medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Publication status of 95 clinical trials of 3 COVID-19 vaccines developed by Chinese companies: An observational cohort study

Authors: Till Bruckner[1,2] and Yixuan Chen[3] (joint first authors), Carolina Cruz[4], Christie Ebube Dike[5], Belen Chavarria[6], Shiyu Chen[7], Ernest Dela Dzidzornu[8]

Abstract

Transparency shortcomings can undermine confidence in the safety and efficacy of vaccines. This study assesses the publication status of 95 clinical trials of 3 COVID-19 vaccines developed by Chinese companies that received a World Health Organization Emergency Use Listing (EUL) and have been marketed globally. We searched trial registries and the scientific literature to assess current trial status and the public availability of results.

After excluding 2 withdrawn trials, we found that at least 62/93 trials (67%) involving 307,933 patients had verifiably been completed or terminated. Only 44 of those 62 trials (71%) had published results in a peer-reviewed journal; none had tabular summary results available on a trial registry. The results of 18/62 (29%) verifiably completed or terminated trials remained unpublished. The trial status information stated in trial registries was often incorrect.

[1] UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromso, Norway; ORCID: 0000-0001-9346-3319; Corresponding author: tillbruckner@gmail.com
[2] TranspariMED, Bristol, UK: www.transparimed.org
[3] Independent researcher, Jinhua, China; ORCID: 0009-0005-1445-4040
[4] University of Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico; ORCID: 0009-0007-1203-5357
[5] Molecular and Genetics Unit, Institute of Child Health, College of Medicine, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria; ORCID: 0009-0004-5303-6610.
[6] National Autonomous University of Nicaragua at León, León, Nicaragua; ORCID: 0009-0008-1752-3058
[7] Independent researcher, London, UK
[8] Independent researcher, Accra, Ghana

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Our findings reveal a substantial gap between the disclosure practices of the 3 Chinese companies and global best practice benchmarks. Transparency and global public trust in Chinese biopharmaceutical products could be improved by aligning Chinese legal disclosure requirements with those prevalent in more mature markets, or by the voluntary adoption of stronger transparency practices by Chinese companies.

1. Introduction

After the emergence of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in late 2019, the rapid development of vaccines became a global health priority even as members of the public voiced concerns that regulators might rush through approvals without due regard to vaccine safety and efficacy (1). Transparency in clinical trials of vaccines is essential to foster public trust and boost vaccine acceptance (2, 3).

However, the existing literature suggests that many COVID-19 vaccine trials were not fully transparent. A 2021 global report by Transparency International found that clinical trial protocols had been made public for only 12% of 86 clinical trials of 20 COVID-19 vaccines (4). Several Western pharmaceutical companies were criticised for incomplete disclosure of trial designs (5). Vaccine approvals by the Indian drug regulator did not follow existing pathways and lacked transparency (6). Chinese companies in particular were widely criticised for only releasing partial trial results (7, 8).

As of August 2023, a total of 3 COVID-19 vaccines developed by 3 different Chinese companies had successfully completed the World Health Organisation's (WHO's) Emergency

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Use Listing (EUL) evaluation process, opening the door to international markets (9, 10). As of December 2022, more than 1,3 billion doses of these 3 vaccines had been exported to dozens of countries, significantly increasing the diversity and volume of global vaccine supply (11, 12).

Table 1: Key Chinese COVID-19 vaccine exports as of December 2022

Company	Vaccine	EUL date	Doses exported	Countries
Sinopharm	Covilo	07 May 2021	575.8 million	93
Sinovac	CoronaVac	01 June 2021	774.2 million	56
CanSino	Convidecia	19 May 2022	32.7 million	10

Source: China COVID-19 Vaccine Tracker (https://bridgebeijing.com/our-publications/our-publications-1/china-covid-19-vaccines-tracker/#Sinovac_8211_CoronaVac_COVID-19_Vaccine)

This paper examines a key element of trial transparency by assessing the publication status of all clinical trials involving the 3 COVID-19 vaccines developed by Chinese companies that received an EUL from the WHO. While Chinese law requires vaccine trial results to be shared with the national medicines regulator, it does not require them to be made public (13).

However, irrespective of national laws, publication of trial results is an ethical obligation under the Declaration of Helsinki (14). According to global best practices set out in the WHO's Joint statement on public disclosure of results from clinical trials, the results of all clinical trials should be published on a public trial registry within 12 months of trial

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

completion, and in a peer-reviewed journal within 24 months of trial completion (15). Sharing vaccine trial results with the public can support better understanding of vaccine effectiveness and potential adverse effects (16-18). Our hypothesis was that not all trial results had been made public.

