Reporting of Retrospective Registration in Clinical Trial Publications

Martin Haslberger* (MH), https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8067-2856, martin.haslberger@bih-charite.de
Stefanie Gestrich (SG), stefanie.gestrich@charite.de
Daniel Strech (DS), https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9153-079X, daniel.strech@bih-charite.de

Berlin Institute of Health at Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, QUEST Center for Responsible Research, Charitéplatz 1, 10117 Berlin, Germany

* Corresponding author

Keywords: Clinical Trials, Trial Registration, Reporting, Retrospective Registration

Author Contributions
Martin Haslberger – Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, analysis, writing - original draft, project management
Stefanie Gestrich – Methodology, investigation
Daniel Strech – Conceptualization, methodology, supervision, writing – review and editing, funding acquisition

Open Data and Code
All code and the data for this study are available at https://github.com/mhaslberger/retrospective-registration.

Funding
This work was partly funded under a grant from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany (Bundesministerium fuer Bildung und Forschung - BMBF) [01PW18012]. The funder was not involved in the study design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation, writing of the manuscript, or the decision to submit for publication.

Conflicts
The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments
We thank Maia Salholz-Hillel for conceptual feedback and technical support. We thank Martin R. Holst and Dr. Delwen Franzen for feedback on the manuscript.

Abstract

Objective: Prospective registration of clinical research has been widely implemented and advocated for many reasons: to detect and mitigate publication bias, selective reporting, and undisclosed changes in the determination of primary and secondary outcomes. Prospective registration allows for public scrutiny of trials, facilitates the identification of gaps in research, and supports the coordination of efforts by preventing unnecessary duplication. Retrospective registration undermines many of these reasons but is commonly found. We provide a comprehensive analysis of retrospective registration and the reporting thereof in publications, as well as factors associated with these practices.

Design: For this cross-sectional study, we used a validated dataset of trials registered on ClinicalTrials.gov or DRKS, with a German University Medical Center as the lead center, completed between 2009 and 2017, and with at least one peer-reviewed results publication. We extracted all registration statements from all results publications of retrospectively registered trials, including mentions and justifications of retrospective registration. We analyzed associations between key trial variables and different registration and reporting practices.

Results: In our dataset of 1927 trials with a corresponding results publication, 956 (53.7%) were retrospectively registered. Of those, 2.2% (21) explicitly report the retrospective registration in the abstract and 3.5% (33) in the full text. In 2.1% (20) of publications, authors provide a justification/explanation for the retrospective registration in the full text. Registration numbers were significantly underreported in abstracts of retrospectively registered trials ($p < 0.001$). Publications in ICMJE member journals had higher rates of both prospective registration and disclosure of retrospective registration, although not statistically significant. Publications in journals claiming to follow ICMJE recommendations showed lower rates compared to non-ICMJE-following journals.

Conclusions: In contrast to ICMJE guidance, retrospective registration is disclosed and explained only in a small number of retrospectively registered studies. Lack of disclosure might lead readers to wrongly interpret the registration as a quality criterion that, in the case of a retrospective registration, rather describes a concern. Disclosure of the retrospective nature of the registration would require 1-2 additional sentences in the manuscript and could be easily implemented by publishers.

Introduction

Prospective registration of clinical trials (i.e., registration before enrollment of the first participant) is an important practice to reduce biases in their conduct and reporting (1). A number of ethical and legal documents call for prospective registration: The Declaration of Helsinki (2) and the WHO registry standards (3) state that registration and results reporting of clinical trials are an ethical responsibility. In addition, many journals, via the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), encourage or require prospective registration with an appropriate registry before the first participant is enrolled for all trials they publish, as well as the reporting of trial registration numbers in publications for better findability (4,5). Similarly, reporting guidelines such as CONSORT (6) and GPP3 (7) recommend the reporting of trial registration numbers.

