.19)	59.7 (± 29.35)	49.0 (± 29.46)
Week 36 (N=341,170,173,315)	65.8 (± 28.50)	58.7 (± 30.99)	62.1 (± 28.12)	57.3 (± 29.16)
Week 52 (N=327,163,166,304)	69.6 (± 27.38)	63.6 (± 29.19)	67.4 (± 26.60)	57.1 (± 29.59)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Number of Participants With European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) Response at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Number of Participants With European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) Response at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

Good Response: DAS28(CRP) at visit ≤3.2 and improvement from baseline >1.2. Moderate Response: DAS28(CRP) at visit ≤3.2 and improvement from baseline >0.6 and ≤1.2; DAS28(CRP) at visit >3.2 and ≤5.1 and improvement from baseline >0.6; DAS 28(CRP) at visit >5.1 and improvement from baseline >1.2. No Response: DAS28(CRP) at visit ≤5.1 and improvement from baseline ≤0.6; DAS 28(CRP) >5.1 at visit and improvement from baseline ≤1.2. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analyzed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: participants				
Week 2: Good Response (N=399,199,200,396)	66	21	35	20
Week 2: Moderate Response (N=399,199,200,396)	199	92	88	118
Week 2: No Response (N=399,199,200,396)	134	86	77	258
Week 4: Good Response (N=403,199,202,401)	120	45	63	45
Week 4: Moderate Response (N=403,199,202,401)	206	104	97	161
Week 4: No Response (N=403,199,202,401)	77	50	42	195
Week 12: Good Response (N=386,195,189,380)	230	100	98	116
Week 12: Moderate Response (N=386,195,189,380)	130	79	77	190
Week 12: No Response (N=386,195,189,380)	26	16	14	74
Week 24: Good Response (N=374,190,183,368)	283	127	126	186
Week 24: Moderate Response (N=374,190,183,368)	82	55	52	153
Week 24: No Response (N=374,190,183,368)	9	8	5	29
Week 36: Good Response (N=347,177,177,321)	276	118	124	208
Week 36: Moderate Response (N=347,177,177,321)	64	54	51	106
Week 36: No Response (N=347,177,177,321)	7	5	2	7
Week 52: Good Response (N=332,170,169,307)	286	123	136	194
Week 52: Moderate Response (N=332,170,169,307)	43	43	30	102
Week 52: No Response (N=332,170,169,307)	3	4	3	11

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Clinical Disease Activity Index (CDAI) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in Clinical Disease Activity Index (CDAI) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

CDAI is calculated using formula: CDAI = TJC28 + SJC28 + SGA + PGA. PGA and SGA are assessed using a VAS on a scale of 0-10 [0 and 10 indicating no disease activity and maximum disease activity]. CDAI can range from 0 to 76, with higher score indicating more severe disease activity status. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline	39.5 (± 12.77)	39.2 (± 12.69)	40.0 (± 12.63)	40.2 (± 12.50)
Change at Week 2 (N=396,199,201,401)	-13.6 (± 12.05)	-12.0 (± 10.54)	-13.9 (± 12.53)	-8.5 (± 11.33)
Change at Week 4 (N=401,200,198,402)	-19.9 (± 13.64)	-17.8 (± 12.06)	-18.4 (± 12.96)	-13.3 (± 12.61)
Change at Week 12 (N=388,195,191,384)	-27.8 (± 13.60)	-26.1 (± 13.00)	-27.5 (± 13.55)	-22.7 (± 13.38)
Change at Week 24 (N=372,187,184,364)	-31.3 (± 13.19)	-30.0 (± 13.32)	-31.3 (± 12.57)	-28.2 (± 13.43)
Change at Week 36 (N=347,177,178,324)	-32.2 (± 13.37)	-30.8 (± 12.84)	-32.7 (± 12.16)	-31.3 (± 12.66)
Change at Week 52 (N=332,169,171,307)	-33.8 (± 13.00)	-31.9 (± 12.22)	-33.6 (± 12.28)	-31.2 (± 13.12)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [253]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.3
upper limit	-4.1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.82

Notes:

[253] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [254]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6.4
upper limit	-2.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.01

Notes:

[254] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [255]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.7
upper limit	-3.7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.01

Notes:

[255] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [256]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-7.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-8.9
upper limit	-5.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.83

Notes:

[256] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [257]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.3
upper limit	-3.3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.02

Notes:

[257] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [258]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.8
upper limit	-3.7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.02

Notes:

[258] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [259]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.3
upper limit	-4.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.72

Notes:

[259] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [260]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6.1
upper limit	-2.7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.88

Notes:

[260] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [261]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6.8
upper limit	-3.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.88

Notes:

[261] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [262]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5.3
upper limit	-2.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.61

Notes:

[262] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [263]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.3
upper limit	-1.3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.75

Notes:

[263] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [264]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.4
upper limit	-1.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.75

Notes:

[264] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [265]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.4
upper limit	-1.1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.59

Notes:

[265] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.36 [266]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2
upper limit	0.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.71

Notes:

[266] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.009 [267]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.3
upper limit	-0.5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.72

Notes:

[267] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [268]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.5
upper limit	-2.2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.56

Notes:

[268] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.042 [269]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2.7
upper limit	-0.1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.69

Notes:

[269] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [270]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.7
upper limit	-1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.69

Notes:

[270] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Simplified Disease Activity Index (SDAI) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in Simplified Disease Activity Index (SDAI) at Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

SDAI is a composite measure that sums the TJC28, SJC28, SGA, PGA, and the hsCRP (in mg/dL). PGA and SGA assessed using VAS on a scale of 0-10 [0 and 10 indicating no disease activity and maximum disease activity]. Higher score indicates more severe disease activity status and total possible score is 86. A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 2, 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline	41.3 (± 13.41)	41.0 (± 13.53)	41.8 (± 13.09)	41.9 (± 13.39)
Change at Week 2 (N=394,197,200,392)	-14.9 (± 12.45)	-12.9 (± 10.84)	-15.0 (± 12.82)	-8.6 (± 11.49)
Change at Week 4 (N=397,199,196,399)	-21.3 (± 14.17)	-19.0 (± 12.58)	-19.6 (± 13.38)	-13.7 (± 12.83)
Change at Week 12 (N=384,194,188,378)	-29.2 (± 14.05)	-27.1 (± 13.59)	-28.6 (± 14.02)	-23.5 (± 13.82)
Change at Week 24 (N=372,187,183,362)	-32.7 (± 13.83)	-31.1 (± 14.09)	-32.7 (± 13.14)	-29.0 (± 14.09)
Change at Week 36 (N=346,176,176,318)	-33.5 (± 14.02)	-32.1 (± 13.61)	-33.9 (± 12.67)	-32.3 (± 13.47)
Change at Week 52 (N=332,169,169,307)	-35.2 (± 13.68)	-33.0 (± 13.12)	-35.0 (± 12.69)	-32.0 (± 14.14)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [271]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-8.5
upper limit	-5.2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.85

Notes:

[271] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [272]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.3
upper limit	-3.3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.04

Notes:

[272] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 2; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [273]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-8.8
upper limit	-4.7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.03

Notes:

[273] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [274]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-8.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-9.9
upper limit	-6.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.85

Notes:

[274] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [275]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-8.2
upper limit	-4.1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.04

Notes:

[275] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [276]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-8.5
upper limit	-4.5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.04

Notes:

[276] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [277]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-6.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-8
upper limit	-5.1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.74

Notes:

[277] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [278]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6.5
upper limit	-3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.9

Notes:

[278] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [279]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-5.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.4
upper limit	-3.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.9

Notes:

[279] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [280]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-4.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5.9
upper limit	-3.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.64

Notes:

[280] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [281]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.6
upper limit	-1.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.78

Notes:

[281] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [282]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.9
upper limit	-1.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.79

Notes:

[282] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [283]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.8
upper limit	-1.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.61

Notes:

[283] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	MTX Monotherapy v Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.23 [284]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2.4
upper limit	0.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.74

Notes:

[284] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.005 [285]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.6
upper limit	-0.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.75

Notes:

[285] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [286]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-3.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5
upper limit	-2.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[286] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.021 [287]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-1.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.1
upper limit	-0.3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.73

Notes:

[287] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [288]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-2.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.3
upper limit	-1.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.73

Notes:

[288] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants With no Radiographic Progression From Baseline at Weeks 24, and 52

End point title	Percentage of Participants With no Radiographic Progression From Baseline at Weeks 24, and 52

End point description:

Participant`s radiographs of bilateral hands, wrists and feet are taken and evaluated through central review using the mTSS method. No radiographic progression is defined by the change from baseline in mTSS and is reported for the following categories: Change in mTSS ≤ 0.5, Change in mTSS ≤ 0 and Change in mTSS ≤ smallest detectable change (SDC). Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 24, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of participants				
number (confidence interval 95%)				
Week(Wk)24:Change in mTSS ≤ 0.5(N=355,184,173,356)	89.6 (86.3 to 92.9)	87.0 (81.8 to 92.1)	89.6 (84.8 to 94.4)	82.0 (77.9 to 86.2)
Wk 24: Change in mTSS ≤ 0 (N=355,184,173,356)	80.6 (76.3 to 84.8)	76.6 (70.2 to 83.0)	82.7 (76.7 to 88.6)	72.5 (67.7 to 77.3)
Wk 24:Change in mTSS≤SDC(1.53) (N=355,184,173,356	95.2 (92.8 to 97.6)	93.5 (89.6 to 97.3)	96.0 (92.7 to 99.2)	91.6 (88.5 to 94.6)
Wk 52: Change in mTSS ≤ 0.5 (N=345,176,166,330)	88.1 (84.6 to 91.7)	85.8 (80.4 to 91.2)	84.3 (78.5 to 90.2)	77.9 (73.2 to 82.5)
Wk 52: Change in mTSS ≤ 0 (N=345,176,166,330)	80.6 (76.3 to 84.9)	76.1 (69.6 to 82.7)	77.1 (70.4 to 83.8)	70.6 (65.5 to 75.7)
Wk 52:Change in mTSS≤SDC(1.77) (N=345,176,166,330)	94.2 (91.6 to 96.8)	94.9 (91.3 to 98.4)	89.2 (84.1 to 94.2)	86.7 (82.8 to 90.5)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description: Week 24 for Change in mTSS <= 0.5	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.006 [289]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.2
upper limit	12.9

Notes:

[289] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description: Week 24 for Change in mTSS <= 0.5	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.16 [290]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	4.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.8
upper limit	11.6

Notes:

[290] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24 for Change in mTSS <= 0.5

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.029 [291]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.1
upper limit	14.1

Notes:

[291] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24 for Change in mTSS <= 0

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.015 [292]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	8.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.6
upper limit	14.6

Notes:

[292] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 24 for Change in mTSS <= 0	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.33 [293]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	4.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.9
upper limit	12.2

Notes:

[293] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 24 for Change in mTSS <= 0	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.013 [294]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	10.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.5
upper limit	17.9

Notes:

[294] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 24 for Change in mTSS <= SDC (1.53)	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.074 [295]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	3.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.3
upper limit	7.6

Notes:

[295] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24 for Change in mTSS <= SDC (1.53)

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.49 [296]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	1.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.1
upper limit	6.9

Notes:

[296] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24 for Change in mTSS <= SDC (1.53)

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.075 [297]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	4.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.2
upper limit	8.9

Notes:

[297] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, and stratification factors in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52 for Change in mTSS <= 0.5	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [298]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	10.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	4.3
upper limit	16.2

Notes:

[298] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, stratification factors and campaign groups in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52 for Change in mTSS <= 0.5	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.045 [299]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.7
upper limit	15.2

Notes:

[299] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, stratification factors and campaign groups in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52 for Change in mTSS <= 0.5	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.1 [300]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	6.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.1
upper limit	14

Notes:

[300] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, stratification factors and campaign groups in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52 for Change in mTSS <= 0	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.004 [301]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	10
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	3.2
upper limit	16.7

Notes:

[301] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, stratification factors and campaign groups in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52 for Change in mTSS <= 0	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.25 [302]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	5.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2.9
upper limit	14

Notes:

[302] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, stratification factors and campaign groups in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52 for Change in mTSS <= 0	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.14 [303]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	6.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2
upper limit	15

Notes:

[303] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, stratification factors and campaign groups in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52 for Change in mTSS <= SDC (1.77)	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.002 [304]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	7.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.8
upper limit	12.3

Notes:

[304] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, stratification factors and campaign groups in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy
Statistical analysis description:	
Week 52 for Change in mTSS <= SDC (1.77)	
Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.008 [305]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	8.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.9
upper limit	13.6

Notes:

[305] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, stratification factors and campaign groups in the model.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52 for Change in mTSS <= SDC (1.77)

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.47 [306]
Method	Regression, Logistic
Parameter estimate	Difference in Response Rates
Point estimate	2.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.9
upper limit	8.9

Notes:

[306] - P-value was calculated from the logistic regression with treatment groups, stratification factors and campaign groups in the model.

Secondary: 36-Item Short Form Survey (SF-36) Physical Component Summary (PCS) Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	36-Item Short Form Survey (SF-36) Physical Component Summary (PCS) Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The SF-36 is a 36-item, self-reported, generic, comprehensive, and health-related quality of life questionnaire based on 8 health domains in 2 components: physical well-being (physical functioning, role-physical, bodily pain, general health perceptions), mental well-being (vitality, social functioning, role-emotional, and mental health). Each domain is scored by summing the individual items and transforming the scores into a 0 to 100 scale with highest possible score of 100. Higher scores indicate better health status or functioning. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Week 4 (N=408,203,205,411)	40.6 (± 8.04)	39.2 (± 8.86)	39.6 (± 8.46)	37.0 (± 8.13)
Week 12 (N=394,198,195,389)	45.0 (± 8.42)	42.9 (± 9.71)	42.7 (± 9.90)	40.9 (± 8.10)
Week 24 (N=375,190,187,371)	46.3 (± 8.16)	44.8 (± 9.39)	44.1 (± 9.42)	43.0 (± 8.36)
Week 36 (N=348,178,179,327)	46.6 (± 8.17)	45.2 (± 9.42)	45.0 (± 8.89)	44.4 (± 8.39)
Week 52 (N=333,169,172,307)	47.4 (± 8.35)	45.6 (± 9.02)	45.9 (± 9.40)	44.5 (± 8.32)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in SF-36 PCS Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in SF-36 PCS Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The SF-36 is a 36-item, self-reported, generic, comprehensive, and health-related quality of life questionnaire based on 8 health domains in 2 components: physical well-being (physical functioning, role-physical, bodily pain, general health perceptions), mental well-being (vitality, social functioning, role-emotional, and mental health). Each domain is scored by summing the individual items and transforming the scores into a 0 to 100 scale with highest possible score of 100. Higher scores indicate better health status or functioning. Positive change in value indicates improvement and better quality of life. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=414,207,208,416)	33.9 (± 7.48)	33.7 (± 8.00)	33.6 (± 7.70)	33.3 (± 7.28)
Change at Week 4 (N=406,203,203,411)	6.8 (± 6.86)	5.3 (± 6.90)	5.9 (± 7.53)	3.8 (± 6.38)
Change at Week 12 (N=392,198,193,389)	11.2 (± 8.66)	9.1 (± 8.82)	8.9 (± 9.17)	7.6 (± 7.64)
Change at Week 24 (N=373,190,185,371)	12.3 (± 8.89)	11.1 (± 9.00)	10.4 (± 9.09)	9.7 (± 8.62)
Change at Week 36 (N=346,178,177,327)	12.4 (± 9.30)	11.7 (± 8.52)	11.2 (± 8.54)	11.3 (± 9.04)
Change at Week 52 (N=331,169,170,307)	13.4 (± 9.62)	12.0 (± 8.47)	11.9 (± 9.22)	11.2 (± 9.49)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [307]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	3.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.4
upper limit	4.1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.45