2. Methodology

This study was preregistered on OSF (https://osf.io/4f9k7). No UK Health Research Authority NHS REC ethics approval was required as the study exclusively used publicly available study-level data. Outcomes are reported in line with the STROBE (STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology) guideline for cohort studies (19). Line-by-line data for trials are included within the manuscript as Table 6. This study did not receive external funding. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

2.1 Cohort selection

We extracted the registry numbers of clinical trials involving the 3 COVID-19 vaccines from the McGill University's COVID-19 Vaccine Tracker website (https://covid19.trackvaccines.org/), which had last been updated on 02 December 2022 (11). We included all 95 clinical trials listed for the 3 vaccines in our study cohort (Table 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Clinical trials involving 3 key Chinese vaccines

Company	Vaccine	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Trials total
Sinopharm	Covilo	3	17	19	39
Sinovac	CoronaVac	8	17	17	42
CanSino	Convidecia	4	6	4	14
Total		**15**	**40**	**40**	**95**

Reference: COVID-19 Vaccine Tracker (https://covid19.trackvaccines.org/)

2.2 Data collection and search strategy

First, we entered the trial registry ID numbers listed in the Covid-19 Vaccine Tracker into the ICTRP search function (https://trialsearch.who.int/Default.aspx) to identify potential additional registry entries for each of the 95 trials.

Second, we manually extracted the following data from registry entries for each trial: trial status, completion date, and number of trial participants (actual if available, else planned). If a trial was registered on multiple registries, we would use registry data from registries in the following order of priority: ClinicalTrials.gov, ChiCTR, other registries.

Third, two researchers independently searched for the outcomes of each trial using a detailed search strategy set out in the study protocol (https://osf.io/4f9k7). Briefly, we (a) scanned the "results" section of all relevant trial registries for tabular summary results or hyperlinked publications, (b) searched PubMed and Google Scholar for the clinical trial ID

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

number(s), (c) searched PubMed and Google Scholar for the trial title and principal investigator. The three steps above were completed between 23 August 2023 and 5 September 2023.

We then reviewed all journal publications to verify that they described the outcome of the trial by matching the 4 PICO criteria (patient inclusion criteria, intervention, comparison and outcomes). As per protocol, we only counted tabular summary results on trial registries and full-length publications of final trial results in peer-reviewed journals as 'reported'. We classified trial outcomes only published as preprints, conference abstracts, press releases or other grey literature as 'unreported'. For each trial, we compared and reviewed the search results from 2 team members and resolved any remaining inconsistencies and ambiguities. We then extracted the date of each publication.

2.3 Outcome measures

The prespecified primary outcome measure was the number and percent of completed trials whose results remained unreported. Secondary outcome measures were the number and percentage of patients enrolled (planned or actual enrolment, depending on registry data availability for each trial) in completed trials whose results remained unreported, and the number and percentage of trials that met both WHO best practices in clinical trial reporting, i.e. results posted onto a public registry within 12 months of trial completion and results published in a peer-reviewed journal within 24 months of trial completion.

For the purpose of calculating the metrics above, we considered trials to have been completed if their status was marked as completed or terminated on a trial registry, and/or

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

if the final outcomes had been made public on a trial registry or in a peer-reviewed journal (even if the registry still listed the trial as ongoing).

3. Results

According to registry data, 36/95 trials (38%) had been completed or terminated early as of 23 August 2023. 51/95 trials (54%) were listed as not yet completed. The status of 6/95 trials (6%) was marked as unknown. 2/95 trials (2%) had been withdrawn before recruiting any participants; we excluded these 2 withdrawn trials from further analysis, leaving 93 trials.

Table 3: Trial status as per registry data; n=95

Trial status	Number of trials
Completed	33
Terminated	3
Recruiting	21
Not yet recruiting	10
Active not recruiting	18
Suspended	2
Unknown	6
Withdrawn	2
Total	**95**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Chart 1: Trial status as per registry data; n=95



The trial status information listed in trial registries was often incorrect. We located published outcomes for 44/93 trials that had not been withdrawn (47%), but less than half of those trials were listed as completed or terminated in registries.

A trial is only listed as completed or terminated on a registry if the record holder has actively performed the relevant update after the initial registration, so we assume that those status data are correct. In addition, the trials for which we located published final outcomes are evidently no longer ongoing. Therefore, combining registry status data and located publications indicates that at least 62/93 trials (67%) had verifiably been completed or terminated at the time of data extraction. In total, 307,933 patients participated in those 62 trials.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Chart 2: Trial status on registries and results publication status; n=93



Only 44 of those 62 trials (71%) had published results in a peer-reviewed journal, in all cases within less than 24 months of trial completion or termination. The results of 18/62 (29%) verifiably completed or terminated trials remained unpublished. One trial (NCT05049226) only had results available as a preprint; as per protocol, we classified this trial as unreported.

