## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL:

Supplementary table 1a: Functional outcome by treatment group using central adjudicator and site investigator data in REVASCAT

	Central adjuc	licator data	icator data Site investigator		
Outcome	Treated (n=103)	Control (n=103)	Treated (n=103)	Control (n=103)	
mRS 0	7	6	6	3	
mRS 1	18	7	23	10	
mRS 2	20	16	20	16	
mRS 3	19	20	15	20	
mRS 4	8	17	7	15	
mRS 5/6	31	37	32	39	

mRS refers to modified Rankin Scale

				Central Adjudic	cators		
Site Investigators	mRS 0	mRS 1	mRS 2	mRS 3	mRS 4	mRS 5/6	Total
mRS 0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
mRS 1	4	25	3	1	0	0	33
mRS 2	0	0	33	3	0	0	36
mRS 3	0	0	0	35	0	0	35
mRS 4	0	0	0	0	22	0	22
mRS 5/6	0	0	0	0	3	68	71
Total	13	25	36	39	25	68	206
Disagreements (%)	4 (31%)	0 (-)	3 (8%)	4 (10%)	3 (12%)	0 (-)	14 (7%)

Supplementary table 1b: Agreement on functional outcome between central adjudicators and site investigators in REVASCAT

Crude agreement = 192/206 = 93%, unweighted kappa = 0.91, weighted kappa using linear weights = 0.96. mRS refers to modified Rankin Scale

Supplementary table 1c: Functional outcome by treatment group using central adjudicator and misclassified site investigator data in REVASCAT

	Central adju	dicator data	Example n site inves	nisclassified tigator data
Outcome	Treated (n=103)	Control (n=103)	Treated (n=103)	Control (n=103)
mRS 0	7	6	14	3
mRS 1	18	7	15	7
mRS 2	20	16	21	11
mRS 3	19	20	19	20
mRS 4	8	17	14	19
mRS 5/6	31	37	20	43

Misclassified site investigator data is from one of 1000 simulations (starting seed 2206). mRS refers to modified Rankin Scale

	Central Adjudicators						
Site Investigators	mRS 0	mRS 1	mRS 2	mRS 3	mRS 4	mRS 5/6	Total
mRS 0	10	7	0	0	0	0	17
mRS 1	3	15	4	1	0	0	22
mRS 2	0	3	24	5	0	0	32
mRS 3	0	0	8	26	4	1	39
mRS 4	0	0	0	8	15	10	33
mRS 5/6	0	0	0	0	6	57	63
Total	13	25	36	39	25	68	206
Disagreements (%)	3 (23%)	10 (40%)	12 (33%)	14 (36%)	10 (40%)	11 (16%)	60 (29%)

Supplementary table 1d: Agreement on functional outcome between central adjudicators and example misclassified site investigators in REVASCAT (data from one of 1000 simulations)

Mean crude agreement (SD) = 72.2% (2.80%), mean unweighted kappa (SD) = 0.65 (0.03), mean weighted kappa using linear weights (SD) = 0.84 (0.02). Mean crude agreement, unweighted and weighted kappa are from 1000 simulations (starting seed 2206). mRS refers to modified Rankin Scale

	Central adjuc	dicator data	Site inves	tigator data
Outcome	Treated (n=1556)	Control (n=1540)	Treated (n=1556)	Control (n=1540)
No recurrent event	1463	1435	1457	1434
TIA	32	48	34	53
Stroke: mRS 0/1	15	18	16	16
Stroke: mRS 2/3	22	23	23	22
Stroke: mRS 4/5	11	9	13	10
Fatal stroke: mRS 6	13	7	13	5

Supplementary table 2a: Functional outcome by treatment group using central adjudicator and site investigator data in TARDIS

mRS refers to modified Rankin Scale

	Central Adjudicators						
Site Investigators	No recurrent event	TIA	Stroke: mRS 0/1	Stroke: mRS 2/3	Stroke: mRS 4/5	Fatal stroke: mRS 6	Total
No recurrent event	2881	1	3	4	0	2	2891
TIA	5	77	4	1	0	0	87
Stroke: mRS 0/1	4	2	26	0	0	0	32
Stroke: mRS 2/3	5	0	0	40	0	0	45
Stroke: mRS 4/5	3	0	0	0	20	0	23
Fatal stroke: mRS 6	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Total	2898	80	33	45	20	20	3096
Disagreements (%)	17 (1%)	3 (4%)	7 (21%)	5 (11%)	0 (-)	2 (10%)	34 (1%)

Supplementary table 2b: Agreement on incidence and severity of stroke between central adjudicators and site investigators in TARDIS

Crude agreement = 3062/3096 = 98.9%, unweighted kappa = 0.91, weighted kappa using linear weights = 0.91. TIA refers to Transient Ischaemic Attack, mRS refers to modified Rankin Scale

Supplementary table 2c: Functional outcome by treatment group using central adjudicator and misclassified site investigator data in TARDIS

	Central adju	dicator data	Example misclassified site investigator data			
Outcome	Treated (n=1556)	Control (n=1540)	Treated (n=1556)	Control (n=1540)		
No recurrent event	1463	1435	1472	1403		
TIA	32	48	31	58		
Stroke: mRS 0/1	15	18	16	26		
Stroke: mRS 2/3	22	23	17	31		
Stroke: mRS 4/5	11	9	10	12		
Fatal stroke: mRS 6	13	7	10	10		