Notes:

[307] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.001 [308]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.7
upper limit	2.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.55

Notes:

[308] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [309]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.3
upper limit	3.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.55

Notes:

[309] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [310]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	3.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.7
upper limit	4.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.54

Notes:

[310] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.008 [311]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.5
upper limit	3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.66

Notes:

[311] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.023 [312]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.2
upper limit	2.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.66

Notes:

[312] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [313]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.8
upper limit	4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.56

Notes:

[313] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.019 [314]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.3
upper limit	2.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.68

Notes:

[314] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.23 [315]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.5
upper limit	2.2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.69

Notes:

[315] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.003 [316]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.6
upper limit	2.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.59

Notes:

[316] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.38 [317]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.8
upper limit	2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.71

Notes:

[317] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.59 [318]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	1.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.72

Notes:

[318] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [319]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.6
upper limit	4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.62

Notes:

[319] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.11 [320]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.3
upper limit	2.7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.76

Notes:

[320] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.071 [321]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.1
upper limit	2.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.76

Notes:

[321] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS) Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The SF-36 is a 36-item, self-reported, generic, comprehensive, and health-related quality of life questionnaire based on 8 health domains in 2 components: physical well-being (physical functioning, role-physical, bodily pain, general health perceptions), mental well-being (vitality, social functioning, role-emotional, and mental health). Each domain is scored by summing the individual items and transforming the scores into a 0 to 100 scale with highest possible score of 100. Higher scores indicate better health status or functioning. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Week 4 (N=408,203,205,411)	48.7 (± 9.73)	46.9 (± 10.42)	47.5 (± 10.46)	45.5 (± 11.38)
Week 12 (N=394,198,195,389)	49.9 (± 9.49)	49.2 (± 9.99)	48.8 (± 10.85)	48.1 (± 10.26)
Week 24 (N=375,190,187,371)	50.1 (± 9.61)	50.1 (± 10.34)	49.2 (± 10.11)	49.4 (± 10.25)
Week 36 (N=348,178,179,327)	51.1 (± 9.38)	50.6 (± 10.26)	49.1 (± 9.61)	49.9 (± 10.20)
Week 52 (N=333,169,172,307)	50.9 (± 9.32)	50.0 (± 10.08)	49.7 (± 10.00)	50.2 (± 9.64)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in SF-36 MCS Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in SF-36 MCS Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The SF-36 is a 36-item, self-reported, generic, comprehensive, and health-related quality of life questionnaire based on 8 health domains in 2 components: physical well-being (physical functioning, role-physical, bodily pain, general health perceptions), mental well-being (vitality, social functioning, role-emotional, and mental health). Each domain is scored by summing the individual items and transforming the scores into a 0 to 100 scale with highest possible score of 100. Higher scores indicate better health status or functioning. Positive change in value indicates improvement and better quality of life. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=414,207,208,416)	44.6 (± 10.60)	43.2 (± 11.47)	43.1 (± 11.27)	43.5 (± 11.50)
Change at Week 4 (N=406,203,203,411)	4.1 (± 9.32)	3.6 (± 8.93)	4.5 (± 9.59)	1.9 (± 9.22)
Change at Week 12 (N=392,198,193,389)	5.3 (± 10.00)	5.7 (± 10.04)	5.5 (± 10.87)	4.5 (± 10.26)
Change at Week 24 (N=373,190,185,371)	5.4 (± 10.45)	6.6 (± 10.89)	5.8 (± 11.26)	6.0 (± 10.95)
Change at Week 36 (N=346,178,177,327)	6.5 (± 10.68)	7.3 (± 11.17)	5.4 (± 11.66)	6.2 (± 10.96)
Change at Week 52 (N=331,169,170,307)	6.2 (± 10.74)	6.8 (± 11.47)	6.1 (± 11.26)	6.5 (± 11.11)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [322]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.6
upper limit	3.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.57

Notes:

[322] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.032 [323]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.1
upper limit	2.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.7

Notes:

[323] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [324]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1
upper limit	3.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.7

Notes:

[324] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.023 [325]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.2
upper limit	2.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.6

Notes:

[325] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.065 [326]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.1
upper limit	2.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.74

Notes:

[326] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.15 [327]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.4
upper limit	2.5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.74

Notes:

[327] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.73 [328]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	1.5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.64

Notes:

[328] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.37 [329]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.8
upper limit	2.2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.78

Notes:

[329] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.83 [330]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.7
upper limit	1.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.78

Notes:

[330] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.073 [331]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.1
upper limit	2.5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.66

Notes:

[331] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.09 [332]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.2
upper limit	2.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.8

Notes:

[332] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.68 [333]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.9
upper limit	1.2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.81

Notes:

[333] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.3 [334]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.6
upper limit	2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.67

Notes:

[334] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.69 [335]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.3
upper limit	1.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.82

Notes:

[335] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.95 [336]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	-0.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.7
upper limit	1.5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.82

Notes:

[336] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy (FACIT)-Fatigue Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy (FACIT)-Fatigue Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

FACIT-Fatigue scale is a brief, 13-item, symptom-specific questionnaire that specifically assesses the self-reported severity of fatigue and its impact upon daily activities and functioning in the past 7 days. The FACIT-Fatigue uses 0 (not at all) to 4 (very much) numeric rating scale for a total possible score of 52. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Week 4 (N=404,201,200,408)	35.2 (± 9.82)	34.1 (± 10.75)	34.2 (± 10.52)	31.4 (± 10.87)
Week 12 (N=386,195,190,386)	38.1 (± 10.21)	36.6 (± 11.26)	36.9 (± 11.16)	35.3 (± 10.23)
Week 24 (N=368,189,183,366)	39.1 (± 10.13)	38.7 (± 10.11)	37.9 (± 10.76)	37.3 (± 10.62)
Week 36 (N=345,177,177,324)	39.8 (± 9.58)	38.9 (± 10.19)	38.8 (± 10.17)	38.1 (± 9.86)
Week 52 (N=322,166,168,300)	40.2 (± 9.36)	38.7 (± 9.88)	39.7 (± 10.96)	38.4 (± 9.91)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in FACIT-Fatigue Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36,

and 52	
End point title	Change From Baseline in FACIT-Fatigue Score at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

FACIT-Fatigue scale is a brief, 13-item, symptom-specific questionnaire that specifically assesses the self-reported severity of fatigue and its impact upon daily activities and functioning in the past 7 days. The FACIT-Fatigue uses 0 (not at all) to 4 (very much) numeric rating scales for a total possible score of 52. Positive change in value indicates improvement (no or less severity of fatigue). Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=411,207,206,415)	28.3 (± 10.93)	27.3 (± 11.92)	27.3 (± 10.90)	27.1 (± 10.72)
Change at Week 4 (N=403,201,198,408)	7.0 (± 9.46)	6.7 (± 9.64)	6.8 (± 9.94)	4.3 (± 9.24)
Change at Week 12 (N=383,195,188,385)	9.8 (± 11.20)	9.2 (± 11.21)	9.4 (± 10.57)	8.1 (± 10.09)
Change at Week 24 (N=365,189,181,365)	10.6 (± 11.49)	11.4 (± 11.26)	10.2 (± 11.37)	10.1 (± 11.19)
Change at Week 36 (N=343,177,174,323)	11.3 (± 11.21)	11.9 (± 11.53)	10.9 (± 10.81)	11.1 (± 10.91)
Change at Week 52 (N=320,166,166,300)	11.7 (± 11.52)	11.9 (± 12.29)	11.5 (± 11.17)	11.3 (± 11.49)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [337]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	3.2

Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2.1
upper limit	4.4
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.58

Notes:

[337] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [338]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.1
upper limit	3.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.7

Notes:

[338] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [339]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1.3
upper limit	4.1

Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.71

Notes:

[339] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [340]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1
upper limit	3.5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.64

Notes:

[340] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.13 [341]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.4
upper limit	2.7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.78

Notes:

[341] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.032 [342]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.1
upper limit	3.2
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.79

Notes:

[342] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.061 [343]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.1
upper limit	2.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.68

Notes:

[343] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.11 [344]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.3
upper limit	2.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.82

Notes:

[344] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.7 [345]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.3
upper limit	1.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.83

Notes:

[345] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.028 [346]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.2
upper limit	2.8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.67

Notes:

[346] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.15 [347]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.4
upper limit	2.7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.81

Notes:

[347] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.41 [348]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.9
upper limit	2.3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.81

Notes:

[348] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.017 [349]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0.3
upper limit	3.1
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.71

Notes:

[349] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.27 [350]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.7
upper limit	2.6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.86

Notes:

[350] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.15 [351]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	1.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.5
upper limit	2.9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	0.87

Notes:

[351] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Number of Participants by European Quality of Life 5 Dimensions (EQ-5D) Health Profile Categories at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Number of Participants by European Quality of Life 5 Dimensions (EQ-5D) Health Profile Categories at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The EQ-5D-5 levels (EQ-5D-5L) is a standardized measure of health status of the participant at the visit (same day) that provides a simple, generic measure of health for clinical and economic appraisal. EQ-5D-5L consists of 2 components: a descriptive system of the participant`s health and a rating of his or her current health state on a 0-100 VAS. The descriptive system comprises the following 5 dimensions: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, and anxiety/depression (Anx/Dep). Each dimension has 5 levels: no problems, slight problems, moderate problems, severe problems, and extreme problems. Rating gets recorded on a vertical VAS in which the endpoints are labeled best imaginable health state is 100 (on the top) and worst imaginable health state is 0 (on the bottom). Higher scores of

EQ VAS indicate better health. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: participants				
Mobility:Week(Wk)4,No Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	161	66	81	104
Mobility:Wk 4,Slight Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	149	68	56	135
Mobility:Wk 4,Moderate Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	82	50	38	116
Mobility:Wk 4,Severe Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	13	17	20	54
Mobility:Wk 4,Extreme Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	1	1	6	1
Mobility:Wk 12,No Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	198	87	86	138
Mobility:Wk 12,Slight Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	135	56	60	135
Mobility:Wk 12,ModerateProblems(N=390,196,192,3	41	36	27	91
Mobility:Wk 12,Severe Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	12	17	14	20
Mobility:Wk 12,Extreme Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	4	0	5	4
Mobility:Wk 24,No Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	208	92	95	152
Mobility:Wk 24,Slight Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	116	55	50	135
Mobility:Wk 24,ModerateProblems(N=377,192,184,3	46	36	24	63
Mobility:Wk 24,Severe Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	5	9	13	16
Mobility:Wk 24,Extreme Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	2	0	2	4
Mobility:Wk 36,No Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	216	93	98	152
Mobility:Wk 36,Slight Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	96	60	46	135
Mobility:Wk 36,ModerateProblems(N=365,188,180,3	48	30	27	51
Mobility:Wk 36,Severe Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	5	5	8	16
Mobility:Wk 36,Extreme Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	0	0	1	2
Mobility:Wk 52,No Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	217	91	93	156
Mobility:Wk 52,Slight Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	92	50	47	108
Mobility:Wk 52,ModerateProblems(N=347,176,174,3	28	29	21	54

Mobility:Wk 52,Severe Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	9	6	10	15
Mobility:Wk 52,Extreme Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	1	0	3	1
Selfcare:Wk 4,No Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	214	99	102	143
Selfcare:Wk 4,Slight Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	142	63	50	141
Selfcare:Wk 4,Moderate Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	42	28	38	96
Selfcare:Wk 4,Severe Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	7	9	10	29
Selfcare:Wk 4,Extreme Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	1	3	1	1
Selfcare:Wk 12,No Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	277	113	111	190
Selfcare:Wk 12,Slight Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	85	55	55	129
Selfcare:Wk 12,ModerateProblems(N=390,196,192,3	19	22	21	54
Selfcare:Wk 12,Severe Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	6	5	4	13
Selfcare:Wk 12,Extreme Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	3	1	1	2
Selfcare:Wk 24,No Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	283	128	112	222
Selfcare:Wk 24,Slight Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	73	42	52	95
Selfcare:Wk 24,ModerateProblems(N=377,192,184,3	16	20	17	46
Selfcare:Wk 24,Severe Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	1	2	3	5
Selfcare:Wk 24,Extreme Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	4	0	0	2
Selfcare:Wk 36,No Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	271	122	121	224
Selfcare:Wk 36,Slight Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	70	44	41	93
Selfcare:Wk 36,ModerateProblems(N=365,188,180,3	20	21	16	31
Selfcare:Wk 36,Severe Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	3	1	1	5
Selfcare:Wk 36,Extreme Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	1	0	1	3
Selfcare:Wk 52,No Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	268	117	117	208
Selfcare:Wk 52,Slight Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	60	36	36	84
Selfcare:Wk 52,ModerateProblems(N=347,176,174,3	13	21	16	35
Selfcare:Wk 52,Severe Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	5	2	4	6
Selfcare:Wk 52,Extreme Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	1	0	1	1
UsualActivities:Wk 4,No Problem(N=406,202,201,410)	118	50	54	80
UsualActivities:Wk 4,Slight (N=406,202,201,410)	180	86	81	153
UsualActivities:Wk 4,Moderate (N=406,202,201,410)	90	47	49	122
UsualActivities:Wk 4,Severe (N=406,202,201,410)	16	19	14	49

UsualActivities:Wk 4,Extreme (N=406,202,201,410)	2	0	3	6
UsualActivities:Wk12,No Problem(N=390,196,192,388)	185	78	83	101
UsualActivities:Wk12,Slight (N=390,196,192,388)	148	65	61	179
UsualActivities:Wk12,Moderate (N=390,196,192,388)	44	42	35	85
UsualActivities:Wk12,Severe (N=390,196,192,388)	11	9	11	19
UsualActivities:Wk12,Extreme (N=390,196,192,388)	2	2	2	4
UsualActivities:Wk24,No Problem(N=377,192,184,370)	188	92	83	142
UsualActivities:Wk24,Slight (N=377,192,184,370)	135	60	63	147
UsualActivities:Wk24,Moderate (N=377,192,184,370)	43	31	30	64
UsualActivities:Wk24,Severe (N=377,192,184,370)	8	9	8	13
UsualActivities:Wk24,Extreme (N=377,192,184,370)	3	0	0	4
UsualActivities:Wk36,No Problem(N=365,188,180,356)	199	86	92	158
UsualActivities:Wk36,Slight (N=365,188,180,356)	119	61	51	134
UsualActivities:Wk36,Moderate (N=365,188,180,356)	42	37	31	50
UsualActivities:Wk36,Severe (N=365,188,180,356)	5	4	3	12
UsualActivities:Wk36,Extreme (N=365,188,180,356)	0	0	3	2
UsualActivities:Wk52,No Problem(N=347,176,174,334)	203	84	92	147
UsualActivities:Wk52,Slight (N=347,176,174,334)	106	62	48	125
UsualActivities:Wk52,Moderate (N=347,176,174,334)	31	22	27	50
UsualActivities:Wk52,Severe (N=347,176,174,334)	7	7	5	10
UsualActivities:Wk52,Extreme (N=347,176,174,334)	0	1	2	2
Pain/Discomfort:Wk 4,No Problem(N=406,202,201,410)	45	23	21	18
Pain/Discomfort:Wk 4,Slight (N=406,202,201,410)	208	85	91	131
Pain/Discomfort:Wk 4,Moderate (N=406,202,201,410)	132	73	60	173
Pain/Discomfort:Wk 4,Severe (N=406,202,201,410)	21	19	26	78
Pain/Discomfort:Wk 4,Extreme (N=406,202,201,410)	0	2	3	10
Pain/Discomfort:Wk12,No Problem(N=390,196,192,388)	93	35	38	41
Pain/Discomfort:Wk12,Slight (N=390,196,192,388)	202	96	81	167
Pain/Discomfort:Wk12,Moderate (N=390,196,192,388)	83	47	53	143
Pain/Discomfort:Wk12,Severe (N=390,196,192,388)	12	15	16	35
Pain/Discomfort:Wk12,Extreme (N=390,196,192,388)	0	3	4	2

