Results reporting for clinical trials led by medical universities and university hospitals in the Nordic countries was often missing or delayed

Gustav Nilsonne[1,2,3†], Susanne Wieschowski[3], Nicholas J. DeVito[4], Maia Salholz-Hillel[3], Love Ahnström[1], Till Bruckner[1,5,6], Katarzyna Klas[7], Tarik Suljic[8], Samruddhi Yerunkar[3], Natasha Olsson[1,9], Carolina Cruz[10], Karolina Strzebonska[7], Lars Småbrekke[11], Mateusz T. Wasylewski[7], Johan Bengtsson[12], Martin Ringsten[13], Aminul Schuster[14], Tomasz Krawczyk[7], Themistoklis Paraskevas[15], Eero Raittio[16,17], Luca Herczeg[18], Jan-Ole Hesselberg[19], Sofia Karlsson[20], Ronak Borana[21], Matteo Bruschettini[22,13], Shai Mulinari[23], Karely Lizárraga[24], Maximilian Siebert[25], Nicole Hildebrand[3], Shreya Ramakrishnan[26,27], Perrine Janiaud[28,29], Emmanuel Zavalis[30,25], Delwen Franzen[3], Kim Boesen[31], Lars G. Hemkens[29,28], Florian Naudet[32,33], Sofie Possmark[34], Rebecca M. Willén[35,36], John P. Ioannidis[25,37], Daniel Strech[3], Cathrine Axfors[25,28,38]

[1]Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden, [2]Department of Psychology, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden, [3]QUEST Center for Responsible Research, Berlin Institute of Health at Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany, [4]Bennett Institute for Applied Data Science, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, Oxfordshire, UK, [5]UiT The Arctic University of Norway, [6]TranspariMED, Bristol, UK, [7]Research Ethics in Medicine Study Group (REMEDY), Jagiellonian University Medical College, Krakow, Poland, [8]Faculty of Medicine, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, [9]Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden, [10]Universidad de Guadalajara, [11]Department of Pharmacy, Faculty of Health Sciences, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, [12]Department of Medical Sciences, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden, [13]Cochrane Sweden, Department of Research and Education, Skåne University Hospital, Lund University, Lund, Sweden, [14]School of Life Sciences, University of Westminster, London, UK, [15]Department of internal medicine, University hospital of Patras, Patras, Greece, [16]Department of Dentistry and Oral Health, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark, [17]Institute of Dentistry, University of Eastern Finland, Kuopio, Finland, [18]Independent researcher, [19]Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway, [20]Department of Clinical Science, Intervention and Technology (CLINTEC), Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden, [21]XLRI Jamshedpur, India, [22]Paediatrics, Department of Clinical Sciences Lund, Lund University, Skåne University Hospital, Lund, [23]Department of Sociology, Lund University, Sweden, [24]University Center of Health Sciences (Centro universitario de ciencias de la salud, CUCS), University of Guadalajara, [25]Meta-research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS), Stanford University, USA, [26]Academy of Scientific and Innovative Research, India, [27]Indian Institute of Public Health, Hyderabad, India, [28]Research Center for Clinical Neuroimmunology and Neuroscience Basel (RC2NB), University Hospital Basel and University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland, [29]Department of Clinical Research, University Hospital Basel, and University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland, [30]Department of Learning Informatics Management and Ethics, Karolinska Institutet, [31]Research Center for Clinical Neuroimmunology and Neuroscience Basel (RC2NB), University Hospital Basel and, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland, [32]Univ Rennes, CHU Rennes, Inserm, Centre d'investigation clinique de Rennes (CIC1414), service de pharmacologie clinique, Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail (Irset), UMR S 1085, EHESP, 35000, Rennes, France, [33]Institut Universitaire de France, Paris, France, [34]Compliance & Data Office, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden, [35]Linnaeus University, Department of Criminology and Police Work, [36]Institute for Globally Distributed Open Research and Education (IGDORE), [37]Department of Medicine, Stanford University,

Stanford, California, United States of America; Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Stanford University, Stanford, California, United States of America; Department of Biomedical Data Science, Stanford University, Stanford, California, United States of America; Department of Statistics, Stanford University, Stanford, California, United States of America, [38]Department for Women's and Children's Health, Uppsala University, Uppsala

[†]Correspondence should be addressed to Gustav Nilsonne; E-mail: gustav.nilsonne@ki.se

Abstract

Objective: To systematically evaluate timely reporting of clinical trial results at medical universities and university hospitals in the Nordic countries.

Study Design and Setting: In this cross-sectional study, we included trials (regardless of intervention) registered in the EU Clinical Trials Registry and/or ClinicalTrials.gov, completed 2016-2019, and led by a university with medical faculty or university hospital in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, or Sweden. We identified summary results posted at the trial registries, and conducted systematic manual searches for results publications (e.g., journal articles, preprints). We present proportions with 95% confidence intervals (CI), and medians with interquartile range (IQR). Protocol: https://osf.io/wua3r

Results: Among 2,112 included clinical trials, 1,650 (78.1%, 95%CI 76.3-79.8%) reported any results during our follow-up; 1,097 (51.9%, 95%CI 49.8-54.1%) reported any results within 2 years of the global completion date; and 48 (2.3%, 95%CI 1.7-3.0%) posted summary results in the registry within 1 year. Median time from global completion date to results reporting was 690 days (IQR 1,103). 856/1,681 (50.9%) of ClinicalTrials.gov-registrations were prospective. Denmark contributed approximately half of all trials. Reporting performance varied widely between institutions.

Conclusion: Missing and delayed results reporting of academically led clinical trials is a pervasive problem in the Nordic countries. We relied on trial registry information, which can be incomplete. Institutions, funders, and policy makers need to support trial teams, ensure regulation adherence, and secure trial reporting before results are permanently lost.

Plain language summary: Reporting of results from clinical trials is necessary for evidence-based clinical decision making. We followed up reporting of clinical trials in the Nordic countries sponsored by medical universities and university hospitals. Of 2,112 studies completed 2016-2019 in two major trials registries, about half reported results in any form within 24 months and more than one in five did not report results at all. These results show that there is need for improvement in the reporting of Nordic clinical trials.

What is new?

- Many Nordic registered clinical trials were reported late or not at all.
- Almost one in four trials remained unreported at the end of our search period.
- About half of registered trials had reported results two years after completion.
- Only 2.3% of trials posted summary results in the registry one year after completion.
- Concerted action is needed to improve reporting of Nordic clinical trials.

Background

Clinical trials are a cornerstone of evidence-based medicine. Completing trials is hard work and requires a joint investment of time and resources by multiple stakeholders. Patients agree to participate, and to contribute their sensitive information, with the premise that results may inform decision-making. Incomplete or delayed reporting impedes this goal and is a preventable research waste (1). The large extent of incomplete and delayed reporting has prompted guidelines and mandates for trial registration and public disclosure of results at official registries (e.g., the European Union Clinical Trials Register (EUCTR) and ClinicalTrials.gov in the United States), by the World Health Organization (WHO), authorities, and funders (2-6). Still, compliance is modest, and many registered studies never have their results uploaded in registries (7–9).

Medicinal products trials in the European Union (EU) are legally mandated by the EU clinical trials regulation to be registered in the EUCTR (10). From 2023 onwards, EUCTR is replaced with the Clinical Trial Information System (CTIS); https://euclinicaltrials.eu. In parallel, applications should be made to the relevant national medicines agency. Approval for marketing in the United States necessitates registration also at ClinicalTrials.gov. Furthermore, EU clinical trials are legally mandated to submit summary results to the registry as soon as the summary results are available and no later than 12 months after completion (10). The contents of summary results are defined by the EU clinical trials regulation and include trial characteristics and main outcomes. Besides the legal mandate codified in the EU clinical trials regulation, the WHO and the Declaration of Helsinki both require timely reporting of clinical trials (11,12). The WHO joint statement on public disclosure of results from clinical trials recommends that summary results be posted on the registry within 12 months of study completion and a journal article be published within 24 months (11).

As public sector institutions and sponsors for clinical investigations, universities and university hospitals have a particular responsibility to ensure their trials are fully and timely reported. In the United States, Germany, Poland, and Canada, benchmarking investigations have shown that institutional activity in this regard is commonly below expectations (13–19). Previous evaluations of summary results reporting of Nordic clinical trials in the EUCTR indicated worrisome performance (20–24). However, those evaluations relied on summary results of trials on medicinal products reported in the EUCTR and did not attempt to find results published in journals. In this project, we therefore sought to provide a more comprehensive benchmark for all the Nordic countries, enabling comparisons with earlier studies.

We aimed to systematically evaluate the reporting of results from registered clinical trials at all Nordic medical universities and university hospitals. Our project expands the thorough manual search approach developed and validated in the respective German IntoValue project (15,16,25,26) for ClinicalTrials.gov. We further include the EUCTR, the main mandated registry of Nordic medicinal product trials, and we incorporate methods and insights from the EU Trials Tracker (8) (as further described and expanded upon by DeVito (27)) and the Dissemination of Registered COVID-19 Clinical Trials (DIRECCT) project (28,29).

Methods

This cross-sectional meta-research study followed a prespecified protocol (https://osf.io/wua3r, Nov 8, 2022) that can be consulted for full method details, with amendments in Appendix Table 1, and is reported according to STROBE (30).

Eligibility Criteria

We included clinical trials that were led by any university with a medical faculty (medical university) or university hospital in the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden), and completed in 2016-2019 as per their registration in the EUCTR or at ClinicalTrials.gov. Other locally used registries not internationally recognized as trial registries were not considered (e.g., ResearchWeb, “Cancer studies in Sweden”, or Open Science Framework) (6,31,32). University hospitals may be a conglomerate of several smaller hospitals, e.g., Copenhagen University Hospital (33,34). Similarly for Stockholm, we included Danderyd Hospital and Stockholm South General Hospital (Södersjukhuset) as they are university-affiliated. Trials were included regardless of phase, population, intervention, comparator, or outcome. We considered a trial to be “led by” the medical university or university hospital if the institution was listed in the EUCTR as sponsor, or at ClinicalTrials.gov as lead sponsor and/or responsible party (35). We excluded trials led by an administrative region (e.g., “Region Skåne”) and trials withdrawn without enrollment. For eligible trials present in both registries, we preferred EUCTR information for being the mandatory registry, but used ClinicalTrials.gov data on status or completion dates if these were more recently updated.

As results publications, we included peer-reviewed scientific publications, preprints, doctoral theses, or published congress abstracts, with >500 words, as shorter abstracts would not be likely to permit comprehensive results reporting. The publication had to be matched to an eligible clinical trial regarding design, indication/population, intervention/treatment, and comparator if applicable. Also, the publication’s primary outcome measure (or first mentioned outcome) had to be listed as an outcome measure in the registration, whether as primary or not. Our goal was to identify correct matches, not to evaluate discrepancies in primary outcome reporting.

As summary results, we included summaries posted in the EUCTR or ClinicalTrials.gov directly as tabular results, or in a file (e.g., Clinical Study Report synopsis, as observed in previous work ()), but not links to external files or publications outside the registration page (this only occurred in two cases). We also included EUCTR results sections without analysis results, but with a plausible justification (e.g., low enrollment), as in previous work (27).

Data collection

EUCTR

We retrieved the latest dataset for the EU Trials Tracker (8,36) of EUCTR trials on Nov 27, 2022, with data from Nov 7, 2022. Trials registered in the EUCTR can have EudraCT protocols, one for each EU/EEA country where the trial is conducted, and a results section. Trials without a EudraCT protocol were not present in the dataset (i.e., not uploaded or not publicly available). We accessed automatically extracted data from EUCTR country

protocols and results sections (Appendix Table 2) from a custom web scraper by the EU Trials Tracker team (36). Automatically identified results sections were manually verified for eligibility as summary results. Global completion dates were preferred from results sections for being the most recently updated.

ClinicalTrials.gov

We downloaded the Aggregate Analysis of ClinicalTrials.gov dataset (AACT, http://aact.ctti-clinicaltrials.org/) on Nov 27, 2022, with data from Nov 9, 2022. We automatically excluded observational studies and duplicated entries and identified the sample with a search string for medical universities and university hospitals (Appendix Table 3). We adapted code from the IntoValue project (25,37) to extract variables (Appendix Table 2), e.g., whether a trial had summary results posted at the registry.

Manual data extraction

Our comprehensive systematic manual search for publications, by two independent reviewers per trial, followed a stepwise process (Appendix Figure 1). First, we identified results publications linked at the registration website. Second, we searched Google with the main trial ID (i.e., EudraCT number or NCT ID; then other trial IDs if present, one at a time), and screened the first page (minimum 10 hits). Third, if no publication was so far identified, we performed another Google search with two combinations of terms from the registry (e.g., title, principal investigator, intervention, disease, or other). Publication dates were extracted automatically through PubMed (for articles with PubMed IDs) and otherwise manually from the publication, preferring the earliest date among multiple available dates or eligible publications. Discrepancies regarding the earliest eligible results publication for each trial were solved by one reviewer with access to the two independent extractions and comments, and uncertainties discussed with another reviewer. We publicly share our dataset with all identified potentially eligible results publications (https://github.com/cathrineaxfors/nordic-trial-reporting).

To pilot and refine the extraction forms, two reviewers (SW and CA) independently analyzed a random set of 10 trials. For training, all reviewers initially analyzed the same 10 trials, with personal feedback after checking agreement against SW and CA. Reviewers repeated the training on another random set of 5 trials if the agreement was <100% for the existence of any eligible results publication, or if they found fewer eligible publications for >20% of trials. This occurred for 6/31 reviewers (19%).