Prospective registration has been widely implemented and advocated for many reasons: to detect and mitigate publication bias (i.e., the non-reporting of studies, or aspects of studies, that did not yield a positive result) and selective reporting (i.e., the selective reporting of only statistically significant primary outcomes). Prospective registration allows for public scrutiny of trials, identification of research gaps and to support the coordination of efforts by preventing unnecessary duplication (9). When trials are registered retrospectively, i.e., their registry entry is created after study start, this undermines the many of the reasons for registration. While prospective registration has increased over the past decade, retrospective registration is still widespread (10–14). Some registries, such as DRKS, explicitly mark retrospectively registered entries as such, whereas others, such as ClinicalTrials.gov, do not. While some publishers allow retrospectively registered trials to be published, others do not. Journals following ICMJE guidance should in principle mandate prospective registration, but this principle is not always enforced (12,15,16).

Our study aims to investigate the conduct of retrospective registration and its transparent reporting further. In a previous study in a cohort of 1509 trials conducted at German University Medical Centers, registered in DRKS or Clinicaltrials.gov, and reported as complete between 2009-2013, 75% were registered retrospectively (17). This rate dropped to 46% for the 1658 trials completed between 2014-2017 (18). Using the data from these two studies on trials registered in two large registries, led by German University Medical Centers, completed between 2009 and 2017, and with at least one available peer-reviewed results publication (17,18), we investigate whether and how authors report retrospective registration in the results publication. We also explore trends over time and how retrospective registration is associated with other practices such as reporting the trial registration number.

Methods

Data sources and sample. We based our sample on two related projects that were conducted at our research group (17,18). The projects have drawn a full sample (n = 3113) of registry entries for interventional studies reported as complete between 2009 and 2017, led by a German University Medical Center and registered in one of two registries: The ClinicalTrials.gov platform (CT.gov) and the Deutsches Register Klinischer Studien (DRKS), which is the WHO primary trial registry for Germany. Our dataset also includes the earliest results publication found for 68.4% (2129/3113) of the trials, which was identified by a combination of automated and hand-searches until September 1st, 2020. We retrieved the combined data from the two projects from a GitHub repository (https://github.com/maia-sh/intovalue-data, accessed 22.02.2022).

Eligibility criteria. We included any trial that [1] was registered as an interventional study in either the ClinicalTrials.gov or the DRKS database, [2] was completed between 2009 and 2017, [3] reports a

German University Medical Center (UMC) listed as the responsible party or lead sponsor, or with a principal investigator from a German UMC, [4] has published results in a peer-reviewed journal. Detailed descriptions of how these variables were derived are provided in the original publications of the dataset (17,18). Retrospective registration was determined based on the registration and study start dates in the registry entries: dates were set to the first of the respective month and studies with a registration date more than one month after start date counted as retrospectively registered.

Data extraction. For all retrospectively registered trials, we manually searched the abstract and the full text of the publications, including editorial statements, whether they reported

- the fact that the study was registered (binary),
- a trial registration number (binary),
- the exact wording used to report the registration, including any provided registration numbers (free text),
- the date of the retrospective registration (binary), and
- the fact that the study was retrospectively registered (binary).
- We also assessed whether (binary) and how authors justified or explained the retrospective registration (free text).

One rater (MH) used the keywords “regist”, “nct”, “drks”, “eudra”, “retro”, “delay”, and “after” to search for registration numbers and wording pointing to retrospective registration in all publications. We considered a retrospective registration statement transparent if the authors explicitly mentioned that the registration was retrospective, e.g., “this study was retrospectively registered in [registry], [TRN]”. Reporting of the registration date alone was not considered as transparent reporting of retrospective registration, except if the date of registration was mentioned in combination with the study start date in the same paragraph.

ICMJE journals. We created additional variables for whether journals follow the ICMJE recommendations (list available on http://www.icmje.org/journals-following-the-icmje-recommendations/, accessed 07.04.2022).

Cross-registrations. We classified all retrospectively registered studies in our sample that report a registration in EudraCT in the publication as prospective, as registrations on the platform are required prior to the approval of regulatory agencies or research ethics committees (19).

