

# **A meta-epidemiological assessment of transparency indicators of infectious disease models**

Short title: Transparency in infectious disease models

Emmanuel A. Zavalis<sup>1,2</sup>, John P.A. Ioannidis<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS), Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Learning, Informatics, Management and Ethics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

<sup>3</sup>Departments of Medicine, of Epidemiology and Population Health, of Biomedical Data Science, and of Statistics, Stanford University, California, USA

Address correspondence to: John P.A. Ioannidis, MD, DSc, 1265 Welch Rd, SPRC, MSOB X306, Stanford, CA 94305, USA. E-mail: [jioannid@stanford.edu](mailto:jioannid@stanford.edu)

## Abstract

Mathematical models have become very influential, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic. Data and code sharing are indispensable for reproducing them, protocol registration may be useful sometimes, and declarations of conflicts of interest (COIs) and of funding are quintessential for transparency. Here, we evaluated these features in publications of infectious disease-related models and assessed whether there were differences before and during the COVID-19 pandemic and for COVID-19 models versus models for other diseases. We analysed all PubMed Central open access publications of infectious disease models published in 2019 and 2021 using previously validated text mining algorithms of transparency indicators. We evaluated 1338 articles: 216 from 2019 and 1122 from 2021 (of which 818 were on COVID-19); almost a six-fold increase in publications within the field. 511 (39.2%) were compartmental models, 337 (25.2%) were time series, 279 (20.9%) were spatiotemporal, 186 (13.9%) were agent-based and 25 (1.9%) contained multiple model types. 288 (21.5%) articles shared code, 332 (24.8%) shared data, 6 (0.4%) were registered, and 1197 (89.5%) and 1109 (82.9%) contained COI and funding statements, respectively. There was no major changes in transparency indicators between 2019 and 2021. COVID-19 articles were less likely to have funding statements and more likely to share code. Manual assessment of 10% of the articles that were identified by the text mining algorithms as fulfilling transparency indicators showed that 24/29 (82.8%) actually shared code, 29/33 (87.9%) actually shared data; and all had COI and funding statements, but 95.8% disclosed no conflict and 11.7% reported no funding. On manual assessment, 5/6 articles identified as registered had indeed been registered. Transparency in infectious disease modelling is relatively low, especially for data and code sharing. This is concerning, considering the nature of this research and the heightened influence it has acquired.

**Keywords:** Mathematical modelling; Simulation; Forecasting; Infectious Disease; Transparency;

Reproducibility

## INTRODUCTION

A large number of infectious disease-related models are published in the scientific literature and their production and influence has rapidly increased during the COVID-19 pandemic. Such models can inform and shape policy, and have also been the subject of much debate (1–4), surrounding a range of issues, including their questionable predictive accuracy and their transparency(5–7).

Sharing of data and of code is totally indispensable for these models to be properly evaluated, used, reused, updated, integrated, or compared with other efforts. Without being able to rerun a model, it resembles a black box where blind trust is requested on its function and credibility. Moreover, other features of transparency, such as declaration of funding and of potential conflicts of interest (COI) are also important to have since many of these models may be very influential on deciding policy with major repercussions. Another feature of transparency that may aid reproducibility and trust in these models sometimes is the registration of their protocols, ideally in advance of their conduct. Registration is concept that receives increasing attention in many scientific fields (8–10) as a safeguard of trust. Registration may not be easy or relevant to have for many mathematical models, especially those that are exploratory and iterative(5). However, it may be feasible and desirable to register protocols about models in some circumstances(5).

There have previously been empirical evaluations of research practices, including documentation and transparency in subfields of mathematical modeling (11–13) that have shown that data and code/algorithm sharing has improved somewhat over time but that it still remains suboptimal. Yet, to our knowledge, in the field of infectious disease modelling there has been no comprehensive, large-scale analysis of such transparency and reproducibility indicators. It would

be of interest to explore the state of transparency in this highly popular field, especially in the context of the rapid and massive adoption of mathematical models during the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, we decided to evaluate infectious disease modeling studies using large-scale algorithmic extraction of information on several transparency and reproducibility indicators (code sharing, data sharing, registration, funding, conflicts of interest). We compared these features in articles published before and during the pandemic (in 2019 and 2021, respectively) and in articles on COVID-19-related models and models related to other infectious diseases.

## **RESULTS**

### **Study sample**

We screened 2903 records in their titles and abstracts according to the eligibility criteria. 1340 papers were excluded due to ineligibility in the primary survey leaving 1563 records for further scrutiny. 58 were excluded during the second round of screening, i.e., during retrieval of information on model type and disease and 167 were excluded for not being part of the PMC OA subset (Fig 1)

#### **Figure 1. Flow chart for study selection**

### **Characteristics of eligible papers**

Of the 1338 eligible papers (Table 1), 216 had been published in 2019 and 1122 in 2021. 818 (61.1%) were COVID-19 papers and the second largest group contained 130 (9.7%) publications and was the group of General (theoretical models). More than 70 different diseases had altogether been modelled in the eligible publications. The model types were more evenly

distributed with the most common model type being compartmental models (N=511, 39.2%) and time series models (N=337, 25.2%).