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics for primary outcomes are presented for the total sample, per country, and per accountable institution (medical university, university hospital, or if applicable, member hospitals of the university hospital, Appendix Table 3). Trials with multiple accountable institutions were counted for each one. The following four primary outcomes were prespecified: (a) *Any results reported within 2 years of completion*: number and percent, with 95% confidence interval using Wilson score, of registered clinical trials that shared results either in a publication or as summary results in the trials registry within 2 years after global completion, as the upper limit of what is mandated or ethically expected (given the WHO joint statement on reporting of clinical trials in journals) (2,4). (b) *Summary*

results reported within 1 year of completion: number and percent, with 95% confidence interval using Wilson score, of registered clinical trials that have summary results posted within 12 months after completion (corresponding to the time frame mandated by the EU clinical trials regulation to upload summary results in the EUCTR). For trials at ClinicalTrials.gov, we apply the same timeline for consistency and to illustrate adherence to best practices (2). (c) *No results reported:* Number and percent (with 95% confidence interval using Wilson score) of registered clinical trials that remained unreported. (d) *Time to reported results:* We calculated median time (and interquartile range) from trial completion (last patient's last visit for all outcomes) to the reporting of summary results or results publication, whichever occurred first, taking into account differential follow-up. This is also illustrated with a Kaplan-Meier curve. For unpublished trials, we censored the timeline at the latest date that searches were performed for that trial.

We report the following three secondary outcomes: (a) Participants in trials that are unreported (planned number) and reported (actual number, or if missing, planned number) according to registry information. (b) Prospective registration: percent (with 95% confidence interval using Wilson score) of clinical trials that are registered before the start date of the study. This outcome is also illustrated with a Kaplan-Meier curve (time to registration after trial start). It was only calculated for trials registered at ClinicalTrials.gov, since EUCTR entries are made by national regulators (27). (c) Number and percent of medicinal products trials identified at ClinicalTrials.gov, excluding intervention category "dietary supplements" and phase I trials, which do not have a cross-registration in the EUCTR.

We also explored subgroup analyses for binary primary outcomes: (a) country (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden); (b) intervention type (medicinal products vs. other interventions); (c) single-center vs. multicenter trials; (d) industry-sponsored vs. other trials; and (e) enrollment (smallest, medium, and largest tertile), as given in registry, whether actual or planned. We applied post-hoc statistical significance testing (Pearson's chi-squared test), Bonferroni-corrected for the number of tests (n=15, i.e., $p<0.05/15$).

Sensitivity analyses were performed to explore the robustness of results for the binary primary outcomes: (a) randomized controlled trials only; (b) trials registered in the EUCTR (with or without cross-registration); (c) trials registered only at ClinicalTrials.gov; (d) excluding trials with missing status or status "Unknown"; (e) recalculating institutional results only counting trials for an institution if it was the sole sponsor or listed *first* among sponsors; (f) using primary completion date instead of global; and (g) trials registered only at ClinicalTrials.gov that had an actual completion date (not anticipated).

Results

We included 2,112 registered trials led by 54 Nordic medical universities and university hospitals (Figure 1). Twenty-two trials were co-led by two different eligible institutions. Most trials were on non-drug interventions, for which phase allocation was generally not applicable (Table 1). Predominant characteristics were academic-only sponsorship, small size (n<100), and single-center organization. Denmark was the major contributor of clinical trials with 48% of the total Nordic output. In the manual searches for results publications (Nov 21, 2022 to March 23, 2023), for 75% of trials, both reviewers found no publication or identified the same earliest publication; for 13%, both found at least one publication, but the

earliest among these was not the same; and for 11%, one reviewer found a publication and not the other. Among trials with a results publication, the earliest publication was most often a journal article (1,574/1,601, 98.3%), and rarely a preprint (18/1,601, 1.1%) or other type (9/1,601, <1%; letter to the editor, n=4, doctoral thesis, n=3, conference abstract, n=2). Half of the earliest publications were linked at a registry (790/1,601, 49.3%). The other half were found only through our systematic Google search (768/1,601 48%) or cross-referenced in a linked publication (43/1,601, 2.7%).

Primary outcomes

Just more than half of all trials were reported within 2 years of completion (1,097/2,112, 51.9%, 95%CI 49.8-54.1%), most often only as a journal article (946/1,097). Few trials had summary results posted in a trial registry within one year of completion (48/2,112, 2.3%, 95%CI 1.7-3%). At any time, across a follow-up time of 2.9 to 7.1 years after completion, summary results were still uncommon (296/2,112, 14.0%, 95%CI 12.6-15.6%) and just over three-fourths of trials reported any results, whether as summary results or a results publication (1,650/2,112 trials, 78.1%, 95%CI 76.3-79.8%). A median of 22.7 months passed between completion and first results reporting (690 days, IQR 1,103 days). The performance of individual institutions varied widely (Figure 2; Appendix Tables 4-7). Time to first results reporting is displayed in Figure 3 and per country in Appendix Figure 2. For 174 trials, results were reported before the global completion date (i.e., the day before or earlier).

Secondary outcomes

Unreported trials (n=462) had a median planned sample size of 42 (IQR 80, range 1-15,030) with a potential total of 83,489 individuals (Denmark n=51,020, Finland n=5,878, Iceland n=1,573, Norway n=11,972, and Sweden n=13,046). For reported trials (n=1,650), median sample size (actual or planned) was 58 (IQR 116.75, range 2-150,000), with a total of 865,781. Prospectively registered trials among those only registered at ClinicalTrials.gov were overall 50.9% (856/1,681) and varied widely between institutions (Appendix Figure 3, Appendix Table 8). Another 14% (n=236) were registered within 60 days, and 35% (n=589) more than 60 days, after their start (Appendix Figure 4). Among trials registered at ClinicalTrials.gov likely falling under the requirement for registration in the EUCTR (non-phase-I medicinal products trials), less than two-thirds were found also in the EUCTR (195/333, 58.6%, 95%CI 53.2-63.7%).

Subgroup analyses

Denmark presented the highest percentage of reported trials among the Nordic countries (Figure 4), and Norway the lowest. Large trials (vs. small trials) were more likely to be reported at all, and within 2 years of completion; and medicinal product trials (vs. non-medicinal product trials) were more likely to have summary results. We found no differences per multicenter status or industry-sponsored status (Appendix Table 9).

Sensitivity analyses

Reporting was better for EUCTR-registered trials, and worse for only ClinicalTrials.gov-registered trials, than the overall sample (Appendix Table 10). Reporting of any results, and within 2 years of completion, was higher among completed trials than those terminated or

with unknown status (Appendix Table 10). Other sensitivity analyses were consistent with the main results (Appendix Tables 10-13).

Discussion

Summary of findings

Only 52% of clinical trials led by Nordic medical universities or university hospitals were reported in adherence to WHO recommendations (11). Timely summary results reporting in the registries was rare, with only 2% of registrations showing results 12 months after completion. Among EUCTR registrations, for which this practice is now mandatory, the proportion was 8%. For 22% of trials (planned to involve 83,489 participants), no results could be located regardless of time limit. Contrary to established recommendations, almost half of registrations were made retrospectively, limiting their usefulness (38,39). Among trials registered at ClinicalTrials.gov likely falling under the requirement for registration in the EUCTR, short of two-thirds were found also in the EUCTR. These results show that registration and reporting of clinical trials in the Nordic countries can be considerably improved.

Comparison to earlier research

Overall, results from the present project are similar to earlier findings in other settings. The IntoValue project followed up reporting of trials from German university medical centers, registered in ClinicalTrials.gov or in the German Clinical Trials Register (DRKS) (14–17). Our present results are similar to theirs, where out of 1,658 trials completed in 2014–2017, 43% published results either as summary results or in journal articles within 24 months after completion, and five years after completion, 70% of the trials were published (15). In Canada, a follow-up of 6,720 trials on ClinicalTrials.gov from 2009-2019 showed that 59% were registered prospectively and 39% reported summary results in the registry (19). This proportion is considerably higher than in the present study, mainly because they included many industry-sponsored studies, among which summary results reporting was more common. Of trials registered 2009-2014, 55% were subsequently published in an academic journal (19). In Poland, among 305 interventional clinical trials at academic medical centers registered on ClinicalTrials.gov and completed 2009–2013, 80% had been published as articles or posted summary results in 2019 (18). Results were posted within a year of study completion and/or published within 2 years of study completion for 43% of trials. In the United States, a sample of 400 trials from ClinicalTrials.gov was followed up for 36 months and results were found for 61% of trials either in the registry or on PubMed (40).

Strengths and limitations

A strength of this project is that extensive online manual searches were carried out to track results publications, inspired by and further developing previous methods (14–17). Investigators were trained with sample searches and two independent investigators performed searches for each trial, relying not only on trial identifiers but also other characteristics. Although some results publications may still have been missed, we believe that a high coverage has been reached. A further strength is the careful manual work to identify and validate cross-registrations.

The following limitations should be noted. This project relied on information in trial registries, which can be incomplete and not updated since the initial entry. For instance, completion

date and enrollment numbers can reflect what was estimated at the start, rather than actual numbers. A recent study of registered Covid-19 trials found that registrations with actively updated completion status showed a higher proportion of results reported compared to others (41). We did not contact primary investigators nor sponsors to verify trial status; however, a survey in a sample of German registered trials showed only minor changes after status verification by the primary investigator (42). The planned number of participants in unreported trials is likely an overestimation compared to final enrollment (43,44), but the lack of results for their trials still reflects extensive research waste. The registries contain a heterogeneous sample of trials, some of which are intended to inform clinical practice, and some of which are closer to basic research.

In the EUCTR, registration dates and start dates have particular limitations (27). While all trials on the EUCTR should be prospectively registered as they would need approvals tied to their registration before starting, it is impossible to tell from the registration when a trial actually started. Also, primary completion dates (with respect to primary outcome) are not generally registered, and we instead had to use global completion dates (last patient's last recorded data point). For trials with long follow-up of secondary outcomes, this may be much later, and contributes to explaining the proportion of trials reported before their completion date. Using a stricter cutoff, numbers for timely reporting may be even lower. We expect many trials to erroneously appear as ongoing although they are actually completed or terminated (45); for Norway, this affects a particularly large proportion of trials (24). Timely reporting may have been overestimated, if trials without status update are less likely to have reported results. In contrast to the EUCTR, ClinicalTrials.gov lists anticipated completion dates, which allowed us to include trials without an active status update. However, since some of these trials may be still ongoing, this may partly explain the difference in results between the two registries. In our sensitivity analysis among ClinicalTrials.gov-registered trials with "actual" completion dates results were in-between.

Cross-registration of trials in our examined registries varied in extent and content overlap. If some were without overlapping or similar titles, we may have missed them and hence double-counted some trials. These might appear unreported if summary results were posted in one registration and not the other. Information in cross-registrations was often inconsistent in terms of key study dates and status. We chose to merge cross-registrations to use the most updated information.

Not all trials are registered, and those not registered may be more likely to also not be reported (27,46). Trials that were not prospectively registered may have had a higher likelihood of becoming registered if the investigators were in the process of reporting. Also, we did not scrutinize the quality of the reporting nor alignment with registered outcomes. These reasons may contribute to overestimating the proportion of meaningfully reported trials.

Implications and future perspectives

Nordic academic sponsors need to improve clinical trials registration and reporting. Joint work is needed by multiple stakeholders to enable continuous monitoring of clinical trials reporting and to align resource allocation with best practices. The Nordic Trial Alliance Working Group on Transparency and Registration has recommended institutions to implement standard operating procedures to support their researchers and ensure complete

registration and reporting (47). Resources summarizing how universities can improve clinical trial reporting are also compiled online (e.g., https://www.transparimed.org/resources). Possible solutions are already implemented by some sponsoring institutions, e.g., as recently reported by one Nordic institution (Karolinska Institutet) with dedicated support staff for trial registration and active follow-up of reporting (48). In Germany, efforts are ongoing to involve trial funders in creating and implementing strategies for increased reporting (49), and other examples on lobbying activities or infrastructural support structures exist in the United States and United Kingdom (50–52).

There may be several reasons for slow or missing reporting of clinical trials (27). Trials may be underfunded, and institutional support may be lacking, leaving the individual researcher with sole responsibility for trial reporting. Summary results posting can be difficult for researchers unfamiliar with registry interfaces and procedures. Reporting of results in journals typically requires manuscripts to pass editorial and/or peer review, a process largely outside of the researcher's control. More fundamentally, current models for assessing academic merits may not be well aligned with transparent reporting (53). Researchers may perceive journal publications and journal impact factors as main criteria for funding and promotion. This misalignment may be to the detriment of reporting summary results in registries, or reporting negative results or those contrary to established opinion and therefore more difficult to publish in journals. These obstacles highlight the role of preprints as a vehicle for rapid and unhindered dissemination of research results. Assessments of the merit of articles reporting clinical trials could be improved by taking into account whether studies were prospectively registered and results reported in a timely and complete manner (54).

Conclusions

We found considerable room for improvement of registration and reporting of Nordic clinical trials. Late and incomplete reporting reduces the accuracy and validity of the evidence base used for clinical decision making and hampers the advancement of knowledge. Future extensions should be made for industry-sponsored trials (55) and trials in other registries. Joint action by stakeholders is needed, especially at the initiative of academic institutions, to support, monitor, and incentivise trials registration and timely reporting.

Declarations

Data sharing

Data and code used for our analyses are publicly available at https://github.com/cathrineaxfors/nordic-trial-reporting and https://zenodo.org/records/10091147.