Reliability assessment of ratings. To assess the reliability of the data extraction, another rater (SG) performed three validation steps: first, a sample of 100 publications was screened using the same extraction form, during the main screening to refine category definitions. Second, another sample of 100 publications for which no registration number reporting was noted by MH to check for false negative ratings. Third, all cases with either date, or reporting of retrospective registration or justification were screened, to check for false positives.

Analyses

Associations between prospective registration and other variables

To test the strength of the associations between prospective registration and three variables, we used Pearson’s chi-squared independence test or Fisher’s exact test (for small numbers). These variables are (1) publication in a ICMJE member journal or a journal following ICMJE recommendations, (2) reporting of a registration number, and (3) industry funding.

Associations between reporting of retrospective registration and other variables

To test the strength of the associations between the reporting of retrospective registration and two binary variables, we used Fisher’s exact test. These variables are (1) publication in a ICMJE member journal or a journal following ICMJE recommendations, and (2) industry funding.

Software

We used Microsoft Excel for data collection and R (version 4.0.3) for data analysis and visualization.

Results

Sample of retrospectively registered trials. After applying the above-mentioned exclusion criteria, 1927 (1932 - 5) registered studies with an associated results publication remained. Of these, 1038 (53.7%) were retrospectively registered according to the information provided in Clinicaltrials.gov and DRKS. We screened these 1038 studies for our analysis. 77 (7.8%) of the publications provided a EudraCT number, in which case we reclassified the study as prospectively registered. For statistical comparisons, we used the prospectively registered studies in the dataset as a control group. A flowchart of this study selection is provided in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Flowchart of in-/exclusion of studies. From the 1038 trials that were retrospectively registered in Clincialtrials.gov or DRKS, we excluded 5 publications that clearly did not report clinical study results (e.g., secondary analyses of CT data) and another 77 that reported EudraCT entries in the publications, resulting in 956 retrospectively registered studies from a total dataset of 1927 (971 + 956) studies.

Retrospective registration. Figure 2 shows the extent of retrospective registration over time, which has been falling steadily from 100% in 2004 to 25% in 2017.



Year (Start)	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
n	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	18	13	26	38	65	96	166	186	243	218	233	193	167	133	95	25
RR	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	18	13	25	30	38	57	96	97	120	106	95	78	79	57	29	6
% RR	100						100		100	100	100	100	96.2	78.9	58.5	59.4	57.8	52.2	49.4	48.6	40.8	40.4	47.3	42.9	30.5	24

Figure 2: Percentage of retrospectively registered (RR) trials over time (per study start year). GAM (generalized additive model) smoother laid over (blue). Bubble sizes indicate the number of trials per year in the dataset.

We describe associations between prospective registration and previously defined binary variables in Table 1: We found no statistically significant association between publications in ICMJE member journals and prospective registration. Trials published in journals reporting to follow ICMJE recommendations were even prospectively registered at a lower rate, compared to non-following journals. It is important to note here that the information on ICMJE-following is based on journals' requests to be included on the ICMJE website, therefore our results suggest that journals requesting to be featured on the site often do not enforce the recommendations strongly. However, there are other journals, such as many PloS journals, that are not featured on the ICMJE site, but implement the recommendations. Retrospectively registered trials, compared to prospectively registered trials significantly underreported registration numbers in the abstract (p = 0.0007). Industry sponsorship of trials was associated with prospective registration (p = 0.002).

Table 1: Associations between prospective registration and other variables

Variable		# (%) prospectively registered	P-value
ICMJE member journal	Y	28 (63.6%)	p = 0.09 (Fisher)
	N	943 (50.1%)	
ICMJE member/following journal	Y	329 (49.2%)	p = 0.47 (Chi-sq.)
	N	642 (51.0%)	
TRN reporting in abstract	Y	404 (55.4%)	p = 0.0007*** (Chi-sq.)
	N	567 (47.3%)	
Industry sponsorship	Y	163 (59.3%)	p = 0.002** (Chi-sq.)
	N	808 (48.9%)	

Reporting of registration. In 783 (81.9%) of the remaining 956 results publications of retrospectively registered trials, the registration was explicitly reported in either the abstract or the full text. In all

except four of these publications, the registration was mentioned by providing the registration number. In the other cases, the registration was mentioned but without reporting a registration number.