Pain/Discomfort:Wk24,No Problem(N=377,192,184,370)	110	46	40	44
Pain/Discomfort:Wk24,Slight (N=377,192,184,370)	182	91	93	206
Pain/Discomfort:Wk24,Moderate (N=377,192,184,370)	75	46	42	98
Pain/Discomfort:Wk24,Severe (N=377,192,184,370)	9	9	7	22
Pain/Discomfort:Wk24,Extreme (N=377,192,184,370)	1	0	2	0
Pain/Discomfort:Wk36,No Problem(N=365,188,180,356)	102	43	39	57
Pain/Discomfort:Wk36,Slight (N=365,188,180,356)	188	90	87	195
Pain/Discomfort:Wk36,Moderate (N=365,188,180,356)	68	41	44	85
Pain/Discomfort:Wk36,Severe (N=365,188,180,356)	6	14	7	18
Pain/Discomfort:Wk36,Extreme (N=365,188,180,356)	1	0	3	1
Pain/Discomfort:Wk52,No Problem(N=347,176,174,334)	108	46	49	63
Pain/Discomfort:Wk52,Slight (N=347,176,174,334)	169	82	88	168
Pain/Discomfort:Wk52,Moderate (N=347,176,174,334)	59	40	25	80
Pain/Discomfort:Wk52,Severe (N=347,176,174,334)	11	8	9	22
Pain/Discomfort:Wk52,Extreme (N=347,176,174,334)	0	0	3	1
Anx/Dep:Wk 4,No Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	221	101	94	159
Anx/Dep:Wk 4,Slight Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	126	58	64	148
Anx/Dep:Wk 4,Moderate Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	53	33	35	73
Anx/Dep:Wk 4,Severe Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	6	10	6	25
Anx/Dep:Wk 4,Extreme Problems(N=406,202,201,410)	0	0	2	5
Anx/Dep:Wk 12,No Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	233	104	106	198
Anx/Dep:Wk 12,Slight Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	114	62	58	125
Anx/Dep:Wk 12,Moderate Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	28	19	17	49
Anx/Dep:Wk 12,Severe Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	14	9	10	15
Anx/Dep:Wk 12,Extreme Problems(N=390,196,192,388)	1	2	1	1
Anx/Dep:Wk 24,No Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	236	117	103	219
Anx/Dep:Wk 24,Slight Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	97	47	64	93
Anx/Dep:Wk 24,Moderate Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	32	25	11	42
Anx/Dep:Wk 24,Severe Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	9	3	6	14
Anx/Dep:Wk 24,Extreme Problems(N=377,192,184,370)	3	0	0	2
Anx/Dep:Wk 36,No Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	233	119	103	194

Anx/Dep:Wk 36,Slight Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	99	50	56	116
Anx/Dep:Wk 36,Moderate Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	31	13	17	32
Anx/Dep:Wk 36,Severe Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	2	5	3	12
Anx/Dep:Wk 36,Extreme Problems(N=365,188,180,356)	0	1	1	2
Anx/Dep:Wk 52,No Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	222	113	106	182
Anx/Dep:Wk 52,Slight Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	94	40	43	100
Anx/Dep:Wk 52,Moderate Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	26	18	20	45
Anx/Dep:Wk 52,Severe Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	5	5	3	5
Anx/Dep:Wk 52,Extreme Problems(N=347,176,174,334)	0	0	2	2

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: EQ-5D Current Health VAS at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	EQ-5D Current Health VAS at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

EQ-5D-5L is a standardized measure of health status of the participant at the visit (same day) that provides a simple, generic measure of health for clinical and economic appraisal. Participant rates their current health state on a 0-100 VAS. It gets recorded on a vertical VAS in which the endpoints are labeled best imaginable health state is 100 (on the top) and worst imaginable health state is 0 (on the bottom). Higher scores of EQ VAS indicate better health. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Week 4 (N=404,201,200,408)	65 (± 18.7)	61 (± 21.6)	62 (± 20.0)	56 (± 21.2)
Week 12 (N=386,195,190,386)	69 (± 21.3)	67 (± 22.9)	66 (± 22.7)	64 (± 20.7)
Week 24 (N=368,189,183,366)	73 (± 21.0)	72 (± 19.6)	68 (± 22.4)	69 (± 21.3)
Week 36 (N=344,177,177,324)	73 (± 22.1)	71 (± 21.8)	69 (± 21.1)	68 (± 22.8)
Week 52 (N=322,166,168,300)	75 (± 21.7)	72 (± 22.1)	71 (± 23.7)	71 (± 21.2)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in EQ-5D Current Health VAS at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in EQ-5D Current Health VAS at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The EQ-5D-5L is a standardized measure of health status of the participant at the visit (same day) that provides a simple, generic measure of health for clinical and economic appraisal. Participant rates their current health state on a 0-100 VAS. It gets recorded on a vertical VAS in which the endpoints are labeled best imaginable health state is 100 (on the top) and worst imaginable health state is 0 (on the bottom). Higher scores of EQ VAS indicate better health. Positive change indicates improvement (better health). Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=411,207,206,415)	50 (± 22.0)	50 (± 24.6)	51 (± 22.5)	50 (± 22.1)
Change at Week 4 (N=403,201,198,408)	16 (± 25.0)	10 (± 24.6)	11 (± 22.4)	7 (± 25.0)
Change at Week 12 (N=383,195,188,385)	19 (± 29.8)	17 (± 28.0)	15 (± 26.1)	14 (± 27.7)
Change at Week 24 (N=365,189,181,365)	24 (± 28.1)	21 (± 27.7)	17 (± 29.0)	19 (± 28.8)
Change at Week 36 (N=342,177,174,323)	23 (± 29.7)	21 (± 28.6)	18 (± 28.8)	19 (± 29.8)
Change at Week 52 (N=320,166,166,300)	26 (± 31.1)	22 (± 31.5)	20 (± 30.1)	22 (± 30.6)

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [352]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	6
upper limit	12
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.3

Notes:

[352] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.006 [353]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1
upper limit	8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[353] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 4; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [354]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	3
upper limit	9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[354] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [355]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2
upper limit	8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.5

Notes:

[355] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.089 [356]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0
upper limit	7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.8

Notes:

[356] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 12; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.18 [357]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1
upper limit	6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.9

Notes:

[357] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.003 [358]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	1
upper limit	7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.5

Notes:

[358] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.049 [359]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0
upper limit	7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.8

Notes:

[359] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 24; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.84 [360]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4
upper limit	3
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.8

Notes:

[360] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	< 0.001 [361]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2
upper limit	9
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.6

Notes:

[361] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.078 [362]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0
upper limit	7
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2

Notes:

[362] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 36; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.39 [363]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2
upper limit	6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2

Notes:

[363] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	832
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.004 [364]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	5
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	2
upper limit	8
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	1.7

Notes:

[364] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX v MTX Monotherapy
Number of subjects included in analysis	623
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.45 [365]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3
upper limit	6
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.1

Notes:

[365] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Statistical analysis title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy vs MTX Monotherapy

Statistical analysis description:

Week 52; LS-Mean, 95% CI, and P-value were provided from MMRM. Missing change scores were not imputed using the MMRM approach assuming an unstructured variance-covariance matrix for the repeated measures.

Comparison groups	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy v MTX Monotherapy

Number of subjects included in analysis	626
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.85 [366]
Method	MMRM
Parameter estimate	Least Squares Mean Difference
Point estimate	0
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4
upper limit	5
Variability estimate	Standard error of the mean
Dispersion value	2.1

Notes:

[366] - MMRM model included treatment, visit, treatment by visit, stratification factors, and baseline value as fixed effects, and participants being the random effect.