Conflicts of interest

None.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: G.N., S.W., N.J.D., M.S.-H., S.Y., L.S., M.R., E.R., J.-O.H., M.B., S.M., P.J., T.B., K.B., M.C., L.G.H., F.N., S.P., R.M.W., J.P.I., D.S., and C.A.
Investigation (data collection): S.W., K.K., T.S., S.Y., N.O., C.C., K.S., L.S., M.W., J.B., M.R., A.S., T.K., T.P., L.A., E.R., L.H., J.-O.H., S.K., R.B., M.B., S.M., K.L., M.S., N.H., S.R., P.J., E.Z., T.B., D.F., and C.A.
Methodology: G.N., S.W., N.J.D., M.S.-H., T.B., J.P.A.I., D.S., and C.A.
Data curation: C.A. and L.A.
Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Project Administration, Resources, Supervision, Visualization: C.A.
Software: N.J.D., M.S.-H., and C.A.
Validation: L.A., K.K., and C.A.
Writing - original draft: G.N. and C.A.
Writing - review & editing: All authors.

Acknowledgements

CA reports funding for this project by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation through the Wallenberg Foundation Postdoctoral Scholarship Program at Stanford (KAW 2019.0561). FN reports funding outside this project from the French National Research Agency (ANR-17-CE36-0010), the French ministry of health and the French ministry of research; being work package leader in the OSIRIS project (Open Science to Increase Reproducibility in Science) with funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 101094725); and being work package leader for the doctoral network MSCA-DN SHARE-CTD (HORIZON-MSCA-2022-DN-01 101120360), funded by the EU.

The title page and author contributions section of this document was made using the free open-source tool *tenzing*, https://rollercoaster.shinyapps.io/tenzing/.

References

1. Chalmers I, Glasziou P. Avoidable waste in the production and reporting of research evidence. The Lancet. 2009 Jul 4;374(9683):86–9.
2. World Health Organization. WHO Statement on public disclosure of clinical trial results [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2022 Aug 30]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/09-04-2015-japan-primary-registries-network
3. Moorthy VS, Karam G, Vannice KS, Kieny MP. Rationale for WHO's new position calling for prompt reporting and public disclosure of interventional clinical trial results. PLoS Med. 2015 Apr;12(4):e1001819.
4. European Commission. Commission Guideline — Guidance on posting and publication of result-related information on clinical trials in relation to the implementation of Article 57(2) of Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 and Article 41(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1901/2006. Off J Eur Union. 2012 Oct 6;55(302):7–10.
5. US Food and Drug Administration. FDA. FDA; 2018 [cited 2022 Aug 30]. Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act (FDAAA) of 2007. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/selected-amendments-fdc-act/food-and-drug-administration-amendments-act-fdaaa-2007
6. Swedish Research Council. Registering your clinical study [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Aug 30]. Available from: https://www.vr.se/english/applying-for-funding/requirements-terms-and-conditions/registering-your-clinical-study.html
7. DeVito NJ, Bacon S, Goldacre B. Compliance with legal requirement to report clinical trial results on ClinicalTrials.gov: a cohort study. The Lancet. 2020 Feb 1;395(10221):361–9.
8. Goldacre B, DeVito NJ, Heneghan C, Irving F, Bacon S, Fleminger J, et al. Compliance with requirement to report results on the EU Clinical Trials Register: cohort study and web resource. BMJ. 2018 Sep 12;362:k3218.
9. Anderson ML, Chiswell K, Peterson ED, Tasneem A, Topping J, Califf RM. Compliance with Results Reporting at ClinicalTrials.gov. N Engl J Med. 2015 Mar 12;372(11):1031–9.
10. European Commission. Clinical trials - Regulation EU No 536/2014 [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Nov 29]. Available from: https://health.ec.europa.eu/medicinal-products/clinical-trials/clinical-trials-regulation-eu-no-5362014_en
11. World Health Organization. Joint statement on public disclosure of results from clinical trials [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2023 Nov 29]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/18-05-2017-joint-statement-on-registration
12. World Medical Association (WMA). WMA Declaration of Helsinki – Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Nov 29]. Available from: https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/
13. Chen R, Desai NR, Ross JS, Zhang W, Chau KH, Wayda B, et al. Publication and reporting of clinical trial results: cross sectional analysis across academic medical centers. BMJ. 2016 Feb 17;352:i637.
14. Salholz-Hillel M, Strech D, Carlisle BG. Results publications are inadequately linked to trial registrations: An automated pipeline and evaluation of German university medical centers. Clin Trials Lond Engl. 2022 Jun;19(3):337–46.
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. Strech D, Sievers S, Märschenz S, Riedel N, Wieschowski S, Meerpohl J, et al. Tracking

the timely dissemination of clinical studies. Characteristics and impact of 10 tracking variables. F1000Research. 2018;7:1863.
18. Strzebonska K, Wasylewski MT, Zaborowska L, Riedel N, Wieschowski S, Strech D, et al. Results dissemination of registered clinical trials across Polish academic institutions: a cross-sectional analysis. BMJ Open. 2020 Jan 22;10(1):e034666.
19. Alayche M, Cobey KD, Ng JY, Ardern CL, Khan KM, Chan AW, et al. Evaluating prospective study registration and result reporting of trials conducted in Canada from 2009 to 2019. FACETS. 2023 Jan;8:1–10.
20. Bruckner T. transparimed. 2020 [cited 2023 Nov 13]. Clinical trials in Denmark: Pharma companies excel at transparency, universities lag behind. Available from: https://www.transparimed.org/single-post/clinical-trials-denmark-dkma
21. Bruckner T. CLINICAL TRIAL TRANSPARENCY IN NORWAY – MAPPING UNREPORTED DRUG TRIALS [Internet]. Stiftelsen Dam/Dam Foundation, Oslo, Norway; 2021 [cited 2023 Nov 13]. Available from: https://dam.no/content/uploads/2021/06/Clinical-Trial-Transparency-In-Norway-2021.pdf
22. Bruckner T. transparimed. 2020 [cited 2022 Aug 30]. Results are missing for over two hundred drug trials involving Swedish patients. Available from: https://www.transparimed.org/single-post/results-are-missing-for-over-two-hundred-drug-trials-involving-swedish-patients
23. Cochrane Sweden. Results are missing for over 200 drug trials involving Swedish patients [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 30]. Available from: https://sweden.cochrane.org/sv/news/results-are-missing-over-200-drug-trials-involving-swedish-patients
24. DeVito NJ, Goldacre B. Trends and variation in data quality and availability on the European Union Clinical Trials Register: A cross-sectional study. Clin Trials Lond Engl. 2022 Apr;19(2):172–83.
25. Wieschowski S, Kahrass H, Schürmann C, Strech D, Riedel N, Siegerink B, et al. IntoValue. 2017 Jun 29 [cited 2022 Aug 30]; Available from: https://osf.io/fh426/
26. Wieschowski S, Strech D, Riedel N, Kahrass H, Bruckner T, Holst M, et al. In2Value 2. 2020 Jun 26 [cited 2022 Aug 30]; Available from: https://osf.io/98j7u/
27. DeVito NJ. Trial registries for transparency and accountability in clinical research [Internet] [http://purl.org/dc/dcmitype/Text]. University of Oxford; 2022 [cited 2022 Oct 4]. Available from: https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:3c901316-5c24-4b42-a78e-1037d56d35e4
28. Salholz-Hillel M, Grabitz P, Pugh-Jones M, Strech D, DeVito NJ. Results availability and timeliness of registered COVID-19 clinical trials: interim cross-sectional results from the DIRECCT study. BMJ Open. 2021 Nov 22;11(11):e053096.
29. DeVito NJ, Grabitz P, Salholz-Hillel M, Strech D. Dissemination of Registered COVID-19 Clinical Trials (DIRECCT). 2020 Jun 2 [cited 2022 Oct 14]; Available from: https://osf.io/5f8j2/
30. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. J Clin Epidemiol. 2008 Apr;61(4):344–9.
31. Cancerstudier i Sverige – en databas med pågående kliniska studier - RCC [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 30]. Available from: https://www.cancercentrum.se/samverkan/vara-uppdrag/forskning/cancerstudier-i-sverige/
32. Västra Götalandsregionen. FoU i Västra Götalandsregionen [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 30]. Available from: https://www.researchweb.org/is/vgr
33. Ny fælles branding af Copenhagen University Hospital [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 8]. Available from: https://www.regionh.dk/til-fagfolk/Forskning-og-innovation/Nyheder-om-forskning-og-innovation/Sider/Ny-f%C3%A6lles-branding-af-Copenhagen-University-Hospital-.aspx
34. Hospitaler i Region Hovedstaden [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 8]. Available from: https://www.regionh.dk/hospitaler-i-regionen/Sider/default.aspx

35. FDAAA 801 and the Final Rule - ClinicalTrials.gov [Internet]. [cited 2022 Oct 24]. Available from: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/manage-recs/fdaaa
36. EU Trials Tracker — Who's not sharing clinical trial results? [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 30]. Available from: http://eu.trialstracker.net/
37. QUEST Center, Berlin Institute of Health. IntoValue - Institutions' contribution to increasing value and reducing waste. 2022.
38. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, CONSORT Group. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. BMJ. 2010 Mar 23;340:c332.
39. ICMJE | Recommendations | Clinical Trials [Internet]. [cited 2023 Oct 24]. Available from: https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/publishing-and-editorial-issues/clinical-trial-registration.html
40. Nelson JT, Tse T, Puplampu-Dove Y, Golfinopoulos E, Zarin DA. Comparison of Availability of Trial Results in ClinicalTrials.gov and PubMed by Data Source and Funder Type. JAMA. 2023 Apr 25;329(16):1404–6.
41. Salholz-Hillel M, Pugh-Jones M, Hildebrand N, Schult TA, Schwietering J, Grabitz P, et al. Dissemination of Registered COVID-19 Clinical Trials (DIRECCT): a cross-sectional study. BMC Med. 2023 Nov 29;21(1):475.
42. Wieschowski S. Survey to validate a cohort study on the publication rate of clinical studies of German medical faculties [Unpublished; Master's thesis, German]. Hannover Medical School; 2021.
43. Walters SJ, Bonacho Dos Anjos Henriques-Cadby I, Bortolami O, Flight L, Hind D, Jacques RM, et al. Recruitment and retention of participants in randomised controlled trials: a review of trials funded and published by the United Kingdom Health Technology Assessment Programme. BMJ Open. 2017 Mar 20;7(3):e015276.
44. Janiaud P, Axfors C, Ioannidis JPA, Hemkens LG. Recruitment and Results Reporting of COVID-19 Randomized Clinical Trials Registered in the First 100 Days of the Pandemic. JAMA Netw Open. 2021 Mar 1;4(3):e210330.
45. Fleminger J, Goldacre B. Prevalence of clinical trial status discrepancies: A cross-sectional study of 10,492 trials registered on both ClinicalTrials.gov and the European Union Clinical Trials Register. PLOS ONE. 2018 Mar 7;13(3):e0193088.
46. Trinquart L, Dunn AG, Bourgeois FT. Registration of published randomized trials: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Med. 2018 Oct 16;16(1):173.
47. Nordic Trial Alliance Working Group on Transparency and Registration, NordForsk. Transparency and Registration in Clinical Research in the Nordic Countries [Internet]. Nordic Trial Alliance; 2015 [cited 2023 Nov 8]. Available from: https://www.nordictrialalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/nta_transparency_report.pdf
48. Possmark S, Martinsson Björkdahl C. Ansvarsfull rapportering av kliniska läkemedelsprövningar [Internet]. Läkartidningen. 2023 [cited 2023 Oct 24]. Available from: https://lakartidningen.se/klinik-och-vetenskap-1/artiklar-1/temaartikel/2023/05/ansvarsfull-rapportering-av-kliniska-lakemedelsprovningar/
49. Franzen D, Salholz-Hillel M. Berliner Institut für Gesundheitsforschung - Charité und Max-Delbrück-Centrum. 2023 [cited 2023 Oct 24]. EFFECTT - Projects - BIH at Charité. Available from: https://www.bihealth.org/en/translation/innovation-enabler/quest-center/projects/project/empowering-funders-for-enhanced-clinical-trial-transparency-effectt
50. Mirjam Keestra S, Rodgers F, Gepp S, Grabitz P, Bruckner T. Improving clinical trial transparency at UK universities: Evaluating 3 years of policies and reporting performance on the European Clinical Trial Register. Clin Trials. 2022 Apr 1;19(2):217–23.
51. O'Reilly EK, Hassell NJ, Snyder DC, Natoli S, Liu I, Rimmler J, et al. ClinicalTrials.gov Reporting: Strategies for Success at an Academic Health Center. Clin Transl Sci. 2015;8(1):48–51.
52. Snider SH, Flume PA, Gentilin SL, Lesch WA, Sampson RR, Sonne SC. Overcoming

non-compliance with clinical trial registration and results reporting: One Institution's approach. Contemp Clin Trials Commun. 2020 Jun 1;18:100557.
53. Rice DB, Raffoul H, Ioannidis JPA, Moher D. Academic criteria for promotion and tenure in biomedical sciences faculties: cross sectional analysis of international sample of universities. BMJ. 2020 Jun 25;369:m2081.
54. Moher D, Bouter L, Kleinert S, Glasziou P, Sham MH, Barbour V, et al. The Hong Kong Principles for assessing researchers: Fostering research integrity. PLOS Biol. 2020 Jul 16;18(7):e3000737.
55. Swedish Research Council. Statistics - stöd och information om kliniska studier [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Sep 27]. Available from: https://www.kliniskastudier.se/english/statistics.html
56. Riedel N, Wieschowski S, Bruckner T, Holst MR, Kahrass H, Nury E, et al. Dataset for the IntoValue 1 + 2 studies on results dissemination from clinical trials conducted at German university medical centers completed between 2009 and 2017 [Internet]. Zenodo; 2021 [cited 2022 Aug 30]. Available from: https://zenodo.org/record/5141343

Tables

Table 1. Characteristics of included trials (N=2,112).