### **Table 1. Characteristics of the eligible studies**

## **Transparency indicators**

Table 2 shows the transparency indicators overall and in the three main categories based on year and COVID-19 focus. We found that based on the text mining algorithms 288 (21.5%) articles shared code, 332 (24.8%) shared data, 6 (0.4%) used registration, and 1197 (89.5%) and 1109 (82.9%) contained a COI and funding statement, respectively. 919 (68.7%) of publications shared neither data nor code, while 199 (14.9%) of all papers shared both data and code.

### **Table 2. Key transparency indicators overall and per year/COVID-19 focus**

We found no differences between years and between COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 papers in terms of probability of sharing data, registration, or mentioning of COIs. COVID-19 papers were more likely to share their code openly than the non-COVID-19 publications from the same year (14.1% v. 25.3%,  $p=5.1 \times 10^{-5}$ ), and they were less likely to report on funding compared with non-COVID-19 papers in the same year ( $p=3.5 \times 10^{-5}$ ). This led to an overall lower percentage of papers reporting on funding in 2021 compared with 2019 ( $p=1.0 \times 10^{-6}$ ).

## **Other correlates of transparency indicators**

As shown in Table 3, data sharing varied significantly across journals, e.g. it was 54.8% in PLoS One, but 12.7% in International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. Code sharing varied significantly across diseases, e.g. it was most common for dengue and least common for malaria (34.3% v 5.4%); and it varied significantly among types of models, (highest in agent-based models with 33.9% of publications sharing code). Registration was uncommon in all subgroups. COI disclosures were most common in dengue and least common in general

models and they also varied by type of model (least common in compartmental models). Funding information was most commonly disclosed in dengue models and least commonly disclosed in general models; it also varied by type of model (being lowest in compartmental models); and by journal.

### **Table 3. Key transparency indicators per disease type, model type, and journal**

Multivariable regressions (not shown) showed similar results. Code sharing was more common in COVID-19 models and in agent-based models. Data sharing was more common in spatiotemporal and agent-based models and also depended substantially on the journal. We did not perform multivariable regressions for the presence of COI and funding statements, since these depended almost entirely on the journal (several journals had 100% frequency of having a placeholder for such statements). Registration was too uncommon to subject to multivariable analysis.

## **Manual validation**

We also checked a random sample of 29 (10%) of papers that were found to be sharing code, 33 (10%) of those sharing data, and all 6 that were registered. Of these, 24/29 (82.8%) actually shared code, 29/33 (87.9%) actually shared data and 5/6 (83.3%) were indeed registered. The papers that used registration were two malaria models(14,15), one vector model (16) (which focused on malaria vectors) one polio (Sabin 2 virus (17)) model and one rotavirus model(18). The majority were from 2021(14,16,17) and were also malaria models (two malaria and one vector that was essentially malaria (14–16)) the majority we also classified as spatiotemporal (14–16). Finally, of the 120 articles (10%) that text mining found that they contained a COI statements, there was indeed a placeholder for this statement in all articles, but the vast majority of the statements (115 (95.8%)) disclosed no conflict at all. Of the 111 (10%) articles where text

mining found that they contained a funding statement, all of them had indeed such a statement, but 13 (11.7%) stated that they had no funding.

## DISCUSSION

Analysing 1338 recent articles from the field of infectious disease modelling we found that less than a quarter of these publications shared code or data, and only 14% shared both. This is concerning since it does not allow other scientists to check the models in any depth and it also limits their further uses. Moreover, registration was almost nonexistent. On a positive note, the large majority of models did provide some information on funding and COIs. However, the vast majority of COI statements simply said that they was no conflict. Furthermore, we saw no major differences between 2019 and 2021. COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 papers showed largely similar patterns for these transparency indicators, although the former were modestly more likely to share code and modestly less likely to report on funding. There were some differences for some of the transparency indicators across journals, model types and diseases.

Jalali et al. (11) analysed 29 articles on COVID-19 models in 2020 and found that 48% shared code, in 60% data was shared, whilst 80% contained a funding and COI disclosure respectively. Our findings show much lower rates of code sharing and data sharing. The Jalali et al. sample was apparently highly selective as it focused on the most referenced models among a compilation of models by the US Centers for Disease Control (19). In another empirical assessment of the reproducibility of 100 papers in simulation modelling in public health and health policy published over half a century (until 2016) and covering all applications (not just infectious diseases), code was available for only 2% of publications(20). Finally, in an empirical evaluation in decision modelling by Emerson et al. (13), when the team tried to get authors of papers to share their code 7.3% of simulation modelling researchers responded and in the end



only 1.6% agreed to share their code. This suggests that infectious disease models are not doing worse than other mathematical models, and may be doing even substantially better, but there is still plenty of room for improvement in sharing practices.