Secondary: Work Productivity and Activity Impairment-Rheumatoid Arthritis (WPAI-RA): Mean Percentage of Work Time Missed (Absenteeism) at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Work Productivity and Activity Impairment-Rheumatoid Arthritis (WPAI-RA): Mean Percentage of Work Time Missed (Absenteeism) at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The WPAI is a questionnaire that measures impairments in work activities in participants with RA which consists of 6 questions: currently employed; work time missed due to RA; work time missed due to other reasons; hours actually worked; degree RA affected productivity while working (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant from working); degree RA affected productivity in regular unpaid activities (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant`s daily activities). Outcomes are expressed as impairment percentages. Higher numbers indicate greater impairment and less productivity. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of work time missed				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Week 4 (N=167,77,87,150)	10.1 (± 23.95)	15.4 (± 30.46)	9.2 (± 21.88)	16.0 (± 30.49)
Week 12 (N=163,72,84,161)	6.7 (± 19.11)	7.3 (± 18.29)	12.6 (± 24.42)	11.3 (± 25.59)
Week 24 (N=164,72,86,145)	6.4 (± 19.93)	5.7 (± 13.96)	12.4 (± 23.14)	5.1 (± 14.21)
Week 36 (N=156,73,85,131)	5.5 (± 15.78)	7.0 (± 17.90)	11.5 (± 25.28)	5.6 (± 16.90)
week 52 (N=149,69,76,120)	4.6 (± 14.62)	8.5 (± 20.70)	9.8 (± 22.21)	6.4 (± 19.84)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Impairment While Working Due to RA (Presenteeism) at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Impairment While Working Due to RA (Presenteeism) at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The WPAI is a questionnaire that measures impairments in work activities in participants with RA which consists of 6 questions: currently employed; work time missed due to RA; work time missed due to other reasons; hours actually worked; degree RA affected productivity while working (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant from working); degree RA affected productivity in regular unpaid activities (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant`s daily activities). Outcomes are expressed as impairment percentages. Higher numbers indicate greater impairment and less productivity. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of impairment while working				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Week 4 (N=160,70,84,137)	29.6 (± 24.21)	29.4 (± 27.76)	33.9 (± 24.10)	45.3 (± 26.04)
Week 12 (N=160,72,81,152)	22.6 (± 23.43)	23.6 (± 24.85)	26.0 (± 24.78)	32.5 (± 24.31)
Week 24 (N=160,72,84,144)	17.9 (± 18.95)	18.1 (± 19.40)	23.2 (± 24.70)	23.3 (± 21.18)
Week 36 (N=155,72,81,129)	15.5 (± 18.38)	16.3 (± 20.31)	20.9 (± 24.04)	22.7 (± 24.10)
Week 52 (N=148,67,74,116)	14.5 (± 18.08)	19.6 (± 22.32)	16.5 (± 23.08)	18.3 (± 16.95)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Overall Work Productivity Impairment Due to RA at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Overall Work Productivity Impairment Due to RA at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The WPAI is a questionnaire that measures impairments in work activities in participants with RA which consists of 6 questions: currently employed; work time missed due to RA; work time missed due to other reasons; hours actually worked; degree RA affected productivity while working (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant from working); degree RA affected productivity in regular unpaid activities (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant`s daily activities). Outcomes are expressed as impairment percentages. Higher numbers indicate greater impairment and less productivity. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary
End point timeframe: Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52	

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of overall work productivity				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Week 4 (N=160,70,84,137)	32.8 (± 25.79)	32.3 (± 29.18)	37.0 (± 25.87)	48.6 (± 27.40)
Week 12 (N=160,72,81,152)	25.1 (± 26.42)	26.7 (± 28.11)	31.4 (± 28.43)	35.5 (± 26.13)
Week 24 (N=160,72,84,144)	20.2 (± 22.36)	22.4 (± 22.92)	29.3 (± 28.98)	26.2 (± 23.45)
Week 36 (N=155,72,81,129)	18.8 (± 22.09)	20.9 (± 23.34)	24.5 (± 28.11)	25.0 (± 25.89)
Week 52 (N=148,67,74,116)	17.2 (± 21.61)	22.9 (± 25.21)	21.2 (± 27.26)	20.7 (± 18.67)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Activity Impairment Due to RA at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Activity Impairment Due to RA at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The WPAI is a questionnaire that measures impairments in work activities in participants with RA which consists of 6 questions: currently employed; work time missed due to RA; work time missed due to other reasons; hours actually worked; degree RA affected productivity while working (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant from working); degree RA affected productivity in regular unpaid activities (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant`s daily activities). Outcomes are expressed as impairment percentages. Higher numbers indicate greater impairment and less productivity. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary
End point timeframe: Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52	

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of activity impairment				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				

Week 4 (N=404,201,200,408)	40.4 (± 25.52)	46.8 (± 27.82)	45.4 (± 25.65)	51.6 (± 24.73)
Week 12 (N=386,195,190,386)	30.6 (± 25.53)	36.1 (± 26.77)	34.7 (± 27.29)	41.1 (± 24.75)
Week 24 (N=368,189,183,366)	26.5 (± 23.32)	29.5 (± 26.02)	32.3 (± 26.92)	32.1 (± 24.44)
Week 36 (N=344,177,177,324)	23.5 (± 22.54)	29.7 (± 27.03)	29.0 (± 26.08)	31.8 (± 25.55)
Week 52 (N=322,166,168,300)	22.5 (± 22.80)	28.2 (± 26.54)	25.6 (± 25.19)	28.8 (± 23.81)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Work Time Missed (Absenteeism) at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Work Time Missed (Absenteeism) at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The WPAI is a questionnaire that measures impairments in work activities in participants with RA which consists of 6 questions: currently employed; work time missed due to RA; work time missed due to other reasons; hours actually worked; degree RA affected productivity while working (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant from working); degree RA affected productivity in regular unpaid activities (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant`s daily activities). Outcomes are expressed as impairment percentages, higher numbers indicate greater impairment and less productivity. A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of work time missed				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=171,78,88,167)	12.8 (± 24.29)	20.1 (± 32.36)	13.5 (± 26.35)	15.6 (± 28.79)
Change at Week 4 (N=155,70,82,138)	-1.5 (± 25.68)	-3.3 (± 24.44)	-4.0 (± 21.08)	-1.3 (± 23.73)
Change at Week 12 (N=142,67,75,141)	-4.9 (± 25.11)	-11.0 (± 32.65)	-2.3 (± 23.52)	-5.2 (± 29.01)
Change at Week 24 (N=141,63,77,122)	-4.8 (± 28.91)	-15.5 (± 34.51)	-3.1 (± 28.77)	-10.6 (± 29.08)
Change at Week 36 (N=130,62,69,107)	-6.7 (± 28.20)	-16.4 (± 35.63)	-4.1 (± 26.83)	-7.9 (± 29.99)
Change at Week 52 (N=124,59,65,97)	-4.8 (± 23.27)	-15.7 (± 32.72)	-2.8 (± 29.12)	-6.7 (± 31.63)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Impairment While Working Due to RA (Presenteeism) at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Impairment While Working Due to RA (Presenteeism) at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The WPAI is a questionnaire that measures impairments in work activities in participants with RA which consists of 6 questions: currently employed; work time missed due to RA; work time missed due to other reasons; hours actually worked; degree RA affected productivity while working (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant from working); degree RA affected productivity in regular unpaid activities (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant`s daily activities). Outcomes are expressed as impairment percentages, higher numbers indicate greater impairment and less productivity. A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of impairment while working				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=163,70,82,154)	47.3 (± 26.32)	49.0 (± 28.45)	52.1 (± 25.81)	53.6 (± 27.12)
Change at Week 4 (N=144,62,77,125)	-17.8 (± 25.34)	-19.8 (± 27.49)	-18.3 (± 28.58)	-7.4 (± 20.55)
Change at Week 12 (N=135,61,70,126)	-25.6 (± 27.09)	-28.4 (± 29.39)	-26.0 (± 24.70)	-20.7 (± 27.83)
Change at Week 24 (N=132,56,72,113)	-27.1 (± 26.77)	-32.9 (± 28.20)	-27.9 (± 27.06)	-28.3 (± 29.06)
Change at Week 36 (N=123,55,64,99)	-29.1 (± 24.99)	-33.8 (± 27.99)	-30.3 (± 29.38)	-28.8 (± 31.92)
Change at Week 52 (120,51,61,89)	-32.3 (± 26.81)	-32.7 (± 31.75)	-33.3 (± 29.25)	-31.5 (± 28.23)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Overall Work Productivity Impairment Due to RA at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Overall Work Productivity Impairment Due to RA at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The WPAI is a questionnaire that measures impairments in work activities in participants with RA which consists of 6 questions: currently employed; work time missed due to RA; work time missed due to