*Table 2: Number of retrospectively registered trials and prevalence of key retrospective registration reporting practices. * "other" includes footnotes, sidebars, etc.*

	n	% (of total)
Total: Retrospectively registered trials	**956**	**100.0%**
Registration reported	783	81.9%
Registration number reported	**779**	**81.5%**
in abstract	*325*	*34.0%*
in full-text	*535*	*56.0%*
*in other**	*134*	*14.0%*
Registration date reported	**67**	**7.0%**
in abstract	*45*	*4.7%*
in full-text	*32*	*3.3%*
Retrospective registration addressed	**47**	**4.9%**
in abstract	*21*	*2.2%*
in full-text	*33*	*3.5%*
Retrospective registration justified/explained	**20**	**2.1%**
in abstract	*0*	*0.0%*
in full-text	*20*	*2.1%*

Reporting of retrospective registration. The rate of trials for which retrospective registration is reported transparently increased over the last years up to 15.4% in 2020 (Figure 3). Overall, among all 956 retrospectively registered clinical studies, only 47 (4.9%) mention explicitly that this registration was retrospective in the abstract or full text. Among those cases, 20 give some explanation or justification for why registration was retrospective; we provide examples for these cases below in Table 2. In 67 (7.0%) cases, the authors reported the registration date alongside the registration statement, but in 35 of those, the date was provided without giving the necessary context that the registration was retrospective.



Year (Pub.)	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
n	2	0	2	12	40	111	144	199	205	240	278	234	215	160	85
RRR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	9	10	4	6
% RRR	0		0	0	0	0	0	0.9	0	4.4	8.5	8.7	11.2	8	15.4

Figure 3: Percentage of retrospectively registered trials reporting retrospective registration transparently in the publication over time (per study publication year). GAM (generalized additive model) smoother laid over (blue). Bubble sizes indicate the number of trials per year in the dataset. Starting in 2013, some authors begin to report retrospective registration. 15% of publications of retrospectively registered trials from 2020 transparently report retrospective registration. Four trials were published before 2009 – in all those cases the study completion dates provided in the registry were after 2009. Study start dates were before 2005 and studies were registered in 2005 (3/4) or later (1/4).

Publications in ICMJE member or -following journals had a higher rate of reporting of retrospective registration (p = 0.004) but we found no association for industry sponsored trials (p = 0.162) (Table 3).

Table 3: Associations between transparent reporting of retrospective registration and other variables

Variable		# (%) reporting RR	P-value
ICMJE member journal	Y	2 (12.5%)	p = 0.184 (Fisher exact)
	N	45 (4.8%)	
ICMJE member/following journal	Y	7 (2.1%)	p = 0.004** (Fisher exact)
	N	40 (6.5%)	
Industry sponsorship	Y	2 (1.8%)	p = 0.162 (Fisher exact)
	N	45 (5.3%)	

Justifications of retrospective registration. In 24 cases in which the retrospective nature of the registration was reported, the authors provided further information explaining or justifying the retrospective registration. Table 2 shows the main themes present in authors' explanations, with text examples.

Table 4. Main themes identified from authors' explanations of retrospective reporting and example statements.

Theme	Example(s)
Unawareness of policy	"At the time when the trial was started, the initiators of this study were unfortunately unaware of the policy of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), which requires prospective registration of all interventional clinical trials. As soon as we became aware of this policy, we registered the trial." (PMID: 26812052)