There have been many initiatives for improving sharing code and better documentation in the modelling community (21–24) as well, repositories for COVID-19 models (25,26) . The modelling community including COVID-19 (27) modelling has had multiple calls for transparency and the debate of reproducibility has been ongoing for decades (28–30). Several journals have tried to take steps in enhancing reproducibility. For example, Science changed their policy for code and data sharing to make both essentially mandatory (31). However, Stodden et al. (32) found no clear improvement after such interventions. Models are published in a vast array of journals and sharing rate as well as reporting and documentation requirements tend to be highly journal specific.

The frequency of code and data sharing in our sample was higher than what was documented for the general biomedical literature that was assessed in Serghiou et al. (33) using the same algorithm. COI and funding disclosures were almost equally common. On the other hand, we observed a ten-fold lower registration rate in our sample compared with the overall biomedical literature, which may reflect the difficulty of registering models and the lack of sufficient sensitization of the field to this possibility (5). We found that essentially 5 of our studies were registered (after validating the initial 6 that we found). Realising that registration may be difficult and even impossible for a large portion of models (exploratory models for instance) (5), it would still be advisable to register confirmatory studies of models that are destined to be used for policy to reduce the “vibration of effects” (the range of possible results obtained with multiple analytical choices) (34,35). Otherwise, promising output or excellent fit

may in reality be due to bias alone. When the stakes are high and wrong decisions may have grave implications, more rigor is needed.

The rates of COI and funding disclosures are satisfactory on face value, considering they both are above 80% both in our sample and across other empirical assessments (11,33,36). This may also be due to the fact that both these types of disclosures have been introduced into many journal's routinely published items and there is a standard placeholder for them. Typically journals mandate a COI and funding statement. However, the fidelity and completeness of these statements is difficult to probe. We cannot exclude that undisclosed COIs may exist. Our random sample validation found that the COI disclosures almost never mentioned any conflict. Given the policy implications of many models, especially in the COVID-19 era, this pattern may represent under-reporting of conflicts. Funding disclosures were more informative with only 12% stating no funding, but even then unstated sources of funding cannot be excluded.

## **Limitations**

There are limitations in our evaluation. Our sample focused on the PubMed Central Open Access subset and not all PubMed-indexed papers. It is unclear if non-open access papers may be less likely to adopt sharing practices. If so, the proportion of sharing in the total infectious disease modeling literature may be over-estimated.

Second, we used a text-mining approach which has been extensively validated across the entire biomedical literature, but the algorithms may have different performance specifically in the infectious disease modeling field. Nevertheless, in-depth evaluation of a random sample of papers suggests that identification of these indicators is quite accurate and false positives are uncommon. We did not check manually for false negatives, because the algorithms have very

high negative predictive value, but it is possible that in a few articles some transparency indicators may have been missed.

Third, the presence of a data sharing or code sharing statement doesn't promise full functionality and the ability to fully reuse the data and code. This can only be decided after spending substantial effort to bring a paper to life based on the shared information. For COI and funding statements, we also only established their existence, but did not appraise in depth the content of these statements, let alone their veracity. Evaluations in other fields suggests that many COIs are undisclosed and funding information is often incomplete (37–39).

Finally, we only assessed a sample that is drawn from two calendar years that are not very far apart, thus major changes might not have been anticipated at least for non-COVID-19 models. Nevertheless, 2021 was a unique year with a pandemic which of course affected the field not merely through inflation of publications(40) but also through specific funder and governmental initiatives and incentives. Therefore, only time will tell if any of the COVID-19 impact on the scientific literature will be long-lasting and if it may also affect the landscape of mathematical modeling in general after the pandemic phases out.

## **Conclusions**

We found that in the highly influential field of infectious disease modeling that relies as much on its assumptions and underlying code and data, transparency and reproducibility have large potential for improvement. Yet, there is a growing literature of recommendations and tutorials for researchers and other stakeholders (41–44), plus the EPIFORGE guidelines (45) which are guidelines for the reporting of epidemic forecasting and prediction research. They all explicitly urge for code sharing, and data sharing and transparency in general. The current lack of transparency may cause problems in the use, reuse, interpretation, and adoption of these

models for scientific or policy activities. It also hinders evidence synthesis and attempts to build on previous research to facilitate progress within the field. Improved transparency and reproducibility may help reinforce the legacy of this important field.

## METHODS

This study is a meta-epidemiological survey of transparency indicators present in four common types of infectious disease models (compartmental, spatiotemporal, agent-based/individual based and time-series) indexed in the PubMed Central Open Access (PMC OA) Subset of PubMed. The study is reported using the STROBE guidelines (46). The code needed for the analysis of our data used R(47) and Python(48).