Trial characteristic[1]	**All trials, N=2,112**	**Trials registered in the EUCTR (with or without ClinicalTrials .gov), n=431**	**Trials registered only at ClinicalTrials .gov, n=1,681**
Country			
Denmark	1,019 (48.2)	255 (59.2)	764 (45.4)
Finland	230 (10.9)	55 (12.8)	175 (10.4)
Iceland	10 (0.5)	3 (0.7)	7 (0.4)
Norway	328 (15.5)	33 (7.7)	295 (17.5)
Sweden	525 (24.9)	85 (19.7)	440 (26.2)
Registry[2]			
Registered in the EUCTR	431 (20.4)	431 (100)	N/A
Registered at ClinicalTrials.gov	2,007 (95.0)	326 (75.6)	1,681 (100)
Intervention type[3]			
Medicinal product	675 (32.0)	431 (100)	244 (14.5)
Not medicinal product	1,437 (68.0)	N/A	1,437 (85.5)
Design (missing, n=3)			

Randomized controlled	1,515 (71.7)	304 (70.5)	1,211 (72)
Non-randomized	594 (28.1)	127 (29.5)	467 (27.8)
Masking (missing, n=8)			
Open label	1,157 (54.8)	245 (56.8)	912 (54.3)
Any masking	947 (44.8)	186 (43.2)	761 (45.3)
Sponsor type[4]			
Industry or mixed	158 (7.5)	22 (5.1)	136 (8.1)
Only non-industry	1,954 (92.5)	409 (94.9)	1,545 (91.9)
Phase			
I	65 (3.1)	12 (2.8)	53 (3.2)
I-II	30 (1.4)	11 (2.6)	19 (1.1)
II	196 (9.3)	149 (34.6)	47 (2.8)
II-III	21 (1.0)	8 (1.9)	13 (0.8)
III	61 (2.9)	39 (9)	22 (1.3)
IV	240 (11.4)	196 (45.5)	44 (2.6)
Not given	1,499 (71.0)	16 (3.7)	1,483 (88.2)
Multicentric			

Yes	526 (24.9)	136 (31.6)	390 (23.2)
No (monocentric)	1,586 (75.1)	295 (68.4)	1,291 (76.8)
Enrollment (actual or anticipated; missing, n=1)			
1 - 100	1,463 (69.3)	318 (73.8)	1145 (68.1)
100 - 500	515 (24.4)	100 (23.2)	415 (24.7)
> 500	133 (6.3)	13 (3)	120 (7.1)
Completion year (actual or anticipated)			
2016	515 (24.4)	107 (24.8)	408 (24.3)
2017	532 (25.2)	134 (31.1)	398 (23.7)
2018	556 (26.3)	91 (21.1)	465 (27.7)
2019	509 (24.1)	99 (23.0)	410 (24.4)
Status			
Completed	1,675 (79.3)	349 (81.0)	1,326 (78.9)
Terminated	149 (7.1)	61 (14.2)	88 (5.2)
Unknown status	288 (13.6)	21 (4.9)	267 (15.9)

Percentages may exceed 100 because of rounding. [1]Total count may differ between categories because of missing data (number missing shown if >0). [2]Subcategories are not mutually exclusive. [3]Medicinal product trials included all EUCTR trials, and ClinicalTrials.gov trials with the labels drug, biological, genetic, or combination product; non-medicinal product trials included ClinicalTrials.gov trials with the labels behavioral, device, diagnostic test, dietary supplement, procedure, radiation, or other. [4]Among lead or collaborating sponsors.

Figures

Figure 1. Flowchart for the search process.



Note. EUCTR trials were identified in the EU Trials Tracker dataset (which excludes EUCTR records without any linked EudraCT protocol). ClinicalTrials.gov trials were identified in the AACT dataset (after excluding duplicate records and observational studies). Automatic screening for cross-registrations was done in the statistical program R (and manually verified). Manual search for cross-registration IDs was done in all results publications. Additional manual searches for cross-registrations were done for all EUCTR-registered trials and for ClinicalTrials.gov-registered medicinal product trials. Cross-registered records were merged to use the most updated information. Summary results were manually verified for all EUCTR trials to exclude trials withdrawn without any enrollment.

Figure 2. Share of trials with any results reporting (summary results or results publications) at the end of follow-up, and within two years of completion.



Note. Confidence intervals calculated with Wilson score (using modified Wilson score if the numerator, or the denominator minus numerator, was less than 3).

Figure 3. Time to first reported results (summary results or results publication, total sample, N=2,112).



Note. For 174 trials (8.2%), results were reported before the completion date. The lowest point of the Kaplan-Meier curve is not the same as the overall proportion that remained unpublished (21.9%) since the curve shows the proportion of unpublished trials among those followed up to that specific point. The curve is restricted to 84 months due to limited data beyond this follow-up (3 trials, one of which had a publication at 85 months).

Figure 4. Reporting of trial results per Nordic country.



Note. Confidence intervals calculated with Wilson score (using modified Wilson score if the numerator, or the denominator minus the numerator, was <3).

Appendix

Appendix to “Results reporting for clinical trials led by medical universities and university hospitals in the Nordic countries was often missing or delayed” by Nilsonne et al.

Tables

Table 1. Amendments to the study protocol
Table 2. Study variables
Table 3. Medical universities and university hospitals in the Nordic countries (and search terms for trial registries)
Table 4. Share of trials with summary results or results publication within two years of completion, per institution
Table 5. Share of trials with summary results within one year of completion, per institution
Table 6. Share of trials with any results reporting (summary results or results publications) at the end of follow-up, per institution
Table 7. Median time from completion to the first reporting of results, per institution
Table 8. Share of trials with prospective trial registration among those registered at ClinicalTrials.gov only (n=1681), per institution
Table 9. Subgroup analyses
Table 10. Sensitivity analyses
Table 11. Sensitivity analysis: Only assigning trials to institutions that are the sole sponsor or first listed. Share of trials with summary results or results publication within two years of completion, per institution
Table 12. Sensitivity analysis: Only assigning trials to institutions that are the sole sponsor or first listed. Share of trials with summary results within one year of completion, per institution
Table 13. Sensitivity analysis: Only assigning trials to institutions that are the sole sponsor or first listed. Share of trials with any results reporting (summary results or results publications) at the end of follow-up, per institution

Figures

Figure 1. Overview of manual identification of results publications
Figure 2. Time to first reported results (summary results or results publication, total sample, N=2,112) per country.
Figure 3. Share of trials with prospective trial registration among those registered at ClinicalTrials.gov only (n=1,681)
Figure 4. Time to trial registration after start date among trials registered at ClinicalTrials.gov only (n=1,681)

Appendix Table 1. Amendments to the study protocol

Section	Amendment	Comment
Variables	These variables were listed in the protocol for data collection but were in the end not collected: publication_enrollment and publication_outcome_consistency	Correction (these variables were never intended to be collected in this project, but in potential follow-up studies)
	For the variable is_controlled, we used the AACT variable intervention_model (instead of “allocation”; single group assignment was coded as not controlled). For EUCTR trials, we coded the trial as controlled if at least 1 country protocol defined it as such.	Correction (intervention_model was the right variable)
	Additional variable coded: single_sponsor.	Correction (had missed to list this variable in the protocol table)
	The variable lead_city was never coded. This also meant that the variable center_size was based on lead_institution (instead of lead_city, as the protocol described).	Correction (lead_city not needed for our purposes).
	Instead of the planned variable alias_id, we simply provide nct_id and eudract_id. In case both are present, the record is a cross-registered trial and includes merged information from both trial registrations.	
	The variable main_sponsor shows whether all sponsors (also collaborators, not just lead) are industry/mixed or only non-industry.	Adaptation of code so that ClinicalTrials.gov ‘agency_class’ was extracted for all sponsors (like for the EUCTR data), and not just lead sponsor. This since the lead sponsor was nearly always

		academic, given our sampling.
	We report the timing of registration as strictly prospective (before the trial start), within 60 days of trial start, and more than 60 days after trial start.	We added the calculation of strictly prospective registration (to not conflate with less strict definitions).
Institution list	No trials were found for Bornholms hospital or Stavanger University Hospital; therefore these institutions are not listed in the results.	
	We have merged results for Huddinge Hospital (1 trial) with Karolinska University Hospital (instead of reporting results separately for Huddinge Hospital).	Correction to the original institution list, since Huddinge Hospital is part of Karolinska University Hospital.
Cross-registration manual search algorithm	The two search steps “Location (country) and disease” and “Location (country) and intervention” were replaced with one: "Location (country) and a combination of terms for indication/disease and intervention", according to the best judgment of the reviewer.	For feasibility since the former search steps were too unspecific.
Data collection	Publications searches were done by two independent reviewers for all trials except a set of 8 (by the last author). In case of discrepant findings, one reviewer with access to both independent reports made the final decision. Reviewers were encouraged to discuss with another reviewer if unsure during this final step.	To increase the validity of publications searches.
	For registrations with several substudies, a results publication counted as eligible if it reported on any of the substudies (without	Following a “generous” logic to rather include than exclude a results publication.

	need to report on all).	
	All automatically identified summary results in the EUCTR were manually verified (instead of only those belonging to prematurely ended trials).	Automatic identification was based on the existence of a web link to a results section, but we observed that the link could be broken (no publicly available results). We added manual verification of all results for increased validity.
	The manual searches for publications took place between 2022-11-21 and 2023-03-23. The (automatic) searches for summary results took place on 2022-11-07 (EUCTR data downloaded) and 2022-11-09 (clinicaltrials.gov downloaded). An exception to the latter were cross-registered trials, which were manually examined for summary results up to 2023-03-23 (by which two trials were found to have summary results not already found).	Clarification of method
Data extraction for cross-registered trials	Among cross-registered trials: Completion dates were extracted from EUCTR results sections whenever present. If no such section existed, and protocol completion dates from ClinicalTrials.gov and EUCTR were conflicting, we chose the latest (unless the ClinicalTrials.gov date entry was “anticipated” and not “actual”, then we chose the EUCTR date). If the completion date in the EUCTR results section was set to <2016 but the ClinicalTrials.gov entry was ≥2016 (and therefore eligible), we included it (this occurred for 5 trials).	In order to include the most updated information on completion dates.

	Among cross-registered trials: if start date information was inconsistent, we used the most updated entry, and in case of a tie, the less strict option (leading to prospectively registered).	
	Among cross-registered trials: Primary completion dates were extracted from ClinicalTrials.gov for all cross-registered trials unless the date was in conflict with (i.e., later than) the global completion date and less updated.	Amendment for the data collection; however, primary completion dates were not used in the analysis.
	Among cross-registered trials: if sponsors were different (and both were eligible sponsors), we merged the information and listed both. We used the sponsor added in the EUCTR as primary (i.e., listed also in the variable single_sponsor).	Necessary amendment.
Data analysis	We added a secondary outcome: number of planned (or actual) participants in reported trials	To give a full overview of the number of participants in reported and unreported trials.
	We did not calculate primary outcome results separately for summary results and publications.	For two reasons: 1) terminated trials may have very few participants enrolled, and for these, it may not be reasonable to expect any publication; 2) summary results constituted a small proportion of the total results reporting.
	Confidence intervals for binary outcomes: We calculated Wilson confidence intervals for binomial proportions using the BinomCI function in the DescTools R package. If the numerator (or denominator minus numerator) was < 3,	Necessary amendment.

	we used the modified Wilson method as proposed by Brown (2001). Ref: Andri Signorell (2023). DescTools: Tools for Descriptive Statistics. R package version 0.99.49. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DescTools	
	For the Kaplan-Meier curve, we censored the timeline at the search date for publications (latest among the two reviewers).	Addition of more accurate measurement of follow-up time for each trial.
	We did not calculate the subgroup analysis on trials conducted in one country vs. trials conducted in many countries. We replaced the analysis with multicenter vs. single-center trials.	Because that information was missing for the large majority of trials (only present in the EUCTR).
	We did not calculate the subgroup analysis on phase I-II trials vs phase III-IV trials.	Because phase description was not applicable to the majority of trials.
	For subgroup analyses, we applied post-hoc statistical significance testing (Pearson's chi-squared test), Bonferroni-corrected for the number of subgroup tests (n=15, i.e., $p<0.05/15$).	Necessary amendment of inference criteria to statistically explore subgroup associations.
	Added sensitivity analysis: Using primary completion date instead of global completion date	Since the primary completion date (last patient's last visit for primary outcomes) is the definition used by the WHO, and not the global completion date (last patient's last visit for all outcomes).
	Added sensitivity analysis: restrict to trials registered only at ClinicalTrials.gov with actual completion date (instead of anticipated completion date)	Since an "anticipated" completion date is an early estimate that may not be accurate.
	Interpretation of sensitivity	

	analyses: We interpreted results from sensitivity analyses as consistent with the main results if the 95% confidence interval of the main results included the point estimate of the sensitivity analysis results.	

Appendix Table 2. Study variables

Automatically extracted variables originate from the EUCTR (through EU Trials Tracker [“EUTT”] (8,27) or the comprehensive web scrapers of EUCTR country protocols and results sections developed by DeVito [“EUCTR web scraper”]) and from the ClinicalTrials.gov (through the AACT dataset). The list also contains manually extracted variables and derived variables.

This list is based extensively on previous work in the IntoValue project (25,56).