Misclassified site investigator data is from one of 1000 simulations (starting seed 2206). mRS refers to modified Rankin Scale

**Supplementary table 2d:** Example agreement on incidence and severity of stroke between central adjudicators and misclassified site investigators in TARDIS (data from one of 1000 simulations)

	Central Adjudicators						
Misclassified site Investigators	No recurrent event	TIA	Stroke: mRS 0/1	Stroke: mRS 2/3	Stroke: mRS 4/5	Fatal stroke: mRS 6	Total
No recurrent event	2866	4	0	4	0	1	2875
TIA	10	76	2	0	0	1	89
Stroke: mRS 0/1	8	0	31	2	1	0	42
Stroke: mRS 2/3	8	0	0	39	1	0	48
Stroke: mRS 4/5	3	0	0	0	18	1	22
Fatal stroke: mRS 6	3	0	0	0	0	17	20
Total	2898	80	33	45	20	20	3096
Disagreements (%)	32 (1%)	4 (5%)	2 (6%)	6 (13%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	49 (2%)

Mean crude agreement (SD) = 98.1% (0.24%), mean unweighted kappa (SD) = 0.85 (0.02), mean weighted kappa using linear weights (SD) = 0.87 (0.02). Mean crude agreement, unweighted and weighted kappa are from 1000 simulations (starting seed 2206). TIA refers to Transient Ischaemic Attack, mRS refers to modified Rankin Scale

				Overall e	event rate		
Propor	tion of events:	10%	15%	20%	30%	40%	50%
Treatm	ent vs Control						
	60% vs 40%	910/1000	1410/2000	1910/2000	2910/3000	3910/4000	4910/5000
		(91%)	(94%)	(95.5%)	(97%)	(97.75%)	(98.2%)
N=10000	55% vs 45%	629/1000	1129/1500	1629/2000	2629/3000	3629/4000	4629/5000
		(62.9%)	(75.27%)	(81.45%)	(87.63%)	(90.73%)	(92.58%)
	52.5% vs 47.5%	NA	169/1500	680/2000	1680/3000	2680/4000	3690/5000
			(11.27%)	(34%)	(56%)	(67%)	(73.8%)
	60% vs 40%	405/500	660/750	905/1000	1405/1500	1905/2000	2405/2500
		(81%)	(88%)	(90.5%)	(93.63%)	(95.25%)	(96.2%)
N-5000	55% vs 45%	149/500	400/750	649/1000	1149/1500	1649/2000	2149/2500
N-5000		(29.8%)	(53.33%)	(64.9%)	(76.6%)	(82.45%)	(85.96%)
	52.5% vs 47.5%	NA	NA	NA	329/1500	829/2000	1329/2500
					(21.93%)	(41.45%)	(53.16%)
	60% vs 40%	210/300	360/450	510/600	810/900	1110/1200	1410/1500
		(70%)	(80%)	(85%)	(90%)	(92.5%)	(94%)
N=3000	55% vs 45%	NA	109/450	260/600	560/900	860/1200	1160/1500
N=3000			(24.22%)	(43%)	(62%)	(71.63%)	(77.33%)
	52.5% vs 47.5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	200/1200	499/1200
						(17%)	(41.6%)
	60% vs 40%	110/200	210/300	310/400	510/600	710/800	910/1000
		(55%)	(70%)	(77.5%)	(85%)	(88.75%)	(91%)
N=2000	55% vs 45%	NA	NA	80/400	280/600	480/800	680/1000
N-2000				(20%)	(46.67%)	(60%)	(68%)
	52.5% vs 47.5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	129/1000
							(12.9%)
	60% vs 40%	15/100	70/150	115/200	215/300	315/400	415/500
		(15%)	(46.67%)	(57.5%)	(71.63%)	(78.75%)	(83%)
N=1000	55% vs 45%	NA	NA	NA	29/300	129/400	229/500
11-1000					(9.67%)	(32.25%)	(45.8%)
	52.5% vs 47.5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Supplementary Table 3:** Number and proportion of non-differentially misclassified events required such that treatment effect is no longer significant at 5% level

Data are number of events misclassified/total number of events (%)

Significant treatment effect is set at  $\alpha$ =0.05 and is from a risk ratio

Proportion of events 60% vs 40% corresponds to a treatment effect of 0.67, a proportion of events 55% to 45% corresponds to a treatment effect of 0.82, and a proportion of events 52.5% to 47.5% corresponds to a treatment effect of 0.90. A treatment effect less than one indicates treatment is beneficial.

NA refers to scenarios where the initial treatment effect before misclassification was non-significant (p>0.05)



**Supplemental figure 1:** Amount of non-differential misclassification required such that treatment effect (relative risk=0.67) is no longer significant at 5% level for various sample sizes and overall event rates

n refers to hypothetical trial sample size



**Supplemental figure 2:** Amount of non-differential misclassification required such that treatment effect (relative risk=0.90) is no longer significant at 5% level for various sample sizes and overall event rates

Missing scenarios are due to the initial treatment effect before misclassification being non-significant (p>0.05). n refers to hypothetical trial sample size