	"The reason for retrospectively registering the study was that the study authors were not aware of the recommendation to register diagnostic accuracy studies before this date." (PMID: 30011285)
Registry delays	"Registration of the study was applied for in April 2015. All queries from the DRKS were answered until the 31st August 2015 except the planned inclusion date of the first patient (first-patient-in), which was correct in the DRKS registry on 1st December 2015. Confirmation of registration occurred on 4th December 2015. The first patient was recruited and randomized into the study on 20th October 2015. Until 4th December 2015 eight patients were randomized into the trial." (PMID: 32142529)
Not obligatory at the time	"At the time of submission of the study protocol, the Ethics Committee did not require registration for feasibility or proof of concept studies. The study was registered in ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02196545) in July 2014 in preparation of a manuscript for publication of the data. The authors confirm that all ongoing and related trials for this intervention are registered." (PMID: 25884637) „It was not registered at a clinical trial register, because at the time of setup in 2003, such a registration was not obligatory." (PMID: 23730377)
Not obligatory for the intervention	"According to national laws it is stipulated to inform the respective ethics committee, but it was not necessary to register the study in an official registry or to obtain an ethics committee vote, because it was an expanded access study (Heilversuch). Despite this, we prospectively obtained a vote of the ethics committee. Study design and patient information form were approved by the local ethics committee (ethics committee of the regional medical association; approval no. EK-BR-50/10-1, date of approval December 10th, 2010). In addition, the study was registered at www.clinicaltrials.gov (ID no. NCT02168790)." (PMID: 25955359)
Miscommunnication between investigators	"The time of first registration was June 17, 2013, and final approved trial registration was July 1, 2013. First patient inclusion was in July 2012 at the Heart Center Leipzig University Hospital, Leipzig, Germany. Thus, there was a delay between first patient inclusion and trial registration that was the result of a misunderstanding between the principal investigator of the trial, Dr Thiele, and the first author, Dr Fuernau, who was responsible for clinical project coordination at the investigator's site at the Heart Center Leipzig University of Leipzig. According to initial communication, registration had to be performed by Dr Fuernau. When the study principal investigator recognized that it had not been performed, we immediately registered the trial at http://www.ClinicalTrials.gov. At this time, only 7 patients at the Heart Center Leipzig University Hospital had been included in the trial." (PMID: 30026282) „[…] there was a delay of trial registration before first patient inclusion which was induced by a misunderstanding between the project coordination for the EU grant (at this time gabo:mi, later on ARTTIC) and the clinical project coordination at the investigator's site at the Heart Center Leipzig - University of Leipzig. According to initial communication registration should be performed by gabo:mi. When the study coordinator recognized that it has not been performed we immediately registered it at clinicaltrials.gov. At this time only 13 patients at the Heart Center Leipzig University Hospital (and no other study site) have been included into the trial." (PMID: 29083953)
Publication	"Registration was done after the study has been conducted and the results suggested a publication and further continuation of this research." (PMID: 27485732)
Confidentiality	"The principal investigator (N.H.) delayed the registration of the study until data acquisition was completed for confidentiality reasons concerning the study methods, especially the magnetic resonance with the related morphometric measurements." (PMID: 26305790)
Logistic/ Administrative issues	"Because of administrative problems, release of registration occurred about six months after study start. The authors confirm that all ongoing and related trials for this intervention are registered. Relevant de-identified data can be downloaded from https://osf.io/426pd." (PMID: 31465443) "Due to organisational changes in the research project shortly before the start of the recruitment we put great efforts into avoiding a delayed start of the data collection in the cooperating inpatient units, which resulted in retrospective study registration and a delayed publication of our study protocol." (PMID: 29077724) „Registration of the trial was delayed after the enrollment of the first patient due to an administrative error. The authors confirm that all ongoing and related trials for this intervention are registered." (PMID: 26501562)

Discussion

In this study we show that in a sample of 956 results publications from retrospectively registered clinical studies led by German UMCs and completed between 2009 and 2017, only a small number of publications (4.9%) make the retrospective nature of the registration transparent, and even fewer (2.1%) explain the reasons for retrospective registration. To our knowledge, only two studies have previously addressed the reporting of retrospective registration: Al-Durra et al. (20) found in a sample of 286 publications in ICMJE member journals and published in 2018 that only 2.8% (n=8) of papers of retrospectively registered trials in their sample include justifications or explanations for delayed registration. Loder et al. (21), in their analysis of 70 papers submitted to the BMJ from 2012-2015 and rejected for registration issues, found that 2.9% (n=2) disclosed the registration problem when published in another journal. Our study finds a slightly lower percentage of 2.1% for explanations of the reasons for retrospective registration, but a higher percentage of 4.9% for

disclosure in a larger sample representing a more diverse selection of journals and broader time frame.