Table 4: Verifiably completed/terminated trials by phase and publication status; n=62

Trial phase	Reported	Unreported	Trials total
Phase 1	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	14
Phase 2	19 (79%)	5 (21%)	24
Phase 3	14 (58%)	10 (42%)	24
Total	**44 (71%)**	**18 (29%)**	**62**

The disclosure performance of the 3 companies varies. CanSino performed best with publishing the outcomes of 9/11 verifiably completed or terminated trials (82%), followed by Sinovac (22/28 trials; 79%) and Sinopharm (13/23 trials; 57%).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 5: Verifiably completed/terminated trials by company and publication status; n=62

Company	Vaccine	Reported	Unreported	Trials total
Sinopharm	Covilo	13 (57%)	10 (43%)	23
Sinovac	CoronaVac	22 (79%)	6 (21%)	28
CanSino	Convidecia	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	11
Total		**44 (71%)**	**18 (29%)**	**62**

According to trial enrolment data on registries, trial outcome data for 108,478 out of 307,933 patients (35%) who participated in the 62 verifiably completed or terminated trials remains unpublished. As none of the 62 trials had tabular summary results available on a trial registry, all trials fell short of WHO best practices in clinical trial reporting.

4. Discussion

Our research shows that the 3 most prominent Chinese companies producing COVID-19 vaccines currently fall significantly short of global best practices in clinical trial transparency. The results of 18 verifiably completed or terminated trials of key Chinese COVID-19 vaccines involving 108,478 patients remained unpublished. At first glance, the non-publication rate of 29% is comparable to or lower than non-publication rates documented for large cohorts of clinical trials in other countries (20-22). However, the actual number and percentage of unreported trials in our cohort are likely to be higher due to the Chinese companies' failure to consistently update the status of their trials on registries. In addition, large pharmaceutical companies in the European Union and the United States typically have strong compliance with laws requiring them to publish the tabular summary results of many

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Phase 2 and Phase 3 trials, and therefore probably significantly outperform their Chinese competitors on this key transparency metric (23, 24).

Our research has important limitations. First, we almost certainly undercounted trials that had been completed or terminated but not published results due to the companies' failure to consistently update the status of their trials on registries. Second, we did not assess the completeness and accuracy of published results. Third, we did not assess whether the WHO or various national medicines regulators were able to access trial outcome data that are not publicly available.

The COVID-19 pandemic marked the emergence of several Chinese companies as global players in vaccine research, development, production and export. Chinese companies made a significant contribution to improving access to COVID-19 vaccines in the Global South. However, trial registry data management and trial outcome disclosure practices by three of the most prominent Chinese vaccine exporters fell significantly short of European and American competitors' standards and WHO global best practices.

The future global expansion of Chinese biopharmaceutical companies might benefit from a stronger alignment of Chinese national disclosure laws with corresponding European and U.S. laws that mandate disclosure of many trial results (25-27). Alternatively, Chinese companies could build confidence in international markets by improving their disclosure practices on a voluntary basis. We hope that other researchers will build on our work by assessing publication bias and research waste in larger cohorts of Chinese commercial and non-commercial trials, and by systematically comparing the performance of major Chinese

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

sponsors with those in the European Union, India, the United States, and other global hubs of biomedical innovation.

Table 6: List of all 95 vaccine trials included in this study

Vaccine	Trial registry number(s)	Phase	Number of trial participants (actual or planned)	Marked as completed or terminated in registry	Results reported
Covilo	IRCT20171122037571N3	1	500	Yes	No
Covilo	NCT05109559	1	690	No	Yes
Covilo	ChiCTR2000032459	1	640	No	Yes
Covilo	NCT05308602	2	480	No	No
Covilo	NCT05463419	2	9300	No	No
Covilo	NCT05323435	2	300	Yes	No
Covilo	IRCT20171122037571N3	2	500	Yes	No
Covilo	IRCT20140818018842N24	2	90	Yes	Yes
Covilo	NCT05465902	2	600	No	No
Covilo	NCT05463354	2	450	No	No
Covilo	NCT04988048	2	1760	No	Yes
Covilo	NCT04962906	2	150	Yes	Yes
Covilo	NCT04983537	2	120	No	Yes
Covilo	NCT05409300	2	400	No	No
Covilo	NCT05109559	2	690	No	Yes
Covilo	NCT05162482	2	1680	No	No
Covilo	NCT04998240	2	360	No	No
Covilo	TCTR20210920005	2	500	No	Yes
Covilo	NCT05172193	2	600	No	No
Covilo	ChiCTR2000032459	2	640	No	No
Covilo	NCT05374954	3	4200	No	No
Covilo	NCT05323461	3	1800	No	Yes
Covilo	PACTR202204735722575	3	10000	No	No
Covilo	NCT05204589	3	10420	No	Yes
Covilo	NCT05463419; PHRR230223-005230	3	9300	No	No
Covilo	NCT05580159	3	2000	No	No
Covilo	IRCT20210206050259N3	3	41128	Yes	Yes
Covilo	NCT05323435	3	300	Yes	No
Covilo	IRCT20201214049709N3	3	41128	Yes	No
Covilo	IRCT20140818018842N24	3	90	Yes	Yes
Covilo	NCT05293665	3	944	No	No
Covilo	NCT05249816	3	1000	Yes	No