other reasons; hours actually worked; degree RA affected productivity while working (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant from working); degree RA affected productivity in regular unpaid activities (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant`s daily activities). Outcomes are expressed as impairment percentages, higher numbers indicate greater impairment and less productivity. A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of overall work productivity				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=163,70,82,154)	50.8 (± 27.28)	51.6 (± 30.10)	54.4 (± 25.60)	56.1 (± 28.00)
Change at Week 4 (N=144,62,77,125)	-17.6 (± 26.21)	-19.0 (± 29.43)	-17.6 (± 28.69)	-6.4 (± 22.27)
Change at Week 12 (N=135,61,70,126)	-26.3 (± 28.85)	-27.5 (± 30.53)	-23.5 (± 26.01)	-20.1 (± 28.63)
Change at Week 24 (N=132,56,72,113)	-28.5 (± 27.71)	-31.3 (± 30.04)	-24.7 (± 29.61)	-27.9 (± 29.31)
Change at Week 36 (N=123,55,64,99)	-29.3 (± 26.76)	-33.1 (± 31.56)	-29.1 (± 31.79)	-29.2 (± 32.72)
Change at Week 52 (N=120,51,61,89)	-33.0 (± 28.74)	-33.5 (± 32.34)	-30.6 (± 31.24)	-30.8 (± 28.76)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Activity Impairment Due to RA at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point title	Change From Baseline in WPAI-RA: Mean Percentage of Activity Impairment Due to RA at Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point description:

The WPAI is a questionnaire that measures impairments in work activities in participants with RA which consists of 6 questions: currently employed; work time missed due to RA; work time missed due to other reasons; hours actually worked; degree RA affected productivity while working (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant from working); degree RA affected productivity in regular unpaid activities (0-10 VAS, with 0 indicating no effect and 10 indicating RA completely prevented the participant`s daily activities). Outcomes are expressed as impairment percentages, higher numbers indicate greater impairment and less productivity. A negative change from baseline indicates improvement. Participants in the Full Analysis Set with available data were analysed.

End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Baseline; Weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

End point values	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy	MTX Monotherapy
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group
Number of subjects analysed	416	207	210	416
Units: percentage of activity impairment				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline (N=411,207,206,415)	60.2 (± 23.36)	62.8 (± 23.10)	63.3 (± 24.37)	64.0 (± 22.59)
Change at Week 4 (N=403,201,198,408)	-19.9 (± 24.07)	-15.8 (± 23.90)	-17.8 (± 27.11)	-12.4 (± 23.80)
Change at Week 12 (N=383,195,188,385)	-29.4 (± 27.15)	-26.4 (± 26.19)	-28.7 (± 27.80)	-22.7 (± 25.32)
Change at Week 24 (N=365,189,181,365)	-33.1 (± 26.84)	-33.2 (± 26.97)	-31.2 (± 28.01)	-31.5 (± 27.80)
Change at Week 36 (N=342,177,174,323)	-35.6 (± 26.52)	-33.8 (± 26.48)	-34.1 (± 28.26)	-32.1 (± 28.47)
Change at Week 52 (N=320,166,166,300)	-36.7 (± 27.11)	-35.4 (± 28.32)	-36.7 (± 28.37)	-34.2 (± 28.83)

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Adverse events

Adverse events information	
Timeframe for reporting adverse events:	
First dose date up to last dose date (Maximum: 56 weeks) plus 30 days	
Adverse event reporting additional description:	
The Safety Analysis Set included all participants who received at least 1 dose of study drug.	
Assessment type	Systematic

Dictionary used	
Dictionary name	MedDRA
Dictionary version	22.0

Reporting groups	
Reporting group title	MTX Monotherapy
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered PTM filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily+ PTM filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 56 weeks.	
Reporting group title	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + PTM filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + MTX up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.	
Reporting group title	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + PTM filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + PTM MTX orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.	
Reporting group title	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX
Reporting group description:	
Participants were administered filgotinib 200 mg orally, once daily + placebo to match (PTM) filgotinib 100 mg orally, once daily + methotrexate (MTX) up to 20 mg orally, once weekly for up to 54 weeks.	

Serious adverse events	MTX Monotherapy	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy
Total subjects affected by serious adverse events			
subjects affected / exposed	28 / 416 (6.73%)	13 / 207 (6.28%)	17 / 210 (8.10%)
number of deaths (all causes)	0	1	0
number of deaths resulting from adverse events			
Neoplasms benign, malignant and unspecified (incl cysts and polyps)			
Breast cancer			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Giant cell tumour of tendon sheath			

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Ovarian adenoma			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Prostate cancer			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Small cell lung cancer			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Squamous cell carcinoma			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Vascular disorders			
Deep vein thrombosis			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Hypertension			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Rheumatoid vasculitis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Varicose vein			

subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
General disorders and administration site conditions			
Chest pain			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pyrexia			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Systemic inflammatory response syndrome			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Respiratory, thoracic and mediastinal disorders			
Pulmonary embolism			
subjects affected / exposed	2 / 416 (0.48%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 2	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Acute respiratory failure			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Bronchiectasis			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Emphysema			

subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Interstitial lung disease			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Lung consolidation			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	1 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pleurisy			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pneumonitis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Psychiatric disorders			
Depression			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Investigations			
White blood cell count decreased			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	1 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Injury, poisoning and procedural complications			
Femur fracture			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0

Accidental overdose			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	1 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Incisional hernia, obstructive			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Subdural haematoma			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Congenital, familial and genetic disorders			
Atrial septal defect			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Cardiac disorders			
Atrial fibrillation			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 2	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Acute myocardial infarction			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Lupus myocarditis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Myocardial infarction			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0

Supraventricular tachycardia			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Nervous system disorders			
Cerebral amyloid angiopathy			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Cerebral artery occlusion			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Cervical radiculopathy			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Facial paralysis			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Haemorrhagic stroke			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Intracranial aneurysm			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
Ischaemic stroke			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Subarachnoid haemorrhage			

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Vertebral artery aneurysm			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
Blood and lymphatic system disorders			
Bone marrow failure			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	1 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Leukocytosis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pancytopenia			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	1 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Thrombocytosis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Gastrointestinal disorders			
Abdominal pain upper			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Gastritis			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Proctitis			

subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Appendiceal mucocoele			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Diverticular perforation			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Gastrointestinal fistula			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Gastrointestinal haemorrhage			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Megacolon			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Small intestinal obstruction			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Upper gastrointestinal haemorrhage			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders			
Prurigo			

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Renal and urinary disorders			
Nephrolithiasis			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Endocrine disorders			
Hyperthyroidism			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Musculoskeletal and connective tissue disorders			
Osteoarthritis			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	2 / 207 (0.97%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 2	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Spinal osteoarthritis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	2 / 207 (0.97%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 2	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Arthralgia			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Back pain			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Intervertebral disc disorder			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0

Intervertebral disc protrusion			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pathological fracture			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Spinal stenosis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Infections and infestations			
Pneumonia			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Bronchitis			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Sepsis			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Abdominal hernia infection			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Appendicitis			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Arthritis infective			

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Herpes zoster			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	1 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Lower respiratory tract infection			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Lymphangitis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	1 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pneumonia bacterial			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pneumonia cryptococcal			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pulmonary sepsis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pyelonephritis			

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pyonephrosis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Septic shock			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	1 / 207 (0.48%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 1	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Skin infection			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Tracheobronchitis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	1 / 210 (0.48%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Metabolism and nutrition disorders			
Dehydration			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Hypertriglyceridaemia			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Hypoglycaemia			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)	0 / 207 (0.00%)	0 / 210 (0.00%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0