### Search and screening

We developed a search strategy to identify papers published from 2019 and 2021 in English in PMC OA subset that included models of infectious diseases: model\*[tiab] OR forecast\*[tiab] OR predict\*[tiab] ) AND (SIR-models[tiab] OR SIR[tiab] OR SIRS[tiab] OR SEIR[tiab] OR SEIR-model[tiab] OR SIRS-model[tiab] OR agent-based[tiab] OR spatiotemporal[tiab] OR nowcast[tiab] OR backprojection[tiab] OR "traveling waves"[tiab] OR (time series[tiab] OR time-series[tiab]) ) NOT (rat model\*[ti] OR murine model\*[ti] OR animal model\*[ti] OR mouse model\*[ti] OR primate model\*[ti]) AND (infect\* OR transmi\* OR epidem\*. The model types that were included were compartmental models, spatiotemporal models, agent-based/ individual-based models and time series models. They were defined as follows:

- (i) Compartmental models assign subsets of the population to different classes according to their infection status (e.g., susceptible exposed, recovered etc.) and models the

- population parameters of the disease according to assumed transmission rates between these subsets [1].
- (ii) Spatiotemporal models explore and predict the temporal and geographical spread of infectious diseases (usually using geographic time series data).
  - (iii) Agent-based/ individual based models are computer simulations of the interaction of agents with unique attributes regarding spatial location, physiological traits and/or social behavior(50,51). Finally,
  - (iv) Time-series models other than spatiotemporal were also included that use trends in number of infected or deaths or any other parameter of interest to predict future trends and numbers of spread (52) .

We excluded clinical predictive, prognostic, and diagnostic models and included only models of infectious agents that can infect humans (i.e. both zoonotic diseases as well as diseases exclusive to humans). All screening and analysis was conducted by EAZ in two eligibility assessment rounds. In the first round, eligibility was assessed based on the title and abstract; in the second where the model type and disease type was extracted, eligibility was also assessed by perusing the article in more depth. After this round, in unclear cases EAZ consulted JPAI and these cases were settled with discussion.

## **Data extraction**

For each eligible study, we extracted information on the model type and disease type manually. For model type, whenever cases came up that were not clear-cut EAZ and JPAI conferred as to what category was sensible. Some phylogenetic models were included and classified as spatiotemporal if they had spatiotemporal aspects. When there were multiple model types in a single paper it was classified as ‘Multiple’. For disease, we used categories defined

based on the infectious agent of interest that was studied. The “Unspecified” category included studies not mentioning a specific infectious agent but a clinical syndrome (i.e. urinary tract infection or pneumonia etc.), the “General (theoretical models)” category included studies that didn’t model a specific disease (i.e. a theoretic pandemic). Finally, where multiple diseases were mentioned, the papers were categorised in a separate category as ‘Multiple different agents’ (i.e. HIV and tuberculosis). Where vectors of diseases such as mosquitos were modelled to predict spread of multiple diseases, we classified the disease as ‘Vector’.

For each eligible article we used PubMed to extract information on metadata that included PMID, PMCID, publication year, journal name and the R package `rtransparent`(33) to extract the following transparency indicators: (i) code sharing (ii) data sharing (iii) (pre-)registration, (iv) COI and (v) funding statements.

`rtransparent` searches through the full text of the papers for specific words or phrases that strongly suggest that the aforementioned transparency indicators are present in that particular paper. The program uses regular expressions to adjust for variations in expressions. For example, to identify code sharing, `rtransparent` looks for “code” and “available” as well as the repository “GitHub” and its variations, and in a paper selected (53) from our dataset it finds the following: “the model and code for reproducing all figures in this manuscript from model output are publicly available online (<https://github.com/bdi-pathogens/openabm-covid19-model-paper>)”

The approach has been previously validated and tested in Serghiou et al. (33) across the entire biomedical literature and has a positive predictive value (PPV) of 88.2% (81.7%-93.8%) and negative predictive value (NPV) of 98.6% (96.2-99.9%) for code sharing; 93.0% (88.0%-97.0%) and 94.4% (89.1%-97.0%) for data sharing, 92.1% (88.3-98.6%) and 99.8% (99.7%-

99.9%) for registration, 99.9% (99.7%-100.0%) and 96.8% (94.4%-99.1%) for COI disclosure and 99.7% (99.3%-99.9%) and 98.1% (96.2%-99.5%) for funding disclosures.

To further validate the performance of the algorithms in detecting code sharing and data sharing reliably, a random sample of 10% of publications that the algorithm identified as sharing code and 10% of those that the algorithm identified as sharing data were manually assessed looking into whether the statements indeed represented true sharing. All papers that were identified by the algorithm to have registration were assessed manually to verify whether registration had been performed. Moreover, a random sample of 10% of papers that were found to contain a COI statement and 10% of those found to include a funding statement were assessed manually to see not only whether such statements were indeed present, but also to assess how many of them contain actual disclosures of specific conflicts or funding sources, respectively, and not just a statement that there are no COIs/funding, e.g. 'There is no conflict of interest', 'No funding was received' or 'Funding disclosure is not applicable'.

## **Statistical analysis**

The primary outcome studied was the percentage of papers that include each of the transparency indicators. We considered three primary comparisons that were conducted using Fisher's exact tests.