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Covilo	ChiCTR2000034780	3	45000	Yes	Yes
Covilo	NCT04510207	3	44101	Yes	No
Covilo	NCT04612972	3	12000	Yes	No
Covilo	NCT04917523	3	1800	Yes	No
Covilo	NCT04984408	3	8825	No	No
Covilo	NCT05163652	3	432	No	No
Covilo	NCT04560881; BIBP2020003AR	3	3000	Yes	No
CoronaVac	NCT05228613	1	175	Yes	No
CoronaVac	NCT05583357	1	40	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT05226429	1	495	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT05109559	1	690	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT05043259	1	420	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04352608	1	744	Yes	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04383574	1	422	Yes	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04551547	1	552	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT05593042	2	826	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT05226429	2	495	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT05230940	2	644	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT04979949	2	222	Yes	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT05087368	2	520	No	Yes
CoronaVac	TCTR20210720005	2	180	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT05109559	2	690	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT05043259	2	420	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04992182	2	534	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT05049226	2	1250	Yes	No (preprint)
CoronaVac	PHRR210210-003308	2	352	Yes	No
CoronaVac	NCT05150496	2	640	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT05254236	2	150	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT04352608	2	744	Yes	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04383574	2	422	Yes	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04551547	2	552	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04884685	2	500	Yes	No
CoronaVac	NCT05433272	3	1400	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT05428592	3	1100	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT05308576	3	10000	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT05204589	3	10420	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04942405	3	1290	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT05077176	3	4340	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT05225285	3	1120	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT04992260	3	14000	No	Yes
CoronaVac	PHRR210210-003308	3	352	Yes	No
CoronaVac	NCT05137418	3	1000	No	No