Study variable	Type	Description and origin
main_id	character	Primary trial registration number. EUTT: EudraCT number. ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT ID.
proj_id	character	Unique project ID for each record
eligibility	character	Eligibility status based on the manual eligibility assessment.
eudract_id	character	EudraCT number. A record that has both an eudract_id and nct_id present is a cross-registered trial that includes merged information from both trial registrations.
nct_id	character	NCT ID. A record that has both an eudract_id and nct_id present is a cross-registered trial that includes merged information from both trial registrations.
crossregistration_check	character	Whether the record has a cross-registration or not and during which step it was identified. Based on the semi-automatic cross-registration searches.
registry	character	Trial registry. EUCTR or ClinicalTrials.gov.
trial_title	character	Title of trial. EUCTR web scraper: protocol section, ‘full title of the trial’. AACT: ‘official_title’ in table ‘studies’.
trial_name	character	Name or acronym of trial. EUCTR web scraper: protocol section, ‘name or abbreviated title of the trial where available’. AACT: ‘brief_title’ in table ‘studies’.
lead_institution	character	Names of lead Nordic medical universities or university hospitals based on `affiliation` in registries. EUTT: based on `normalized_name` and ‘name_of_sponsor’. AACT: based on `sponsors` and `responsible parties`. Manually verified. Multiple institutions (e.g., several sponsors listed) can be present.
lead_country	character	Country of lead Nordic medical universities or university hospitals. Derived from lead_institutions. Multiple countries can be present.

has_publication	logical	Whether any eligible publication was found. Derived from manual publication search variables.
publication_doi	character	Publication DOI. Manually entered during publication search.
publication_pmid	numeric	Publication PMID. Manually entered during publication search.
publication_url	character	Publication URL. Manually entered during publication search.
publication_date	date	Publication date. Manually entered during publication search or automatically derived (for records with PMID). Earliest date used, whether electronic or print publication date.
identification_step	character	Manual publication search: at which step the publication was identified. Manually entered
publication_type	character	Type of identified publication. Manually entered
time_to_registration	logical	Whether the trial was prospectively registered or not. Derived from `registration_date` and `start_date`. Only calculated for trials registered at ClinicalTrials.gov, without cross-registration in the EUCTR.
has_summary_results	logical	Whether summary results were posted at the registry or not. EUTT: 'has_results' (based on the presence of a “View Results” link in a protocol). Manually verified for all trials to exclude trials withdrawn without enrollment. AACT: 'were_results_reported' referring to the structured summary results field, not manually verified.
summary_results_date	date	Date when summary results were posted. EUCTR web scraper: Results section, 'First version publication date'. AACT: `results_first_submitted_date` (field previously called `first_received_results_date`).
registration_date	date	Date of study submission to registry, as given on registry. EUCTR: either from EUCTR web scraper (“Date on which this record was first entered in the EudraCT database”), or from cross-registration in AACT, whichever is earlier. AACT: based on 'study_first_submitted_date'. EUCTR registration dates are based on when the National Competent Authority (NCA) uploads the trial information to the EudraCT portal, so trial teams may have submitted their info to the NCA earlier.
start_date	date	Date of the study start, as given on registry. EUCTR: based on web scraper, results section, 'Actual start date of recruitment', or on cross-registration information

		('start_date' from AACT), whichever is more updated. If not available, missing value (NA). AACT: based on 'start_date'. ClinicalTrials.gov previously allowed start dates without day, in which case date is defaulted to first of the month.
completion_date	date	Date of the study global completion (last patient's last visit), as given on registry. EUTT: 'max_end_date', indicating the latest of available completion dates in case of several country protocols, or from cross-registration in AACT, whichever is later. AACT: 'completion_date'. ClinicalTrials.gov previously allowed completion dates without day, in which case date is defaulted to first of the month.
completion_year	numeric	Year of the study global completion. Derived from `completion_date`.
primary_completion_date	date	Date of the study primary completion (with respect to primary outcome), as given on registry. ClinicalTrials.gov only. AACT: 'primary_completion_date'. ClinicalTrials.gov previously allowed primary completion dates without day, in which case date is defaulted to first of the month. EUCTR sometimes has this information in the results section, but this would only be available for trials with uploaded results.
primary_completion_year	numeric	Year of the study primary completion. Derived from `primary_completion_date`. ClinicalTrials.gov only.
days_cd_to_publication	numeric	Number of days from `completion_date` to `publication_date`. Derived.
days_pcd_to_publication	numeric	Number of days from `primary_completion_date` to `publication_date`. Derived. ClinicalTrials.gov only.
days_cd_to_summary	numeric	Number of days from `completion_date` to `summary_results_date`. Derived. ClinicalTrials.gov only.
days_pcd_to_summary	numeric	Number of days from `primary_completion_date` to `summary_results_date`. Derived. ClinicalTrials.gov only.
days_reg_to_start	numeric	Number of days from `registration_date` to `start_date`. Derived.
days_reg_to_cd	numeric	Number of days from `registration_date` to `completion_date`. Derived.
days_reg_to_pcd	numeric	Number of days from `registration_date` to `primary_completion_date`. Derived. ClinicalTrials.gov only.
days_reg_to_publicati	numeri	Number of days from `registration_date` to

on	c	`publication_date`. Derived.
recruitment_status	character	Recruitment status, as given on registry. EUCTR web scraper: 'trial_status'. AACT: 'overall_status'. Different levels for EUCTR and ClinicalTrials.gov.
phase	character	Trial phase, as given on registry. EUTT: 'phase'. AACT: 'phase'. Different levels for EUCTR and ClinicalTrials.gov.
enrollment	numeric	Number of trial participants, as given on registry. May be anticipated or actual number. EUCTR web scraper: Results section, if present, 'Country: Number of subjects enrolled', 'EEA total number of subjects', 'Worldwide total number of subjects', the largest entered. Otherwise, Protocol section 'F.4 Planned number of subjects to be included'. AACT: 'enrollment'.
is_multicentric	logical	Whether multiple study centers are involved, as given on registry. EUCTR web scraper: Protocol sections 'E.8.3 The trial involves single site in the Member State concerned', 'E.8.4 The trial involves multiple sites in the Member State concerned', 'E.8.5 The trial involves multiple Member States'. AACT: derived from `has_single_facility`.
is_multinational	logical	Whether multiple countries are involved, as given on registry. EUCTR web scraper: Protocol section 'E.8.5 The trial involves multiple Member States'. AACT: derived from `has_single_facility`.
main_sponsor	character	Whether sponsors are industry/mixed or only non-industry, as given on registry (counting both lead sponsors and collaborators). EUTT: 'sponsor_status' (for all listed sponsors in the EUCTR). For ClinicalTrials.gov, sourced from `agency_class` in `sponsors` datatable.
is_controlled	character	Whether trial had any control arm(s), as given on registry. EUCTR web scraper: protocol sections 'E.8.1 Controlled', coding the trial as controlled if at least 1 country protocol defined it as such. AACT: ‘intervention_model’ variable (single group assignment was coded as not controlled). Different levels for EUCTR and ClinicalTrials.gov.
is_randomised	logical	Whether trial was randomized, as described on registry. EUCTR web scraper: protocol section 'E.8.1.1 Randomised', yes or no. AACT: 'allocation' variable, with 'Randomized' or 'Randomized controlled trial' counted as TRUE, while 'Non-Randomized, 'Non-randomized controlled trial', 'Other', and 'Single arm study' counted as FALSE.
masking	character	Trial masking, as given on registry, recoded to open label vs any masking. EUCTR web scraper: protocol sections

		'E.8.1.2 Open', 'E.8.1.3 Single blind', 'E.8.1.4 Double blind', yes or no. AACT: 'masking'. Different levels for EUCTR (Open, Single, Double) and ClinicalTrials.gov (None (Open Label), Single, Double, Triple, Quadruple).
intervention_type	character	Trial intervention type, as given on registry. EUCTR trials are all counted as ‘medicinal products’. AACT: 'intervention_type' (with ‘biological’, ‘combination product’, ‘drug’, ‘genetic’, or ‘dietary supplement’ counted as ‘medicinal products’, vs. ‘behavioral’, ‘device’, ‘diagnostic test’, ‘procedure’, ‘radiation’, or ‘other’ counted as ‘other interventions’).
center_size	character	Institution classified as 'large' or 'small' depending on the number of trials led per `lead_cities`. An institution was classified as 'large' if it conducted more trials than the median trial number per institution. Derived.
single_sponsor	character	Name of lead Nordic medical university or university hospital based on `affiliation` in registries. EUTT: based on `normalized_name` and ‘name_of_sponsor’. AACT: based on `sponsors` and `responsible parties`. Manually verified. If several institutions collaborated, this variable only lists the first. Used for the counting of trials as led by an institution only if they have a single sponsor or if the institution is listed first among sponsors.

Appendix Table 3. Medical universities and university hospitals in the Nordic countries (and search terms for trial registries)

* Search terms to identify registered trials in the EU Trials Tracker dataset ("name of sponsor") and AACT dataset ("sponsor" and "responsible party"). Search terms include primary city name(s), institution name, other commonly used variants of institution name (e.g., former names), and names of member hospitals, if applicable. We apply the original language spelling, English with Nordic vowels/letters, and English without Nordic vowels/letters. Search terms may overlap between institutions. Allocation of trials to accountable institutions will be verified manually.

Accountable institution (with aliases)	**Cities or member institutions included under accountable institution**	**Search terms***	**Comments**
DENMARK			
Aalborg University		Aalborg; Ålborg; Alborg; Nordjylland	
Aalborg University Hospital (Aalborg universitetshospital)	Aalborg Psychiatric Hospital, Nyt Aalborg Universitetshospital, Regionshospital Nordjylland	Aalborg; Ålborg; Alborg	
Aarhus University		Aarhus; Århus	
Aarhus University Hospital (The New University Hospital, Det Nye Universitetshospital)	Skejby; Aarhus Psychiatric Hospital	Aarhus; Århus; Nye Universitetshospital; New University Hospital; Skejby; Marselisborg; Samsø; Samsoe; Samso	Aarhus University Hospital is the new name for several former hospitals: Aarhus sygehus, Skejby sygehus, etc.

University of Copenhagen		Copenhagen; København; Kobenhavn; Københavns; Kobenhavns	
Copenhagen University Hospital (Københavns Universitetshospital)	Rigshospitalet, Glostrup Hospital	Copenhagen; København; Kobenhavn; Københavns; Kobenhavns; Rigshospitalet; Glostrup; National University Hospital Denmark	Copenhagen University Hospital is a conglomerate of several hospitals in Region Hovedstaden and Region Zealand
Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital		Bispebjerg; Frederiksberg	Member hospital of Copenhagen University Hospital
Bornholms Hospital (Not listed in results; no trials found)		Bornholm	Member hospital of Copenhagen University Hospital
Herlev and Gentofte Hospital		Herlev; Gentofte	Member hospital of Copenhagen University Hospital
Holbæk Hospital		Holbæk; Holbaek; Holbak	Member hospital of Copenhagen University Hospital
Hvidovre and Amager Hospital		Hvidovre; Amager	Member hospital of Copenhagen University Hospital
Nordsjællands Hospital	Hillerød, Frederikssund	Nordsjælland; Nordsjälland; Nordsjaelland; Nordsjalland;	Member hospital of Copenhagen

		Hillerød; Hilleroed; Hillerod; Frederikssund	University Hospital
Næstved Hospital	Slagelse, Ringsted	Næstved; Naestved; Nästved; Nastved	Member hospital of Copenhagen University Hospital
Mental health services in the Capital Region of Denmark (Region Hovedstadens psykiatriske hospital)		Region Hovedstadens psykiatri; Region Hovedstaden; Mental Health Services CPH	Member hospital of Copenhagen University Hospital
Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen		Steno Diabetes	Member hospital of Copenhagen University Hospital
Zealand University Hospital (Sjællands Universitetshospital)	Køge, Roskilde	Zealand University Hospital; Sjælland; Själland; Sjaelland; Sjalland; Køge; Koege; Koge	
University of Southern Denmark		Odense; Southern Denmark; Syddansk; Syddanmark	
Odense University Hospital (Odense universitetshospital)	Funen Hospital, Svendborg Hospital, Dagklinik Faaborg, Hospital Unit Nyborg, Hospital Unit Ringe, Hospital Unit Aero	Odense; Funen; Svendborg; Faaborg; Nyborg; Ringe; Ærø; Aeroe; Hospital Unit Aero	Has several member hospitals, not separated in our list
FINLAND			