- All publications in 2019 to all in 2021 (to assess if there is improvement over time)
- All non-COVID-19 publications in 2019 to the non-COVID-19 publications in 2021 (to assess if there is improvement over time for non-COVID-19 publications)
- 2021 COVID-19 publications to 2021 non-COVID-19 ones (to assess if COVID-19 papers differ in transparency indicators versus non-COVID-19 papers).

Subsequently we also explored whether other factors may have correlated with the transparency indicators using Fisher's exact tests to see whether there was any statistically significant association (significance level set at 0.005 (54)) when comparing model types, year, disease modelled, as well as journal separately. We had pre-specified that whenever any statistically significant results were found, we would conduct multivariable logistic regressions as well.

## **Deviations from the protocol**

We deviated from the protocol in that we didn't perform chi-square tests due to too low counts in some variables rendering it unreliable, therefore we decided to conduct these analyses using Fisher's exact tests instead of chi-square tests. The 10% manual assessment of a random sample of articles with COI and funding statements was added post hoc, when we realized that many articles could have such statements but they might simply state that there was no COI and/or no funding.



## **Code and data availability**

The protocol for this study can be found at [doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/JGWVK](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/JGWVK) and the code and data will also be made available upon publication on the same site.

## **COI statement**

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## **Funding statement**

EAZ visiting fellowship at Stanford was partly funded by the foundation ‘Carl Erik Levins Stiftelse’ and by the Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS).

## References

1. Holmdahl I, Buckee C. Wrong but Useful — What Covid-19 Epidemiologic Models Can and Cannot Tell Us. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Jul 23;383(4):303–5.
2. Chin V, Ioannidis JPA, Tanner MA, Cripps S. Effect estimates of COVID-19 non-pharmaceutical interventions are non-robust and highly model-dependent. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2021 Aug;136:96–132.
3. Metcalf CJE, Morris DH, Park SW. Mathematical models to guide pandemic response. *Science*. 2020 Jul 24;369(6502):368–9.
4. Chin V, Samia NI, Marchant R, Rosen O, Ioannidis JPA, Tanner MA, et al. A case study in model failure? COVID-19 daily deaths and ICU bed utilisation predictions in New York state. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2020 Aug;35(8):733–42.
5. Ioannidis JPA. Pre-registration of mathematical models. *Math Biosci*. 2022 Jan 25;345:108782.
6. Tang L, Zhou Y, Wang L, Purkayastha S, Zhang L, He J, et al. A Review of Multi-Compartment Infectious Disease Models. *Int Stat Rev*. 2020 Aug;88(2):462–513.
7. Walters CE, Meslé MMI, Hall IM. Modelling the Global Spread of Diseases: A Review of Current Practice and Capability. *Epidemics*. 2018 Dec;25:1–8.
8. Clarke P, Buckell J, Barnett A. Registered Reports: Time to Radically Rethink Peer Review in Health Economics. *PharmacoEconomics - Open*. 2020 Mar;4(1):1–4.
9. Sampson CJ, Wrightson T. Model Registration: A Call to Action. *PharmacoEconomics - Open*. 2017 Jun;1(2):73–7.

10. Kent S, Becker F, Feenstra T, Tran-Duy A, Schlackow I, Tew M, et al. The Challenge of Transparency and Validation in Health Economic Decision Modelling: A View from Mount Hood. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2019 Nov;37(11):1305–12.
11. Jalali MS, DiGennaro C, Sridhar D. Transparency assessment of COVID-19 models. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2020 Dec;8(12):e1459–60.
12. Janssen MA, Pritchard C, Lee A. On code sharing and model documentation of published individual and agent-based models. *Environ Model Softw*. 2020 Dec;134:104873.
13. Emerson J, Bacon R, Kent A, Neumann PJ, Cohen JT. Publication of Decision Model Source Code: Attitudes of Health Economics Authors. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2019 Nov;37(11):1409–10.
14. Bationo CS, Gaudart J, Dieng S, Cissoko M, Taconet P, Ouedraogo B, et al. Spatio-temporal analysis and prediction of malaria cases using remote sensing meteorological data in Diébougou health district, Burkina Faso, 2016-2017. *Sci Rep*. 2021 Oct 8;11(1):20027.
15. Solomon T, Loha E, Deressa W, Gari T, Lindtjørn B. Spatiotemporal clustering of malaria in southern-central Ethiopia: A community-based cohort study. *PloS One*. 2019;14(9):e0222986.
16. Taconet P, Porciani A, Soma DD, Mouline K, Simard F, Koffi AA, et al. Data-driven and interpretable machine-learning modeling to explore the fine-scale environmental determinants of malaria vectors biting rates in rural Burkina Faso. *Parasit Vectors*. 2021 Jun 29;14(1):345.
17. Famulare M, Wong W, Haque R, Platts-Mills JA, Saha P, Aziz AB, et al. Multiscale model for forecasting Sabin 2 vaccine virus household and community transmission. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2021 Dec;17(12):e1009690.