Serious adverse events	Filgotinib 200 mg +		

	MTX		
Total subjects affected by serious adverse events			
subjects affected / exposed	26 / 416 (6.25%)		
number of deaths (all causes)	3		
number of deaths resulting from adverse events			
Neoplasms benign, malignant and unspecified (incl cysts and polyps)			
Breast cancer			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Giant cell tumour of tendon sheath			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Ovarian adenoma			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Prostate cancer			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Small cell lung cancer			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Squamous cell carcinoma			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Vascular disorders			
Deep vein thrombosis			

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Hypertension				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Rheumatoid vasculitis				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Varicose vein				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
General disorders and administration site conditions				
Chest pain				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pyrexia				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Systemic inflammatory response syndrome				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Respiratory, thoracic and mediastinal disorders				
Pulmonary embolism				

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Acute respiratory failure				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Bronchiectasis				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Emphysema				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Interstitial lung disease				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1			
Lung consolidation				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pleurisy				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pneumonitis				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Psychiatric disorders				
Depression				

subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Investigations			
White blood cell count decreased			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Injury, poisoning and procedural complications			
Femur fracture			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Accidental overdose			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Incisional hernia, obstructive			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Subdural haematoma			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Congenital, familial and genetic disorders			
Atrial septal defect			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Cardiac disorders			
Atrial fibrillation			

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Acute myocardial infarction				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Lupus myocarditis				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
Myocardial infarction				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Supraventricular tachycardia				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Nervous system disorders				
Cerebral amyloid angiopathy				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Cerebral artery occlusion				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Cervical radiculopathy				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Facial paralysis				

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Haemorrhagic stroke				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Intracranial aneurysm				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Ischaemic stroke				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Subarachnoid haemorrhage				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 2			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Vertebral artery aneurysm				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Blood and lymphatic system disorders				
Bone marrow failure				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Leukocytosis				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pancytopenia				

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Thrombocytosis				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Gastrointestinal disorders				
Abdominal pain upper				
subjects affected / exposed	2 / 416 (0.48%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 2			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Gastritis				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Proctitis				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Appendiceal mucocoele				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Diverticular perforation				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Gastrointestinal fistula				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Gastrointestinal haemorrhage				

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Megacolon			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Small intestinal obstruction			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Upper gastrointestinal haemorrhage			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders			
Prurigo			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Renal and urinary disorders			
Nephrolithiasis			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Endocrine disorders			
Hyperthyroidism			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Musculoskeletal and connective tissue disorders			
Osteoarthritis			

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Spinal osteoarthritis				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Arthralgia				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Back pain				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Intervertebral disc disorder				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Intervertebral disc protrusion				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pathological fracture				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Spinal stenosis				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Infections and infestations				
Pneumonia				

subjects affected / exposed	4 / 416 (0.96%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	2 / 4			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Bronchitis				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Sepsis				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Abdominal hernia infection				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Appendicitis				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Arthritis infective				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Herpes zoster				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Lower respiratory tract infection				
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	1 / 1			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Lymphangitis				

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pneumonia bacterial				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pneumonia cryptococcal				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pulmonary sepsis				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pyelonephritis				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Pyonephrosis				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Septic shock				
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)			
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0			
Skin infection				

subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Tracheobronchitis			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Metabolism and nutrition disorders			
Dehydration			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Hypertriglyceridaemia			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 416 (0.00%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		
Hypoglycaemia			
subjects affected / exposed	1 / 416 (0.24%)		
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 1		
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0		

Frequency threshold for reporting non-serious adverse events: 5 %

Non-serious adverse events	MTX Monotherapy	Filgotinib 100 mg + MTX	Filgotinib 200 mg Monotherapy
Total subjects affected by non-serious adverse events			
subjects affected / exposed	164 / 416 (39.42%)	88 / 207 (42.51%)	78 / 210 (37.14%)
Investigations			
Alanine aminotransferase increased			
subjects affected / exposed	11 / 416 (2.64%)	6 / 207 (2.90%)	3 / 210 (1.43%)
occurrences (all)	12	8	3
Vascular disorders			
Hypertension			
subjects affected / exposed	14 / 416 (3.37%)	10 / 207 (4.83%)	15 / 210 (7.14%)
occurrences (all)	14	10	15
Nervous system disorders			

Headache			
subjects affected / exposed	25 / 416 (6.01%)	8 / 207 (3.86%)	8 / 210 (3.81%)
occurrences (all)	30	10	8
Gastrointestinal disorders			
Nausea			
subjects affected / exposed	50 / 416 (12.02%)	35 / 207 (16.91%)	15 / 210 (7.14%)
occurrences (all)	62	43	15
Diarrhoea			
subjects affected / exposed	21 / 416 (5.05%)	12 / 207 (5.80%)	6 / 210 (2.86%)
occurrences (all)	23	15	8
Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders			
Alopecia			
subjects affected / exposed	20 / 416 (4.81%)	15 / 207 (7.25%)	4 / 210 (1.90%)
occurrences (all)	20	16	4
Infections and infestations			
Upper respiratory tract infection			
subjects affected / exposed	34 / 416 (8.17%)	9 / 207 (4.35%)	14 / 210 (6.67%)
occurrences (all)	40	11	15
Nasopharyngitis			
subjects affected / exposed	25 / 416 (6.01%)	17 / 207 (8.21%)	17 / 210 (8.10%)
occurrences (all)	31	20	22
Urinary tract infection			
subjects affected / exposed	11 / 416 (2.64%)	13 / 207 (6.28%)	11 / 210 (5.24%)
occurrences (all)	12	14	11
Bronchitis			
subjects affected / exposed	15 / 416 (3.61%)	11 / 207 (5.31%)	4 / 210 (1.90%)
occurrences (all)	16	11	4

Non-serious adverse events	Filgotinib 200 mg + MTX		
Total subjects affected by non-serious adverse events			
subjects affected / exposed	179 / 416 (43.03%)		
Investigations			
Alanine aminotransferase increased			
subjects affected / exposed	23 / 416 (5.53%)		
occurrences (all)	26		
Vascular disorders			

Hypertension subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all)	21 / 416 (5.05%) 25		
Nervous system disorders Headache subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all)	23 / 416 (5.53%) 24		
Gastrointestinal disorders Nausea subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all) Diarrhoea subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all)	51 / 416 (12.26%) 58 17 / 416 (4.09%) 18		
Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders Alopecia subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all)	17 / 416 (4.09%) 17		
Infections and infestations Upper respiratory tract infection subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all) Nasopharyngitis subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all) Urinary tract infection subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all) Bronchitis subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all)	42 / 416 (10.10%) 48 21 / 416 (5.05%) 27 19 / 416 (4.57%) 23 12 / 416 (2.88%) 15		

More information

Substantial protocol amendments (globally)

Were there any global substantial amendments to the protocol? Yes

Date	Amendment
05 July 2016	• Added urine biomarker samples as an exploratory endpoint • Updated study procedures to collect body weight at all study visits • Updated study procedures to include Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaire for Medication (TSQM) collection every 3 months • Updated the Prior and Concomitant Medications section to clarify documentation of prior medications and restriction window on injectable corticosteroids • Added an assessment of quantitative immunoglobulin (Ig) at Day 1, Week 24, and Week 52/ET • Updated to remove peripheral blood mononuclear cell substudy • Clarified eligibility criteria as needed • Updated the definition of postmenopausal females • Clarified that the magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) substudy would be performed post randomization within 7 days of first dose, at Week 12, and at Week 24 • Clarified that radiographs performed after Day 1 could be done ± 7 days of the scheduled visit • Terminology for the open label extension study was changed to long-term extension (LTE)study • Updated the disease specific questionnaires and activity scales to accurately reflect the relevant literature

Notes:

Interruptions (globally)

Were there any global interruptions to the trial? No

Limitations and caveats

None reported