University of Eastern Finland		Kuopio; Kuopion; Joensuu; Eastern Finland; Itä-Suomen; Ita-Suomen; Östra Finlands; Ostra Finlands; Puijo; Puijon; Alava; Alavan; Julkula; Julkulan; Tarina; Tarinan; KUH	
Kuopio University Hospital (Kuopion yliopistollinen sairaala, Kuopio universitetssjukhus)	KUH Puijo Hospital (Puijon sairaala), KUH Alava Hospital (Alavan sairaala), KUH Julkula Hospital (Julkulan sairaala)		Has several member hospitals, not separated in our list. Search terms listed jointly with university in the same city; hits will be separated manually
University of Helsinki (Helsingfors University)		Helsinki; Helsingin; Helsingfors; Aurora; Espoo; Haartman; Herttoniemi; Hyvinkää; Jorvi; Kellokoski; Lohja; Malmi; Meilahti; Peijas; Porvoo; Raseborg; Töölö; Vantaa	
Helsinki University Hospital (Helsingin yliopistollinen sairaala, Helsingfors Universitetssjukhus)	Aurora Hospital (Auroran sairaala), Espoo Hospital (Espoon sairaala), Haartman Hospital (Haartmanin sairaala), Herttoniemi Hospital (Herttoniemen sairaala), Hyvinkää Hospital (Hyvinkään sairaala), Skin and Allergy Hospital (Iho- ja allergiasairaala), Jorvi Hospital (Jorvin sairaala), Kellokoski Hospital (Kellokosken sairaala), Surgical Hospital (Kirurginen		Has several member hospitals (in Helsinki, Espoo, and Vantaa), not separated in our list. Search terms listed jointly with university in the same city; hits will be separated manually

	sairaala), Lohja Hospital (Lohjan sairaala), Malmi Hospital (Malmin sairaala), Meilahti Triangle Hospital (Meilahden kolmiosairaala), Meilahti Bridge Hospital (Meilahden siltasairaala), Meilahti Tower Hospital (Meilahden tornisairaala), Women's Hospital (Naistenklinikka), Peijas Hospital (Peijaksen sairaala), Porvoo Hospital Porvoon sairaala), Psychiatry Center (Psykiatrikeskus), Park Hospital (Puistosairaala), Raseborg Hospital (Raaseporin sairaala), Eye and Ear Hospital (Silmä-korvasairaala), Comperehensive Cancer Center (Syöpätautien klinikka), Töölö Hospital (Töölön sairaala), New Children's Hospital (Uusi lastensairaala)		
University of Oulu		Oulu; Oulun; Uleåborg; Uleaborg; Oulaskangas; Oulaskankaan	
Oulu University Hospital (Oulun yliopistollinen sairaala, Uleåborgs universitetssjukhus)	Oulaskangas Hospital (Oulaskankaan sairaala)		Search terms listed jointly with university in the same city; hits will be separated manually
University of Tampere		Tampere; Tampereen; Tammerfors; Nokia; Valkeakoski;	

		Sastamala; TAYS; Pitkäniemi	
Tampere University Hospital (Tampereen yliopistollinen sairaala, Tammerfors universitetssjukhus)	Tays Central Hospital (Tays keskussairaala), Tays Hatanpää Hospital (Tays Hatanpää or Hatanpään sairaala), Tays Sastamala Hospital (Tays Sastamala or Sastamalan sairaala), Tays Valkeakoski Hospital (Tays Valkeakoski or Valkeakosken sairaala), Tays Pitkäniemi Hospital (Tays Pitkäniemi or Pitkäniemen sairaala), Hospital for Joint Replacement Coxa (Tekonivelsairaala Coxa), Tays Heart Hospital (Tays sydänsairaala or Sydänsairaala)		Has several member hospitals, not separated in our list. Search terms listed jointly with university in the same city; hits will be separated manually
University of Turku		Turku; Turun; Åbo; Tyks; Halikko; Loimaa; Raisio; Turunmaa; Vakka-Suomi	
Turku University Hospital (Turun yliopistollinen keskussairaala, Åbo universitets centralsjukhus)	Tyks Halikko hospital (Tyks Halikon sairaala or Halikon sairaala), Tyks Loimaa hospital (Tyks Loimaan sairaala or Loimaan sairaala), Tyks Main hospital (Tyks Kantasairaala), Tyks Raisio hospital (Tyks Raision sairaala or Raision sairaala), Tyks Salo hospital (Tyks Salon sairaala or Salon sairaala), Tyks Surgical		Search terms listed jointly with university in the same city; hits will be separated manually

	hospital (Tyks Orto Kirurginen sairaala), Tyks Turunmaa hospital (Tyks Turunmaan sairaala or Turunmaan sairaala), Tyks Vakka-Suomi hospital (Tyks Vakka-Suomen sairaala or Vakka-Suomen sairaala)		
ICELAND			
University of Iceland		Iceland; Reykjavik; Háskóli Íslands; Haskoli Islands; National University Hospital of Iceland; Landspítali; Landspitali; Háskólasjúkrahús; Haskolasjukrahus	
The National University Hospital of Iceland (Landspítali, Landspitali University Hospital)			Search terms listed jointly with university in the same city; hits will be separated manually
NORWAY			
Norwegian University of Science and Technology (Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet)		Trondheim; Gjøvik; Gjövik; Gjoevik; Gjovik; Ålesund; Alesund; Aalesund; Norwegian University of Science and Technology; Norges; teknisk-naturvitenskapelige; teknisk naturvitenskapelige; teknisk-naturvitskaplege; teknisk	

		naturvitskaplege; Olavs; Olav's	
St. Olav’s University Hospital (Trondheim University Hospital, Universitetssykehuset i Trondheim)			Search terms listed jointly with university in the same city; hits will be separated manually
University of Bergen		Bergen	
Haukeland university hospital (Haukeland universitetssjukehus)		Haukeland	
University of Oslo		Oslo	
Oslo University Hospital (Oslo universitetssykehus: The National Hospital Rikshospitalet, Gaustad hospital)	Ullevål Hospital, Aker Hospital	Oslo; Rikshospitalet; Gaustad Hospital; Gaustad; Ullevål; Ullevaal; Ulleval; Aker	
Akershus University Hospital (Akershus universitetssykehus)		Akershus	
UiT The Arctic University of Norway (UiT Norges arktiske universitet)		Arctic University; Norges arktiske; UiT; Tromsø; Tromsö; Tromsoe	
University Hospital of North Norway (Universitetssykehuset	UNN Tromsø, UNN Harstad, UNN Narvik, UNN Åsgård (psychiatry),	Northern Norway; North Norway; Tromsø; Tromsö; Tromsoe;	NS Bodø, a member hospital of Nordlandssykehuset in the same

Nord-Norge)	UNN Longyearbyen (Svalbard), UNN Psykisk helse og rus, Nordlandssykehuset Bodø	Tromso; Nord-Norge; Nord Norge; Harstad; Narvik; Åsgård; Asgard; Longyearbyen; Svalbard; UNN Psykisk; Bodø; Bodö; Bodo	region as UNN, also has university hospital functions (e.g., medical students can perform their two final years of studies there)
Stavanger University Hospital (Stavanger Universitetssjukehus) (Not listed in results; no trials found)		Stavanger	
SWEDEN			
Karolinska Institutet		Stockholm; Stockholms; Karolinska; Karolinskas	
Karolinska University Hospital (Karolinska universitetssjukhuset)		Karolinska	
Danderyd Hospital (Danderyds sjukhus)		Danderyd; Danderyds	Danderyd hospital has university hospital functions
Huddinge Hospital (Huddinge sjukhus)		Huddinge	Member hospital of Karolinska University Hospital
Stockholm South General Hospital (Södersjukhuset)		Stockholm South; South Stockholm; Södersjukhuset; Sodersjukhuset	Stockholm South General Hospital has university hospital functions

Lund University		Lund; Lunds	
Skane University Hospital (Skånes universitetssjukhus)	Lund Hospital, Malmoe Hospital	Skåne; Skane; Skånes; Skanes; Lund; Lunds; Malmö; Malmo; Malmoe	Member hospitals Lund Hospital and Malmö Hospital not separated
Uppsala University		Uppsala	
Uppsala Academic Hospital (Akademiska Sjukhuset i Uppsala)	Uppsala Clinical Research Center (UCR)	Uppsala; Akademiska	
Gothenburg University (Göteborgs universitet)		Göteborg; Göteborgs; Goteborg; Goteborgs; Gothenburg	
Sahlgrenska University Hospital (Sahlgrenska universitetssjukhuset)		Sahlgrenska; Salgrenska; Sahlgren	
Linkoeping University (Linköpings universitet)		Linköping; Linköpings; Linkoeping; Linkoepings; Linkoping; Linkopings	
Linkoeping University Hospital (Universitetssjukhuset i Linköping)			Search terms listed jointly with university in the same city; hits will be separated manually

Umeå University		Umeå; Umeås; Umea; Umeas; Norrland; Norrlands	
University Hospital of Umeå (Norrlands universitetssjukhus)			Search terms listed jointly with university in the same city; hits will be separated manually
Örebro University		Örebro; Örebros; Orebro; Orebros; Oerebro; Oerebros	
Örebro University Hospital (Universitetssjukhuset Örebro)			Search terms listed jointly with university in the same city; hits will be separated manually

Appendix Table 4. Share of trials with summary results or results publication within two years of completion, per institution

Institution	Trials	Results reporting within 2 years	%	95%CI, lower bound	95%CI, upper bound
Aalborg University	31	20	64.5	46.9	78.9
Aalborg University Hospital	35	19	54.3	38.2	69.5
Aarhus University	191	115	60.2	53.1	66.9
Aarhus University Hospital	66	40	60.6	48.5	71.5
Akershus University Hospital	11	5	45.5	21.3	72
Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital	77	45	58.4	47.3	68.8
Copenhagen University Hospital	172	88	51.2	43.7	58.5
Danderyd Hospital	9	4	44.4	18.9	73.3
Gothenburg University	25	14	56	37.1	73.3
Haukeland university hospital	30	9	30	16.7	47.9
Helsinki University Hospital	48	29	60.4	46.3	73
Herlev and Gentofte Hospital	111	55	49.5	40.4	58.7
Holbæk Hospital	3	2	66.7	11.8	98.3
Hvidovre and Amager Hospital	51	32	62.7	49	74.7
Karolinska Institutet	166	82	49.4	41.9	56.9
Karolinska University Hospital	48	27	56.2	42.3	69.3
Kuopio University Hospital	17	12	70.6	46.9	86.7
Linkoeping University	39	21	53.8	38.6	68.4
Linkoeping University Hospital	18	8	44.4	24.6	66.3
Lund University	36	17	47.2	32	63
Mental health	4	4	100	51	100

services in the Capital Region of Denmark					
Næstved Hospital	5	3	60	23.1	92.9
Nordsjællands Hospital	10	4	40	16.8	68.7
Norwegian University of Science and Technology	76	32	42.1	31.6	53.3
Odense University Hospital	91	54	59.3	49.1	68.9
Oslo University Hospital	102	50	49	39.5	58.6
Oulu University Hospital	10	5	50	23.7	76.3
Sahlgrenska University Hospital	42	17	40.5	27	55.5
Skane University Hospital	23	14	60.9	40.8	77.8
St. Olav's University Hospital	24	8	33.3	18	53.3
Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen	13	9	69.2	42.4	87.3
Stockholm South General Hospital	3	2	66.7	11.8	98.3
Tampere University Hospital	24	17	70.8	50.8	85.1
The National University Hospital of Iceland	5	2	40	7.1	76.9
Turku University Hospital	50	20	40	27.6	53.8
UiT The Arctic University of Norway	14	7	50	26.8	73.2
Umeå University	42	20	47.6	33.4	62.3
University Hospital of North Norway	17	6	35.3	17.3	58.7
University Hospital of Umeå	2	1	50	2.6	97.4
University of Bergen	31	16	51.6	34.8	68
University of Copenhagen	99	44	44.4	35.0	54.3
University of	12	2	16.7	3.0	44.8

Eastern Finland					
University of Helsinki	21	11	52.4	32.4	71.7
University of Iceland	5	2	40	7.1	76.9
University of Oslo	23	15	65.2	44.9	81.2
University of Oulu	25	10	40	23.4	59.3
University of Southern Denmark	42	27	64.3	49.2	77
University of Tampere	9	6	66.7	35.4	87.9
University of Turku	20	10	50	29.9	70.1
Uppsala Academic Hospital	9	3	33.3	12.1	64.6
Uppsala University	51	22	43.1	30.5	56.7
Zealand University Hospital	28	16	57.1	39.1	73.5
Örebro University	17	6	35.3	17.3	58.7
Örebro University Hospital	1	1	100	5.1	100
Total	2112	1097	51.9	49.8	54.1

Appendix Table 5. Share of trials with summary results within one year of completion, per institution

Institution	Trials	Summary results posted within 1 year	%	95%CI, lower bound	95%CI, upper bound
Aalborg University	31	0	0	0	11
Aalborg University Hospital	35	4	11.4	4.5	26.0
Aarhus University	191	4	2.1	0.8	5.3
Aarhus University Hospital	66	4	6.1	2.4	14.6
Akershus University Hospital	11	0	0	0	25.9
Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital	77	3	3.9	1.3	10.8
Copenhagen University Hospital	172	2	1.2	0.2	4.1
Danderyd Hospital	9	0	0	0	29.9
Gothenburg University	25	1	4	0.2	19.5
Haukeland university hospital	30	0	0	0	11.4
Helsinki University Hospital	48	2	4.2	0.7	14
Herlev and Gentofte Hospital	111	4	3.6	1.4	8.9
Holbæk Hospital	3	0	0	0	56.1
Hvidovre and Amager Hospital	51	1	2	0.1	10.3
Karolinska Institutet	166	0	0	0	2.3
Karolinska University Hospital	48	2	4.2	0.7	14
Kuopio University Hospital	17	1	5.9	0.3	27
Linkoeping University	39	3	7.7	2.7	20.3
Linkoeping University Hospital	18	1	5.6	0.3	25.8
Lund	36	4	11.1	4.4	25.3

University					
Mental health services in the Capital Region of Denmark	4	0	0	0	49
Næstved Hospital	5	0	0	0	43.4
Nordsjællands Hospital	10	1	10	0.5	40.4
Norwegian University of Science and Technology	76	0	0	0	4.8
Odense University Hospital	91	5	5.5	2.4	12.2
Oslo University Hospital	102	1	1	0.1	5.3
Oulu University Hospital	10	0	0	0	27.8
Sahlgrenska University Hospital	42	0	0	0	8.4
Skane University Hospital	23	1	4.3	0.2	21.0
St. Olav's University Hospital	24	0	0	0	13.8
Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen	13	0	0	0	22.8
Stockholm South General Hospital	3	0	0	0	56.1
Tampere University Hospital	24	0	0	0	13.8
The National University Hospital of Iceland	5	0	0	0	43.4
Turku University Hospital	50	0	0	0	7.1
UiT The Arctic University of Norway	14	0	0	0	21.5
Umeå University	42	0	0	0	8.4
University Hospital of North Norway	17	0	0	0	18.4
University	2	1	50	2.6	97.4