18. Alsova OK, Loktev VB, Naumova EN. Rotavirus Seasonality: An Application of Singular Spectrum Analysis and Polyharmonic Modeling. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2019 Nov 6;16(22):E4309.
19. CDC. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020 [cited 2022 Mar 31]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/forecasting/forecasting-us.html>
20. Jalali MS, DiGennaro C, Guitar A, Lew K, Rahmandad H. Evolution and Reproducibility of Simulation Modeling in Epidemiology and Health Policy Over Half a Century. *Epidemiol Rev*. 2022 Jan 14;43(1):166–75.
21. Neumann PJ, Thorat T, Zhong Y, Anderson J, Farquhar M, Salem M, et al. A Systematic Review of Cost-Effectiveness Studies Reporting Cost-per-DALY Averted. Speybroeck N, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2016 Dec 22;11(12):e0168512.
22. Lloyd CM, Lawson JR, Hunter PJ, Nielsen PF. The CellML Model Repository. *Bioinforma Oxf Engl*. 2008 Sep 15;24(18):2122–3.
23. McDougal RA, Morse TM, Carnevale T, Marengo L, Wang R, Migliore M, et al. Twenty years of ModelDB and beyond: building essential modeling tools for the future of neuroscience. *J Comput Neurosci*. 2017 Feb;42(1):1–10.
24. Le Novère N, Bornstein B, Broicher A, Courtot M, Donizelli M, Dharuri H, et al. BioModels Database: a free, centralized database of curated, published, quantitative kinetic models of biochemical and cellular systems. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2006 Jan 1;34(Database issue):D689-691.
25. Home - COVID 19 forecast hub [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 31]. Available from: <https://covid19forecasthub.org/>

26. Bracher J, Ray EL, Gneiting T, Reich NG. Evaluating epidemic forecasts in an interval format. Pitzer VE, editor. *PLOS Comput Biol*. 2021 Feb 12;17(2):e1008618.
27. Barton CM, Alberti M, Ames D, Atkinson J-A, Bales J, Burke E, et al. Call for transparency of COVID-19 models. Sills J, editor. *Science*. 2020 May;368(6490):482–3.
28. Schaduangrat N, Lampa S, Simeon S, Gleeson MP, Spjuth O, Nantasenamat C. Towards reproducible computational drug discovery. *J Cheminformatics*. 2020 Dec;12(1):9.
29. Conrado DJ, Karlsson MO, Romero K, Sarr C, Wilkins JJ. Open innovation: Towards sharing of data, models and workflows. *Eur J Pharm Sci Off J Eur Fed Pharm Sci*. 2017 Nov 15;109S:S65–71.
30. Alwan NA, Bhopal R, Burgess RA, Colburn T, Cuevas LE, Smith GD, et al. Evidence informing the UK’s COVID-19 public health response must be transparent. *The Lancet*. 2020 Mar;395(10229):1036–7.
31. Hanson B, Sugden A, Alberts B. Making Data Maximally Available. *Science*. 2011 Feb 11;331(6018):649–649.
32. Stodden V, Guo P, Ma Z. Toward Reproducible Computational Research: An Empirical Analysis of Data and Code Policy Adoption by Journals. *PloS One*. 2013;8(6):e67111.
33. Serghiou S, Contopoulos-Ioannidis DG, Boyack KW, Riedel N, Wallach JD, Ioannidis JPA. Assessment of transparency indicators across the biomedical literature: How open is open? Bero L, editor. *PLOS Biol*. 2021 Mar 1;19(3):e3001107.
34. Palpacuer C, Hammas K, Duprez R, Laviolle B, Ioannidis JPA, Naudet F. Vibration of effects from diverse inclusion/exclusion criteria and analytical choices: 9216 different ways to perform an indirect comparison meta-analysis. *BMC Med*. 2019 Dec;17(1):174.

35. Patel CJ, Burford B, Ioannidis JPA. Assessment of vibration of effects due to model specification can demonstrate the instability of observational associations. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2015 Sep;68(9):1046–58.
36. Iqbal SA, Wallach JD, Khoury MJ, Schully SD, Ioannidis JPA. Reproducible Research Practices and Transparency across the Biomedical Literature. Vaux DL, editor. *PLOS Biol*. 2016 Jan 4;14(1):e1002333.
37. Checketts JX, Sims MT, Vassar M. Evaluating Industry Payments Among Dermatology Clinical Practice Guidelines Authors. *JAMA Dermatol*. 2017 Dec 1;153(12):1229.
38. Horn J, Checketts JX, Jawhar O, Vassar M. Evaluation of Industry Relationships Among Authors of Otolaryngology Clinical Practice Guidelines. *JAMA Otolaryngol-- Head Neck Surg*. 2018 Mar 1;144(3):194–201.
39. Ornstein C, Thomas K. Top Cancer Researcher Fails to Disclose Corporate Financial Ties in Major Research Journals. *The New York Times* [Internet]. 2018 Sep 8 [cited 2022 Mar 31]; Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/08/health/jose-baselga-cancer-memorial-sloan-kettering.html>
40. Ioannidis JPA, Salholz-Hillel M, Boyack KW, Baas J. The rapid, massive growth of COVID-19 authors in the scientific literature. *R Soc Open Sci*. 2021 Sep;8(9):210389.
41. Sandve GK, Nekrutenko A, Taylor J, Hovig E. Ten Simple Rules for Reproducible Computational Research. Bourne PE, editor. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2013 Oct 24;9(10):e1003285.
42. Stodden V, McNutt M, Bailey DH, Deelman E, Gil Y, Hanson B, et al. Enhancing reproducibility for computational methods. *Science*. 2016 Dec 9;354(6317):1240–1.