There were diverse reasons for retrospective registration brought forth by authors, many of which have been published previously (20,21). In some cases, authors raise points that lie outside their direct responsibility, such as delays caused by the registry or research not being legally required to be preregistered. Several other reasons provided were within authors' control, such as logistic and administrative issues, miscommunication between researchers or unawareness of registration policies. In some cases, authors report registering a study to meet journal editorial policies even though registration would not be required for the kind of research otherwise. Another identified theme revolves around the confidentiality of methods – however, in this case many other data about the trial could have been preregistered.

Limitations

For feasibility and data quality reasons, our study was based on an existing validated dataset, containing only trials led by German UMCs, which might limit its generalizability to other regions. For example, in Germany, unlike many other countries, there is no legal mandate to register all clinical studies, but the largest funding institutions in Germany (e.g., DFG, BMBF) require the registration of studies as prerequisite for funding. However, the sample also contained multi-center trials with other countries involved and is much larger and from a wider variety of journals than in previous studies (20,21). In addition, due to Germany's high research output (22) our results in any case highlight a key transparency issue in a major research environment.

Our analysis of retrospective registration is based on trial start dates and registration dates as provided by the two registries used for sampling: Clinicaltrials.gov and DRKS. It is possible that authors did not update their registry entries when delays to the start date occurred. For example, we did not specifically follow up cases in which authors wrote that a trial was registered prospectively, but the registry dates did not reflect that statement. In our analyses involving the classification into ICMJE-following and non-following journals, we relied on the data provided on the ICMJE website (icmje.org), which are self-reported by journals, i.e., a journal must write to the ICMJE that they want to be included in the list. Thus, there are some journals missing in the ICMJE data and therefore in our dataset. For ICMJE member journals (n=16) on the other hand, there is a complete listing available.

Conclusion

The Declaration of Helsinki and many other guidelines for responsible clinical research unanimously recommend prospective registration of all clinical studies. For highly regulated clinical trials this was even codified into law. A major aim of prospective registration is to minimize the risk of undisclosed changes in the protocol after the study started and first results are analyzed. When registration happens retrospectively, this major goal is not addressed. The reporting of study registration is generally considered a best practice to make a study more trustworthy. In the case of retrospective registration, in contrast, reporting registration without transparency on the retrospective nature should rather raise concerns as readers might wrongly interpret the mentioning of registration as a quality criterion. This could be considered "performative reproducibility", i.e., the "pretence of reproducibility without the reality" (23). Journals could enforce explicit reporting and explanation of retrospective registration, but we found that this rarely happens. A simple note in the registration

statement of the paper would suffice, such as: “This study was retrospectively registered at [Registry], [X] days after the trial started because [Reason]”.

298 **References**

299

300 1. Simes RJ. Publication bias: the case for an international registry of clinical trials. J Clin Oncol.
301 1986 Oct;4(10):1529–41.

302 2. WMA. World Medical Association: Declaration of Helsinki - Ethical Principles for Medical
303 Research involving Human Subjects [Internet]. 2018. Available from: https://www.wma.net/policies-
304 post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/

305 3. World Health Organization. International standards for clinical trial registries: the
306 registration of all interventional trials is a scientific, ethical and moral responsibility [Internet].
307 version 3.0. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018 [cited 2022 Feb 1]. 48 p. Available from:
308 https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/274994

309 4. ICMJE. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors Recommendations for the
310 Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals [Internet]. [cited
311 2021 Oct 18]. Available from: http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf

312 5. De Angelis C, Drazen JM, Frizelle FA, Haug C, Hoey J, Horton R, et al. Clinical trial registration:
313 a statement from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Lancet Lond Engl. 2004
314 Sep 11;364(9438):911–2.