Hospital of Umeå					
University of Bergen	31	0	0	0	11
University of Copenhagen	99	1	1	0.1	5.5
University of Eastern Finland	12	0	0	0	24.2
University of Helsinki	21	0	0	0	15.5
University of Iceland	5	0	0	0	43.4
University of Oslo	23	0	0	0	14.3
University of Oulu	25	1	4	0.2	19.5
University of Southern Denmark	42	0	0	0	8.4
University of Tampere	9	1	11.1	0.6	43.5
University of Turku	20	0	0	0	16.1
Uppsala Academic Hospital	9	0	0	0	29.9
Uppsala University	51	1	2	0.1	10.3
Zealand University Hospital	28	0	0	0	12.1
Örebro University	17	0	0	0	18.4
Örebro University Hospital	1	0	0	0	94.9
Total	2112	48	2.3	1.7	3.0

Appendix Table 6. Share of trials with any results reporting (summary results or results publications) at the end of follow-up, per institution

Institution	Trials	Any results reporting	%	95%CI, lower bound	95%CI, upper bound
Aalborg University	31	25	80.6	63.7	90.8
Aalborg University Hospital	35	30	85.7	70.6	93.7
Aarhus University	191	161	84.3	78.5	88.8
Aarhus University Hospital	66	52	78.8	67.5	86.9
Akershus University Hospital	11	8	72.7	43.4	90.3
Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital	77	65	84.4	74.7	90.9
Copenhagen University Hospital	172	138	80.2	73.6	85.5
Danderyd Hospital	9	7	77.8	45.3	96.1
Gothenburg University	25	22	88	70	95.8
Haukeland university hospital	30	15	50	33.2	66.8
Helsinki University Hospital	48	41	85.4	72.8	92.8
Herlev and Gentofte Hospital	111	83	74.8	66	81.9
Holbæk Hospital	3	3	100	43.9	100
Hvidovre and Amager Hospital	51	43	84.3	72	91.8
Karolinska Institutet	166	132	79.5	72.7	85.0
Karolinska University Hospital	48	36	75	61.2	85.1
Kuopio University Hospital	17	14	82.4	59	93.8
Linkoeping University	39	31	79.5	64.5	89.2
Linkoeping University Hospital	18	14	77.8	54.8	91
Lund	36	23	63.9	47.6	77.5

University					
Mental health services in the Capital Region of Denmark	4	4	100	51	100
Næstved Hospital	5	5	100	56.6	100
Nordsjællands Hospital	10	9	90	59.6	99.5
Norwegian University of Science and Technology	76	53	69.7	58.7	78.9
Odense University Hospital	91	81	89.0	80.9	93.9
Oslo University Hospital	102	80	78.4	69.5	85.3
Oulu University Hospital	10	6	60	31.3	83.2
Sahlgrenska University Hospital	42	32	76.2	61.5	86.5
Skane University Hospital	23	19	82.6	62.9	93
St. Olav's University Hospital	24	14	58.3	38.8	75.5
Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen	13	11	84.6	57.8	97.3
Stockholm South General Hospital	3	3	100	43.9	100
Tampere University Hospital	24	20	83.3	64.1	93.3
The National University Hospital of Iceland	5	4	80	37.6	99
Turku University Hospital	50	30	60	46.2	72.4
UiT The Arctic University of Norway	14	10	71.4	45.4	88.3
Umeå University	42	29	69	54	80.9
University Hospital of North Norway	17	11	64.7	41.3	82.7
University	2	2	100	17.8	100

Hospital of Umeå					
University of Bergen	31	22	71	53.4	83.9
University of Copenhagen	99	74	74.7	65.4	82.3
University of Eastern Finland	12	8	66.7	39.1	86.2
University of Helsinki	21	17	81	60	92.3
University of Iceland	5	4	80	37.6	99
University of Oslo	23	21	91.3	73.2	98.5
University of Oulu	25	18	72.0	52.4	85.7
University of Southern Denmark	42	38	90.5	77.9	96.2
University of Tampere	9	9	100	70.1	100
University of Turku	20	15	75	53.1	88.8
Uppsala Academic Hospital	9	7	77.8	45.3	96.1
Uppsala University	51	33	64.7	51	76.4
Zealand University Hospital	28	24	85.7	68.5	94.3
Örebro University	17	12	70.6	46.9	86.7
Örebro University Hospital	1	1	100	5.1	100
Total	2112	1650	78.1	76.3	79.8

Appendix Table 7. Median time from completion to the first reporting of results, per institution/country

Institution/Country	Median (days)	Interquartile range (days)
Aalborg University	544	644
Aalborg University Hospital	652	712
Aarhus University	565	821
Aarhus University Hospital	582	884
Akershus University Hospital	820	1374
Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital	624	769
Copenhagen University Hospital	722	1053
Danderyd Hospital	863	776
Gothenburg University	678	487
Haukeland university hospital	1799	
Helsinki University Hospital	636	602
Herlev and Gentofte Hospital	739	1476
Holbæk Hospital	565	707
Hvidovre and Amager Hospital	556	848
Karolinska Institutet	730	1116
Karolinska University Hospital	471	2187
Kuopio University Hospital	251	1449
Linkoeping University	716	705
Linkoeping University Hospital	871	738
Lund University	759	
Mental health services in the Capital Region of Denmark	287	173
Næstved Hospital	607	275
Nordsjællands Hospital	824	619
Norwegian University of Science and Technology	892	1457
Odense University Hospital	571	887
Oslo University Hospital	740	1057
Oulu University Hospital	1213	
Sahlgrenska University Hospital	867	1201
Skane University Hospital	523	1119
St. Olav's University Hospital	1331	
Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen	560	408
Stockholm South General Hospital	216	1052
Tampere University Hospital	382	734
The National University Hospital of Iceland	992	766
Turku University Hospital	913	
UiT The Arctic University of Norway	656	
Umeå University	910	
University Hospital of North Norway	973	
University Hospital of Umeå	427	610
University of Bergen	689	

University of Copenhagen	819	1220
University of Eastern Finland	1278	1292
University of Helsinki	723	1163
University of Iceland	1306	829
University of Oslo	670	566
University of Oulu	1191	1832
University of Southern Denmark	578	511
University of Tampere	276	702
University of Turku	759	1195
Uppsala Academic Hospital	949	595
Uppsala University	971	
Zealand University Hospital	594	530
Örebro University	981	917
Örebro University Hospital	182	0
Denmark (all)	617	885
Finland (all)	703	1505
Iceland (all)	1149	850
Norway (all)	827	
Sweden (all)	736	1217
Total	690	1103

Note: Interquartile range was incalculable (missing) if the reported proportion never reached 75%.

Appendix Table 8. Share of trials with prospective trial registration among those registered at ClinicalTrials.gov only (n=1,681), per institution

Institution	Trials	Prospectively registered	%	95%CI, lower bound	95%CI, upper bound
Aalborg University	30	18	60	42.3	75.4
Aalborg University Hospital	17	10	58.8	36	78.4
Aarhus University	165	90	54.5	46.9	62
Aarhus University Hospital	31	18	58.1	40.8	73.6
Akershus University Hospital	10	8	80	49	96.4
Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital	52	28	53.8	40.5	66.7
Copenhagen University Hospital	118	69	58.5	49.5	67
Danderyd Hospital	7	1	14.3	0.7	51.3
Gothenburg University	19	6	31.6	15.4	54
Haukeland university hospital	25	12	48	30	66.5
Helsinki University Hospital	33	11	33.3	19.8	50.4
Herlev and Gentofte Hospital	81	35	43.2	33	54.1
Holbæk Hospital	2	1	50	2.6	97.4
Hvidovre and Amager Hospital	40	26	65	49.5	77.9
Karolinska Institutet	150	74	49.3	41.4	57.3
Karolinska University Hospital	34	12	35.3	21.5	52.1
Kuopio University Hospital	13	9	69.2	42.4	87.3
Linkoeping University	32	11	34.4	20.4	51.7
Linkoeping University Hospital	13	5	38.5	17.7	64.5
Lund	30	12	40	24.6	57.7

University					
Mental health services in the Capital Region of Denmark	4	1	25	1.3	69.9
Næstved Hospital	4	3	75	30.1	98.7
Nordsjællands Hospital	4	3	75	30.1	98.7
Norwegian University of Science and Technology	69	45	65.2	53.4	75.4
Odense University Hospital	64	38	59.4	47.1	70.5
Oslo University Hospital	87	49	56.3	45.9	66.3
Oulu University Hospital	5	1	20	1	62.4
Sahlgrenska University Hospital	34	13	38.2	23.9	55
Skane University Hospital	14	6	42.9	21.4	67.4
St. Olav's University Hospital	23	16	69.6	49.1	84.4
Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen	7	4	57.1	25	84.2
Stockholm South General Hospital	3	1	33.3	1.7	88.2
Tampere University Hospital	15	4	26.7	10.9	52
The National University Hospital of Iceland	2	1	50	2.6	97.4
Turku University Hospital	39	26	66.7	51	79.4
UiT The Arctic University of Norway	13	6	46.2	23.2	70.9
Umeå University	40	22	55	39.8	69.3
University Hospital of North Norway	17	12	70.6	46.9	86.7
University	1	0	0	0	94.9

Hospital of Umeå					
University of Bergen	30	13	43.3	27.4	60.8
University of Copenhagen	90	45	50	39.9	60.1
University of Eastern Finland	12	7	58.3	32	80.7
University of Helsinki	17	9	52.9	31	73.8
University of Iceland	5	1	20	1	62.4
University of Oslo	21	12	57.1	36.5	75.5
University of Oulu	19	5	26.3	11.8	48.8
University of Southern Denmark	42	23	54.8	39.9	68.8
University of Tampere	8	1	12.5	0.6	47.1
University of Turku	16	7	43.8	23.1	66.8
Uppsala Academic Hospital	6	1	16.7	0.9	56.4
Uppsala University	41	18	43.9	29.9	59
Zealand University Hospital	14	8	57.1	32.6	78.6
Örebro University	16	1	6.2	0.3	28.3
Örebro University Hospital	0	0			
Total	1,681	856	50.9	48.5	53.3

Appendix Table 9. Subgroup analyses

Subgroup	Reporting < 2 yrs	Summary results < 1 yr	Any results reporting
Country			
Denmark	571/1019, 56% (95%CI 53-59.1%)	28/1019, 2.7% (95%CI 1.9-3.9%)	837/1019, 82.1% (95%CI 79.7-84.4%)
Finland	118/230, 51.3% (95%CI 44.9-57.7%)	5/230, 2.2% (95%CI 0.9-5%)	173/230, 75.2% (95%CI 69.3-80.4%)
Iceland	4/10, 40% (95%CI 16.8-68.7%)	0/10, 0% (95%CI 0-27.8%)	8/10, 80% (95%CI 49-94.3%)
Norway	148/328, 45.1% (95%CI 39.8-50.5%)	1/328, 0.3% (95%CI 0.1-1.7%)	234/328, 71.3% (95%CI 66.2-76%)
Sweden	256/525, 48.8% (95%CI 44.5-53%)	14/525, 2.7% (95%CI 1.6-4.4%)	398/525, 75.8% (95%CI 72-79.3%)
Intervention type			
Medicinal product	1097/2112, 51.9% (95%CI 49.8-54.1%)	48/2112, 2.3% (95%CI 1.7-3%)	1650/2112, 78.1% (95%CI 76.3-79.8%)
Not medicinal product	707/1437, 49.2% (95%CI 46.6-51.8%)	10/1437, 0.7% (95%CI 0.4-1.3%)	1087/1437, 75.6% (95%CI 73.4-77.8%)
Multicenter or not			
Multi-center	284/526, 54% (95%CI 49.7-58.2%)	13/526, 2.5% (95%CI 1.4-4.2%)	431/526, 81.9% (95%CI 78.4-85%)
Single-center	813/1586, 51.3% (95%CI 48.8-53.7%)	35/1586, 2.2% (95%CI 1.6-3.1%)	1219/1586, 76.9% (95%CI 74.7-78.9%)
Sponsor type			
Industry or mixed	74/158, 46.8% (95%CI 39.2-54.6%)	4/158, 2.5% (95%CI 1-6.3%)	117/158, 74.1% (95%CI 66.7-80.3%)
Only non-industry	1023/1954, 52.4% (95%CI 50.1-54.6%)	44/1954, 2.3% (95%CI 1.7-3%)	1533/1954, 78.5% (95%CI 76.6-80.2%)
Planned or actual enrollment (n)			
1-30	334/704, 47.4% (95%CI 43.8-51.1%)	25/704, 3.6% (95%CI 2.4-5.2%)	522/704, 74.1% (95%CI 70.8-77.2%)
31-96	359/706, 50.8% (95%CI 47.2-54.5%)	11/706, 1.6% (95%CI 0.9-2.8%)	545/706, 77.2% (95%CI 74-80.1%)
97-150,000	404/701, 57.6% (95%CI 53.9-61.2%)	12/701, 1.7% (95%CI 1-3%)	583/701, 83.2% (95%CI 80.2-85.8%)

Note: We used Pearson's chi-squared test (R function chisq.test) to calculate statistical significance for subgroup associations, with a threshold of $p<0.05/15$ (i.e., Bonferroni-corrected for 15 tests). For calculations with small cell sizes (i.e., all country subgroup tests and the sponsor type test on summary results), we used simulated p-values as a variant of Fisher's exact test. Statistically significant results were obtained for country subgroups on any results reporting (uncorrected $p = 0.002$); intervention type subgroups on summary results within 1 year of completion (uncorrected $p = 0.003$); and enrollment size subgroups on any results reporting (uncorrected $p = 0.0007$) and within 2 years of completion (uncorrected $p = 0.00002$).