43. Piccolo SR, Frampton MB. Tools and techniques for computational reproducibility. *GigaScience*. 2016 Dec;5(1):30.
44. Wilkinson MD, Dumontier M, Aalbersberg IJ, Appleton G, Axton M, Baak A, et al. The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Sci Data*. 2016 Dec;3(1):160018.
45. Pollett S, Johansson MA, Reich NG, Brett-Major D, Del Valle SY, Venkatramanan S, et al. Recommended reporting items for epidemic forecasting and prediction research: The EPIFORGE 2020 guidelines. *PLoS Med*. 2021 Oct;18(10):e1003793.
46. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, et al. The Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2008 Apr;61(4):344–9.
47. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 28]. Available from: <https://www.r-project.org/>
48. Welcome to Python.org [Internet]. Python.org. [cited 2022 Mar 31]. Available from: <https://www.python.org/>
49. Milwid R, Steriu A, Arino J, Heffernan J, Hyder A, Schanzer D, et al. Toward Standardizing a Lexicon of Infectious Disease Modeling Terms. *Front Public Health* [Internet]. 2016 Sep 28 [cited 2022 Feb 12];4. Available from: <http://journal.frontiersin.org/Article/10.3389/fpubh.2016.00213/abstract>
50. Bonabeau E. Agent-based modeling: Methods and techniques for simulating human systems. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2002 May 14;99(Supplement 3):7280–7.

51. Shoukat A, Moghadas SM. Agent-Based Modelling: An Overview with Application to Disease Dynamics. ArXiv200704192 Cs Q-Bio [Internet]. 2020 Jul 8 [cited 2022 Feb 12]; Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2007.04192>
52. Allard R. Use of time-series analysis in infectious disease surveillance. Bull World Health Organ. 1998;76(4):327–33.
53. Hinch R, Probert WJM, Nurtay A, Kendall M, Wymant C, Hall M, et al. OpenABM-Covid19-An agent-based model for non-pharmaceutical interventions against COVID-19 including contact tracing. PLoS Comput Biol. 2021 Jul;17(7):e1009146.
54. Benjamin DJ, Berger JO, Johannesson M, Nosek BA, Wagenmakers E-J, Berk R, et al. Redefine statistical significance. Nat Hum Behav. 2018 Jan;2(1):6–10.



**Table 1. Characteristics of eligible studies**

	2019 N (%) 216 articles	2021 non-COVID-19 N (%) 304 articles	2021 COVID-19 N (%) 818 articles	All publications N (%) 1338 articles
<b>Type of model</b>				
Compartmental	26 (12.0)	91 (29.9)	394 (48.0)	511 (39.2)
Time series	80 (37.0)	82 (27.0)	175 (21.4)	337 (25.2)
Spatiotemporal	78 (36.1)	90 (29.6)	111 (13.6)	279 (20.9)
Agent-based	31 (14.4)	37 (12.2)	118 (14.4)	186 (13.9)
Multiple	1 (0.5)	4 (1.3)	20 (2.4)	25 (1.9)
<b>Type of disease</b>				
COVID-19	0 (0)	0 (0)	818 (100)	818 (61.1)
General	33 (15.3)	97 (31.9)	0 (0)	130 (9.7)
Influenza illnesses	20 (9.3)	20 (6.6)	0 (0)	40 (3.0)
Malaria	15 (6.9)	22 (7.2)	0 (0)	37 (2.8)
Dengue	15 (6.9)	20 (6.6)	0 (0)	35 (2.6)
Others	133 (61.6)	145 (48)	0 (0)	278 (20.8)
<b>Journal</b>				
PLoS One	26 (12.0)	27 (8.9)	62 (7.6)	115 (8.6)
Sci Rep	20 (9.3)	19 (6.3)	52 (6.4)	91 (6.8)
Int J Environ Health	15 (6.9)	21 (6.9)	27 (3.3)	63 (4.7)
BMC Infect Dis	16 (7.4)	12 (3.9)	10 (1.2)	38 (2.8)
PLoS Negl Trop Dis	11 (5.1)	22 (7.2)	0 (0)	33 (2.5)
PLoS Comput Biol	10 (4.6)	10 (3.3)	9 (1.1)	29 (2.2)
BMC Public Health	6 (2.8)	9 (3.0)	13 (1.6)	28 (2.1)
Chaos Solitons Fractals	0 (0)	5 (1.6)	20 (2.4)	25 (1.9)
Others	112 (52.0)	179 (58.9)	625 (76.4)	916 (68.5)