315 6. Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gotzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, et al. CONSORT 2010
316 Explanation and Elaboration: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. BMJ.
317 2010 Mar 23;340(mar23 1):c869–c869.

318 7. Battisti WP, Wager E, Baltzer L, Bridges D, Cairns A, Carswell CI, et al. Good Publication
319 Practice for Communicating Company-Sponsored Medical Research: GPP3. Ann Intern Med. 2015
320 Sep 15;163(6):461–4.

321 8. Food and Drug Administration. Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007
322 [Internet]. 110-85 Sep 27, 2007. Available from: https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-
323 110publ85/pdf/PLAW-110publ85.pdf

324 9. Zarin DA, Keselman A. Registering a Clinical Trial in ClinicalTrials.gov. Chest. 2007
325 Mar;131(3):909–12.

326 10. Trinquart L, Dunn AG, Bourgeois FT. Registration of published randomized trials: a systematic
327 review and meta-analysis. BMC Med. 2018 Oct 16;16(1):173.

328 11. Birajdar AR, Bose D, Nishandar TB, Shende AA, Thatte UM, Gogtay NJ. An audit of studies
329 registered retrospectively with the Clinical Trials Registry of India: A one year analysis. Perspect Clin
330 Res. 2019 Mar;10(1):26–30.

331 12. Scott A, Rucklidge JJ, Mulder RT. Is Mandatory Prospective Trial Registration Working to
332 Prevent Publication of Unregistered Trials and Selective Outcome Reporting? An Observational Study
333 of Five Psychiatry Journals That Mandate Prospective Clinical Trial Registration. Wicherts JM, editor.
334 PLOS ONE. 2015 Aug 19;10(8):e0133718.

335 13. Mann E, Nguyen N, Fleischer S, Meyer G. Compliance with trial registration in five core
336 journals of clinical geriatrics: a survey of original publications on randomised controlled trials from
337 2008 to 2012. Age Ageing. 2014 Nov;43(6):872–6.

14. Smaïl-Faugeron V, Fron-Chabouis H, Durieux P. Clinical trial registration in oral health journals. J Dent Res. 2015 Mar;94(3 Suppl):8S-13S.

15. Harriman SL, Patel J. When are clinical trials registered? An analysis of prospective versus retrospective registration. Trials. 2016 Apr 15;17:187.

16. Boughton S. Retrospectively registered trials: the Editors' dilemma [Internet]. Research in progress blog. 2016 [cited 2022 Jul 21]. Available from: https://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2016/04/15/retrospectively-registered-trials-editors-dilemma/

17. Wieschowski S, Riedel N, Wollmann K, Kahrass H, Müller-Ohlraun S, Schürmann C, et al. Result dissemination from clinical trials conducted at German university medical centers was delayed and incomplete. J Clin Epidemiol. 2019 Nov;115:37–45.

18. Riedel N, Wieschowski S, Bruckner T, Holst MR, Kahrass H, Nury E, et al. Results dissemination from completed clinical trials conducted at German university medical centers remained delayed and incomplete. The 2014 –2017 cohort. J Clin Epidemiol. 2022 Apr;144:1–7.

19. European Medicines Agency. Regulation (EU) No 536/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 on clinical trials on medicinal products for human use, and repealing Directive 2001/20/EC [Internet]. Jan 31, 2022. Available from: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/536/2022-01-31

20. Al-Durra M, Nolan RP, Seto E, Cafazzo JA. Prospective registration and reporting of trial number in randomised clinical trials: global cross sectional study of the adoption of ICMJE and Declaration of Helsinki recommendations. BMJ. 2020 Apr 14;m982.

21. Loder E, Loder S, Cook S. Characteristics and publication fate of unregistered and retrospectively registered clinical trials submitted to The BMJ over 4 years. BMJ Open. 2018 Feb 16;8(2):e020037.

22. German science on the world stage: visualized. Nature. 2020 Nov 26;587(7835):S110–1.

23. Buck S. Beware performative reproducibility. Nature. 2021 Jul 8;595(7866):151–151.