Appendix Table 10. Sensitivity analyses

Analysis	Reporting < 2 yrs	Summary results < 1 yr	Any results reporting
Main analysis	1097/2112, 51.9% (95%CI 49.8-54.1%)	48/2112, 2.3% (95%CI 1.7-3%)	1650/2112, 78.1% (95%CI 76.3-79.8%)
Only RCTs	790/1515, 52.1% (95%CI 49.6-54.7%)	32/1515, 2.1% (95%CI 1.5-3%)	1181/1515, 78% (95%CI 75.8-80%)
Restricted to EUCTR (with or without cross-registration at ClinicalTrials.gov)	267/431, 61.9% (95%CI 57.3-66.4%)	35/431, 8.1% (95%CI 5.9-11.1%)	389/431, 90.3% (95%CI 87.1-92.7%)
Restricted to ClinicalTrials.gov only (no cross-registration in the EUCTR)	830/1681, 49.4% (95%CI 47-51.8%)	13/1681, 0.8% (95%CI 0.5-1.3%)	1261/1681, 75% (95%CI 72.9-77%)
Exclude trials with unknown status	973/1824, 53.3% (95%CI 51.1-55.6%)	48/1824, 2.6% (95%CI 2-3.5%)	1490/1824, 81.7% (95%CI 79.8-83.4%)
Only completed trials	931/1675, 55.6% (95%CI 53.2-57.9%)	42/1675, 2.5% (95%CI 1.9-3.4%)	1418/1675, 84.7% (95%CI 82.9-86.3%)
Primary completion date	961/2045, 47% (95%CI 44.8-49.2%)	38/2045, 1.9% (95%CI 1.4-2.5%)	1600/2045, 78.2% (95%CI 76.4-80%)
Restricted to ClinicalTrials.gov only (no cross-registration in the EUCTR) with actual completion date	711/1411, 50.4% (95%CI 47.8-53%)	13/1411, 0.9% (95%CI 0.5-1.6%)	1112/1411, 78.8% (95%CI 76.6-80.9%)

Appendix Table 11. Sensitivity analysis: Only assigning trials to institutions that are the sole sponsor or first listed. Share of trials with summary results or results publication within two years of completion, per institution

Institution	Trials	Results reporting within 2 years	%	95%CI, lower bound	95%CI, upper bound
Aalborg University	31	20	64.5	46.9	78.9
Aalborg University Hospital	35	19	54.3	38.2	69.5
Aarhus University	186	113	60.8	53.6	67.5
Aarhus University Hospital	64	38	59.4	47.1	70.5
Akershus University Hospital	11	5	45.5	21.3	72
Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital	77	45	58.4	47.3	68.8
Copenhagen University Hospital	172	88	51.2	43.7	58.5
Danderyd Hospital	7	3	42.9	15.8	75
Gothenburg University	24	14	58.3	38.8	75.5
Haukeland university hospital	30	9	30	16.7	47.9
Helsinki University Hospital	46	29	63	48,6	75,5
Herlev and Gentofte Hospital	111	55	49.5	40.4	58.7
Holbæk Hospital	3	2	66.7	11.8	98.3
Hvidovre and Amager Hospital	51	32	62.7	49	74.7
Karolinska Institutet	166	82	49.4	41.9	56.9
Karolinska University Hospital	47	27	57.4	43.3	70.5
Kuopio University Hospital	17	12	70.6	46.9	86.7
Linkoeping University	39	21	53.8	38.6	68.4
Linkoeping University Hospital	18	8	44.4	24.6	66.3

Lund University	36	17	47.2	32	63
Mental health services in the Capital Region of Denmark	3	3	100	43.9	100
Næstved Hospital	5	3	60	23.1	92.9
Nordsjællands Hospital	10	4	40	16.8	68.7
Norwegian University of Science and Technology	76	32	42.1	31.6	53.3
Odense University Hospital	91	54	59.3	49.1	68.9
Oslo University Hospital	102	50	49	39.5	58.6
Oulu University Hospital	10	5	50	23.7	76.3
Sahlgrenska University Hospital	40	16	40	26.3	55.4
Skane University Hospital	23	14	60.9	40.8	77.8
St. Olav's University Hospital	24	8	33.3	18	53.3
Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen	13	9	69.2	42.4	87.3
Stockholm South General Hospital	3	2	66.7	11.8	98.3
Tampere University Hospital	22	15	68.2	47.3	83.6
The National University Hospital of Iceland	5	2	40	7.1	76.9
Turku University Hospital	48	18	37.5	25.2	51.6
UiT The Arctic University of Norway	14	7	50	26.8	73.2
Umeå University	41	19	46.3	32.1	61.3
University Hospital of North Norway	17	6	35.3	17.3	58.7

University Hospital of Umeå	2	1	50	2.6	97.4
University of Bergen	31	16	51.6	34.8	68
University of Copenhagen	97	43	44.3	34.8	54.2
University of Eastern Finland	12	2	16.7	3	44.8
University of Helsinki	21	11	52.4	32.4	71.7
University of Iceland	5	2	40	7.1	76.9
University of Oslo	23	15	65.2	44.9	81.2
University of Oulu	25	10	40	23.4	59.3
University of Southern Denmark	42	27	64.3	49.2	77
University of Tampere	9	6	66.7	35.4	87.9
University of Turku	20	10	50	29.9	70.1
Uppsala Academic Hospital	9	3	33.3	12.1	64.6
Uppsala University	51	22	43.1	30.5	56.7
Zealand University Hospital	28	16	57.1	39.1	73.5
Örebro University	17	6	35.3	17.3	58.7
Örebro University Hospital	1	1	100	5.1	100

Appendix Table 12. Sensitivity analysis: Only assigning trials to institutions that are the sole sponsor or first listed. Share of trials with summary results within one year of completion, per institution

Institution	Trials	Summary results posted within 1 year	%	95%CI, lower bound	95%CI, upper bound
Aalborg University	31	0	0	0	11
Aalborg University Hospital	35	4	11.4	4.5	26
Aarhus University	186	4	2.2	0.8	5.4
Aarhus University Hospital	64	4	6.2	2.5	15.0
Akershus University Hospital	11	0	0	0	25.9
Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital	77	3	3.9	1.3	10.8
Copenhagen University Hospital	172	2	1.2	0.2	4.1
Danderyd Hospital	7	0	0	0	35.4
Gothenburg University	24	1	4.2	0.2	20.2
Haukeland university hospital	30	0	0	0	11.4
Helsinki University Hospital	46	2	4.3	0.8	14.5
Herlev and Gentofte Hospital	111	4	3.6	1.4	8.9
Holbæk Hospital	3	0	0	0	56.1
Hvidovre and Amager Hospital	51	1	2	0.1	10.3
Karolinska Institutet	166	0	0	0	2.3
Karolinska University Hospital	47	2	4.3	0.8	14.2
Kuopio University Hospital	17	1	5.9	0.3	27
Linkoeping University	39	3	7.7	2.7	20.3
Linkoeping University Hospital	18	1	5.6	0.3	25.8

Lund University	36	4	11.1	4.4	25.3
Mental health services in the Capital Region of Denmark	3	0	0	0	56.1
Næstved Hospital	5	0	0	0	43.4
Nordsjællands Hospital	10	1	10	0.5	40.4
Norwegian University of Science and Technology	76	0	0	0	4.8
Odense University Hospital	91	5	5.5	2.4	12.2
Oslo University Hospital	102	1	1	0.1	5.3
Oulu University Hospital	10	0	0	0	27.8
Sahlgrenska University Hospital	40	0	0	0	8.8
Skane University Hospital	23	1	4.3	0.2	21.0
St. Olav's University Hospital	24	0	0	0	13.8
Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen	13	0	0	0	22.8
Stockholm South General Hospital	3	0	0	0	56.1
Tampere University Hospital	22	0	0	0	14.9
The National University Hospital of Iceland	5	0	0	0	43.4
Turku University Hospital	48	0	0	0	7.4
UiT The Arctic University of Norway	14	0	0	0	21.5
Umeå University	41	0	0	0	8.6
University Hospital of North Norway	17	0	0	0	18.4

University Hospital of Umeå	2	1	50	2.6	97.4
University of Bergen	31	0	0	0	11
University of Copenhagen	97	0	0	0	3.8
University of Eastern Finland	12	0	0	0	24.2
University of Helsinki	21	0	0	0	15.5
University of Iceland	5	0	0	0	43.4
University of Oslo	23	0	0	0	14.3
University of Oulu	25	1	4	0.2	19.5
University of Southern Denmark	42	0	0	0	8.4
University of Tampere	9	1	11.1	0.6	43.5
University of Turku	20	0	0	0	16.1
Uppsala Academic Hospital	9	0	0	0	29.9
Uppsala University	51	1	2	0.1	10.3
Zealand University Hospital	28	0	0	0	12.1
Örebro University	17	0	0	0	18.4
Örebro University Hospital	1	0	0	0	94.9

Appendix Table 13. Sensitivity analysis: Only assigning trials to institutions that are the sole sponsor or first listed. Share of trials with any results reporting (summary results or results publications) at the end of follow-up, per institution

Institution	Trials	Any results reporting	%	95%CI, lower bound	95%CI, upper bound
Aalborg University	31	25	80.6	63.7	90.8
Aalborg University Hospital	35	30	85.7	70.6	93.7
Aarhus University	186	157	84.4	78.5	88.9
Aarhus University Hospital	64	50	78.1	66.6	86.5
Akershus University Hospital	11	8	72.7	43.4	90.3
Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital	77	65	84.4	74.7	90.9
Copenhagen University Hospital	172	138	80.2	73.6	85.5
Danderyd Hospital	7	6	85.7	48.7	99.3
Gothenburg University	24	21	87.5	69	95.7
Haukeland university hospital	30	15	50	33.2	66.8
Helsinki University Hospital	46	40	87	74,3	93,9
Herlev and Gentofte Hospital	111	83	74.8	66	81.9
Holbæk Hospital	3	3	100	43.9	100
Hvidovre and Amager Hospital	51	43	84.3	72	91.8
Karolinska Institutet	166	132	79.5	72.7	85
Karolinska University Hospital	47	36	76.6	62.8	86.4
Kuopio University Hospital	17	14	82.4	59	93.8
Linkoeping University	39	31	79.5	64.5	89.2
Linkoeping University Hospital	18	14	77.8	54.8	91

Lund University	36	23	63.9	47.6	77.5
Mental health services in the Capital Region of Denmark	3	3	100	43.9	100
Næstved Hospital	5	5	100	56.6	100
Nordsjællands Hospital	10	9	90	59.6	99.5
Norwegian University of Science and Technology	76	53	69.7	58.7	78.9
Odense University Hospital	91	81	89.0	80.9	93.9
Oslo University Hospital	102	80	78.4	69.5	85.3
Oulu University Hospital	10	6	60	31.3	83.2
Sahlgrenska University Hospital	40	30	75	59.8	85.8
Skane University Hospital	23	19	82.6	62.9	93
St. Olav's University Hospital	24	14	58.3	38.8	75.5
Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen	13	11	84.6	57.8	97.3
Stockholm South General Hospital	3	3	100	43.9	100
Tampere University Hospital	22	18	81.8	61.5	92.7
The National University Hospital of Iceland	5	4	80	37.6	99
Turku University Hospital	48	28	58.3	44.3	71.2
UiT The Arctic University of Norway	14	10	71.4	45.4	88.3
Umeå University	41	28	68.3	53	80.4
University Hospital of North Norway	17	11	64.7	41.3	82.7

University Hospital of Umeå	2	2	100	17.8	100
University of Bergen	31	22	71	53.4	83.9
University of Copenhagen	97	72	74.2	64.7	81.9
University of Eastern Finland	12	8	66.7	39.1	86.2
University of Helsinki	21	17	81	60	92.3
University of Iceland	5	4	80	37.6	99
University of Oslo	23	21	91.3	73.2	98.5
University of Oulu	25	18	72.0	52.4	85.7
University of Southern Denmark	42	38	90.5	77.9	96.2
University of Tampere	9	9	100	70.1	100
University of Turku	20	15	75	53.1	88.8
Uppsala Academic Hospital	9	7	77.8	45.3	96.1
Uppsala University	51	33	64.7	51	76.4
Zealand University Hospital	28	24	85.7	68.5	94.3
Örebro University	17	12	70.6	46.9	86.7
Örebro University Hospital	1	1	100	5.1	100

Appendix Figure 1. Overview of manual identification of results publications.



Note: Steps 1-2 were done for all trials. Step 3 was done only if steps 1-2 yielded no eligible results publication. A maximum of 8 results publications were downloaded for each trial. Searches were conducted by two independent reviewers. The earliest among the publications was selected for the purposes of this study. Discrepancies between reviewers regarding the earliest publication were solved by one reviewer with access to both independent reports.

Appendix Figure 2. Time to first reported results (summary results or results publication, total sample, N=2,112) per country.



Note: For 174 trials (8.2%), results were reported before the completion date.

Appendix Figure 3. Share of trials with prospective trial registration among those registered at ClinicalTrials.gov only (n=1,681).



Note. "Prospective" defined as before the start of the trial, according to the trial registration. Missing value for Örebro University Hospital since no trials were registered in ClinicalTrials.gov for that institution. Confidence intervals calculated with Wilson score (using modified Wilson score if the numerator, or the denominator minus numerator, was less than 3).

Appendix Figure 4. Time to trial registration after start date among trials registered at ClinicalTrials.gov only (n=1,681).



Note. Trials registered before or on their start date (n=879) were coded as registered at day 1 after trial start.