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

CoronaVac	NCT05156632	3	0	**Withdrawn**	No
CoronaVac	NCT04800133	3	1018	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04456595	3	12688	No	No
CoronaVac	NCT04508075; INA-WXFM0YX	3	1620	Yes	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04582344	3	10214	No	Yes
CoronaVac	NCT04617483	3	1040	Yes	No
CoronaVac	NCT04651790	3	2300	Yes	Yes
Convidecia	NCT05043259	1	420	No	Yes
Convidecia	NCT04313127; ChiCTR2000030906	1	108	Yes	Yes
Convidecia	NCT04568811	1	89	Yes	No
Convidecia	NCT04840992	1	840	Yes	Yes
Convidecia	NCT05043259	2	420	No	Yes
Convidecia	NCT05162482	2	1680	No	No
Convidecia	NCT04341389; ChiCTR2000031781	2	508	Yes	Yes
Convidecia	NCT04566770	2	480	Yes	Yes
Convidecia	NCT04840992	2	840	Yes	Yes
Convidecia	NCT05005156	2	876	No	No
Convidecia	NCT05442684	3	0	**Withdrawn**	No
Convidecia	NCT05169008	3	91	Yes	No
Convidecia	NCT04526990	3	44247	Yes	Yes
Convidecia	NCT04540419	3	500	No	Yes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Hamel L, Kearney, A., Kirzinger, A., Lopes , L., Muñana, C., Brodie, M. KFF Health Tracking Poll - September 2020: Top Issues in 2020 Election, The Role of Misinformation, and Views on A Potential Coronavirus Vaccine. https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/report/kff-health-tracking-poll-september-2020/; 2020. [cited 26 Sept 2023]
2. Larson HJ, Cooper LZ, Eskola J, Katz SL, Ratzan S. Addressing the vaccine confidence gap. The Lancet. 2011;378(9790):526-35.
3. Mahase E. Covid-19: Vaccine trials need more transparency to enable scrutiny and earn public trust, say experts. bmj. 2020;371.
4. Rhodes N WT, Rusu V. For Whose Benefit? Transparency in the development and procurement of COVID-19 vaccines. http://ti-health.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/For-Whose-Benefit-Transparency-International.pdf; 2021. [cited 26 Sept 2023]
5. Thomas K. Vaccine Makers Keep Safety Details Quiet, Alarming Scientists. The New York Times. 2020. Available from: https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/13/science/coronavirus-vaccine-trials.html. [cited 26 Sept 2023]
6. Thakur DS, Thikkavarapu PR. The Truth Pill: The Myth of Drug Regulation in India: Simon and Schuster; 2022.
7. Gan NaA, T. Chinese Covid-19 vaccine far less effective than initially claimed in Brazil, sparking concerns. CNN. 2021. Available from: https://edition.cnn.com/2021/01/13/asia/sinovac-covid-vaccine-efficacy-intl-hnk/index.html. [cited 26 Sept 2023]
8. Mallapaty S. China's COVID vaccines are going global—but questions remain. Nature. 2021;593(7858):178-9.
9. WHO. Status of COVID-19 Vaccines within WHO EUL/PQ evaluation process. https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/sites/default/files/documents/Status_COVID_VAX_08AUgust2023.pdf2023. [cited 26 Sept 2023]
10. WHO. COVID-19 Vaccines with WHO Emergency Use Listing. https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/vaccines/vaccinescovid-19-vaccine-eul-issued2023. [cited 26 Sept 2023]
11. COVID19 Vaccine Tracker [Internet]. 2022. Available from: https://covid19.trackvaccines.org. [cited 27 Sept 2023]
12. China COVID-19 Vaccine Tracker [Internet]. 2022. Available from: https://bridgebeijing.com/our-publications/our-publications-1/china-covid-19-vaccines-tracker/#Sinovac_8211_CoronaVac_COVID-19_Vaccine. [cited 27 Sept 2023]
13. Chen Y, Walters J, Bruckner T. Clinical Trial Registration and Reporting in China and the United States: Legal and Regulatory Frameworks, Compliance and Enforcement. Preprints: Preprints; 2023. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.20944/preprints202310.1108.v1. [cited 20 Oct 2023]
14. WMA. In: Association WM, editor. WMA Declaration of Helsinki – ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/2013. [cited 13 Aug 2023]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.17.24304386; this version posted March 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

15. WHO. Joint statement on public disclosure of results from clinical trials. In: Organization WH, editor. https://www.who.int/news/item/18-05-2017-joint-statement-on-registration2017. [cited 13 Aug 2023]
16. Larson HJ, Jarrett C, Eckersberger E, Smith DM, Paterson P. Understanding vaccine hesitancy around vaccines and vaccination from a global perspective: a systematic review of published literature, 2007–2012. Vaccine. 2014;32(19):2150-9.
17. Cordero Jr DA. Rebuilding public trust: a clarified response to COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy predicament. Journal of Public Health. 2021;43(2):e303-e4.
18. 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;12(4):e1001819.
19. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. Bmj. 2007;335(7624):806-8.
20. Franzen DL, Carlisle BG, Salholz-Hillel M, Riedel N, Strech D. Institutional dashboards on clinical trial transparency for University Medical Centers: A case study. PLOS Medicine. 2023;20(3):e1004175.
21. 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;329(16):1404-6.
22. Nilsonne G, Wieschowski S, DeVito NJ, Salholz-Hillel M, Bruckner T, Klas K, et al. Results reporting for clinical trials led by medical universities and university hospitals in the Nordic countries was often missing or delayed. medRxiv2024. p. 2024.02.04.24301363. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/medrxiv/early/2024/02/05/2024.02.04.24301363.full.pdf. [cited 12 March 2024]
23. DeVito NJ, Bacon S, Goldacre B. Compliance with legal requirement to report clinical trial results on ClinicalTrials.gov: a cohort study. The Lancet. 2020;395(10221):361-9.
24. 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;362:k3218.
25. NLM. FDAAA 801 and the Final Rule. . https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/manage-recs/fdaaa2017. Available from: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/manage-recs/fdaaa. [cited 13 Jan 2023]
26. Bruckner T. Clinical trial regulation in Europe - Legal reporting requirements and regulatory strategies in seven key countries. Netherlands: Health Action International; 2022 2022-10-03. Available from: https://policycommons.net/artifacts/3837257/clinical-trial-regulation-in-europe/. [cited 12 March 2024]
27. Petrini C. Regulation (EU) No 536/2014 on clinical trials on medicinal products for human use: an overview. Ann Ist Super Sanita. 2014;50(4):317-21.