**Table 2. Key transparency indicators overall and per year/COVID-19 focus**

*COI: conflicts of interest*

	<b>Code</b>	<b>Data</b>	<b>Registration</b>	<b>COI</b>	<b>Funding</b>
N=1338	<b>sharing</b>	<b>sharing</b>	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>
	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>			
<b>Overall</b>	288 (21.5)	332 (24.8)	6 (0.4)	1197 (89.5)	1109 (82.9)

2019	38 (17.6)	59 (27.3)	3 (1.4)	197 (91.2)	202 (93.5)
2021	250 (22.3)	273 (24.3)	3 (0.3)	1000 (89.2)	907 (80.8)
COVID-19	207 (25.3)	199 (24.3)	0	730 (89.2)	635 (77.6)
non-COVID-19	43 (14.1)	74 (24.3)	3 (1)	270 (88.8)	272 (89.5)
<b>Fisher's exact test (p-values)</b>					
<i>2019 vs 2021</i>	0.15	0.35	0.06	0.45	$1.0 \times 10^{-6}$
<i>2019 vs 2021 non-COVID-19</i>	0.33	0.48	0.70	0.46	0.12
<i>2021 non-COVID-19 vs. COVID-19</i>	$5.1 \times 10^{-5}$	1	0.02	0.83	$3.5 \times 10^{-5}$

**Table 3. Key transparency indicators per disease type, model type, and journal**

*COI: conflicts of interest*

	<b>Code sharing</b> N (%)	<b>Data sharing</b> N (%)	<b>Registration</b> N (%)	<b>COI</b> N (%)	<b>Funding</b> N (%)
<b>Disease modelled</b>					
<i>p</i> (Fisher's exact test)	$7.4 \times 10^{-6}$	0.47	0.001	0.01	$2.8 \times 10^{-10}$
COVID-19	207 (25.3)	199 (24.3)	0 (0)	730 (89.2)	635 (77.6)
General (theoretical model)	31 (23.8)	34 (26.2)	0 (0)	94 (72.3)	108 (83.1)
Influenza illnesses	6 (15)	10 (25)	0 (0)	38 (95)	39 (97.5)
Malaria	2 (5.4)	7 (18.9)	2 (5.4)	37 (100)	35 (94.6)
Dengue	12 (34.3)	13 (37.1)	0 (0)	35 (100)	35 (100)
Other diseases	30 (10.8)	69 (24.8)	4 (1.4)	263 (94.6)	257 (92.4)
<b>Type of model</b>					

<i>p</i> (Fisher's exact test)	0.001	0.006	0.15	$< 1 \times 10^{-7}$	0.008
Compartmental	104 (20.4)	103 (20.2)	0 (0)	419 (82)	405 (79.3)
Time Series	65 (19.3)	81 (24)	2 (0.6)	319 (94.7)	276 (81.9)
Spatiotemporal	52 (18.6)	84 (30.1)	3 (1.1)	263 (94.3)	247 (88.5)
Agent-based	63 (33.9)	58 (31.2)	1 (0.5)	173 (93)	161 (86.6)
Multiple	4 (16)	6 (24)	0 (0)	23 (92)	20 (80)
<b>Journal</b>					
<i>p</i> (Fisher exact)	0.15	$1.7 \times 10^{-12}$	0.11	$2.5 \times 10^{-12}$	$3.4 \times 10^{-14}$
PLoS One	30 (26.1)	63 (54.8)	1 (0.9)	115 (100)	100
Sci Rep	23 (25.3)	21 (23.1)	1 (1.1)	91 (100)	76.9
Int J Environ Res Public Health	8 (12.7)	7 (11.1)	1 (1.6)	63 (100)	100
Other journals	227 (21.2)	241 (22.5)	3 (0.3)	928 (86.8)	80.5

## Identification of studies via databases and registers

### Identification

Records identified from PubMed (N=3987,  $n_{grey}$ =1263,  $n_{pre}$ =2724) on Mar 30<sup>th</sup> 2022.

Records identified from PubMed using free full-text filter (N = 2903,  $n_{grey}$ =806,  $n_{pre}$ =2096) on Mar 30<sup>th</sup> 2022.

### Screening

Records screened using eligibility criteria (n = 2903)

Records excluded (n = 1348)

Reports sought for retrieval of model type and disease modelled (n = 1557)

Reports not retrieved (not PMC open access subset) (n = 367)

Excluded due to ineligibility (n=58)

- Not a model (n=9)
- Not a prediction of infectious disease dynamics (n=37)
- Uneligible language (n=1)
- Not one of the specified types of models (n=8)
- Not a publication (retraction or erratum) (n=2)
- Duplicates (Preprint and original article) (n=1)

### Included

Papers included in analysis (n = 1338)