Time-to-retraction and likelihood of evidence contamination (VITALITY Extension I): a retrospective cohort analysis

Yuan Tian[1], Zhen Peng[2], Suhail A. Doi[3], Luis Furuya-Kanamori[4], Hong Cao[5], Lifeng Lin[6], Haitao Chu[7], Yoon Loke[8], Ben W Mol[9,10], Su Golder[11], Sunita Vohra[12], Chang Xu[1,13] ✉

1. Proof of Concept Center, Eastern Hepatobiliary Surgery Hospital, Third Affiliated Hospital, Second Military Medical University, Naval Medical University, Shanghai, China
2. Key Laboratory of Population Health Across Life Cycle, Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, Anhui Medical University, Anhui, China & School of Public Health, Anhui Medical University, Anhui, China
3. Department of Population Medicine, College of Medicine, QU Health, Qatar University, Doha, Qatar
4. UQ Centre for Clinical Research, The University of Queensland, Herston, Australia
5. School of Pharmacy, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China
6. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA
7. Statistical Research and Data Science Center, Global Biometrics and Data Management, Pfizer Inc, New York, NY; Division of Biostatistics and Health Data Science, University of Minnesota School of Public Health, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA
8. Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK
9. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Monash University, Clayton, Australia.
10. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Amsterdam University Medical Centre, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
11. Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK
12. Department of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry; Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada
13. Department of Pharmacy, Ren Ji Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China & College of Clinical Pharmacy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China

Abstract

Background: The number of problematic randomized clinical trials (RCTs) has risen sharply in recent decades, posing serious challenges to the integrity of the healthcare evidence ecosystem.

Objective: To investigate whether retraction of problematic RCTs could reduce evidence contamination.

Design: Retrospective cohort study

Setting: A secondary analysis of the VITALITY Study database.

Participants: 1,330 retracted RCTs with 847 systematic reviews.

Measurements: The difference in the median number (and its interquartile, IQR) of contamination before and after retraction. The association between time-to-retraction and likelihood of evidence contamination.

Results: Among these retracted RCTs, 426 led to evidence contamination, resulting in 1,106 contamination events (855 before retraction vs. 251 after retraction). The time interval between RCT publication and first contamination ranged from 0.2 to 30.9 years, with a median of 3.3 years (95% CI: 3.0 to 3.9). The median number of contaminated systematic reviews was lower after retraction than before retraction (1, IQR: 1 to 2 vs. 0, IQR: 0 to 1, $P < 0.01$). Compared with trials retracted more than 7.5 years after publication, those retracted among 1.0 to 1.8 years (OR = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.60 to 0.80) and retracted within 1.0 year (OR = 0.69, 95% CI: 0.60 to 0.80) were associated with lower likelihood of evidence contamination.

Limitations: Only assessed contaminated systematic reviews with quantitative synthesis and limited to retracted RCTs.

Conclusions: Retracting problematic RCTs can significantly reduce evidence contamination, and a faster retraction was associated with less contamination. To safeguard the integrity of the evidence ecosystem, academic journals should act promptly in retracting problematic studies to minimize their downstream impact.

Primary Funding Sources: The National Natural Science Foundation of China (72204003, 72574229)

Introduction

In clinical research, randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are considered to be the most rigorous study design for establishing causal relationships between health interventions and outcomes [1, 2]. The strict randomization process utilized in RCTs is intended to ensure that the comparator groups are “exchangeable”, meaning that each group possesses the same baseline risk for specific conditions [3]. This methodological design allows researchers to minimize potential biases, such as confounding [4]. Due to this distinctive feature, RCTs have gained widespread acceptance for pre-marketing evaluation of new investigational drugs, medical devices, and health-related interventions [5-7].

Despite their methodological strengths, RCTs are not immune to bias. Sub-optimal design, conduct, and analysis can introduce biases such as selection bias and measurement bias, resulting in deviations of estimated effects from the true values [8, 9]. Over the past fifty years, researchers in clinical epidemiology have made significant efforts to address these biases [9-11]. Various statistical and epidemiological methods are available to measure and deal with the issue of bias [12-15]. However, all these efforts rely on one fundamental assumption: that RCTs are conducted with integrity, and without fabrication or falsification by competent researchers [16, 17].

In recent decades, an increasing number of retracted RCTs have been documented due to the questionable nature of their data and practices, raising significant concerns and contributing to a crisis of trust within the scientific community [18-20]. Research integrity has emerged as a critical threat in the field of clinical epidemiology [20, 21]. The negative consequences of retracted RCTs extend beyond the evidence they present; their substantial dissemination rates significantly amplify their influence, for example, causes evidence contamination on evidence ecosystem [22, 23].

How to mitigate the impact of potentially problematic studies remains a pressing research question for clinical epidemiology [24-26]. Researches have documented that the number of citations diminished rapidly after the retraction of problematic studies [27-29]. Moreover, retracted studies received an annual average of 2.5 citations, lower than that of 3.6 citations

for non-retracted studies [30]. These findings demonstrated a fact that timely retraction of problematic studies would mitigate their citation. While evidence contamination differs conceptually from citation, and whether retraction could mitigate their impact on healthcare evidence ecosystem remains unclear.

To answer this question, we conducted a retrospective study to bridge this gap, based on the VITALITY Study cohort to compare the number of evidence contamination in systematic reviews for problematic trials before and after their retraction.

Methods

Study Design

This study employed a retrospective cohort design, and was reported according to STROBE checklist for cohort studies [31]. We utilized the VITALITY Study I database, which encompassed a cohort of retracted trials obtained from Retraction Watch database, and a subsequent cohort of systematic reviews that quantitatively synthesized these retracted trials identified via forward citation searching [23]. Since evidence from these retracted trials were synthesized into the systematic reviews, the event of evidence contamination occurred, and these systematic reviews were therefore deemed contaminated. The cohort of retracted trials and the cohort of contaminated systematic reviews were then used to investigate the association between retraction of problematic RCTs and evidence contamination.

Database

The VITALITY Study I database, established on 21 November 2024, comprises 1,330 retracted trials and 847 systematic reviews that quantitatively synthesized retracted trials. In brief, retracted RCTs from the Retraction Watch database (http://retractiondatabase.org/) up to November 5, 2024 were screened and collected, and then a forward citation searching of each retracted trial via Google Scholar and Scopus was used to identify systematic reviews that quantitatively synthesized these trials. We excluded records that provided limited information (e.g., conference abstracts), replicated or reanalyzed other meta-analyses (e.g., umbrella reviews), were published in non-English languages, or had been retracted. Details of the

search strategy and screening methodology have been reported elsewhere [23].

Data collection

For the retracted trials, the following data were directly extracted from the Retraction Watch database: Digital Object Identifier (DOI), title, journal of publication, journal quartiles (e.g., Q1), date of publication, date of retraction, retraction initiator (e.g., author), author names of the retraction. We also collected information from the main texts of retracted trials, including registration of trial (e.g., yes, no), data sharing statement (e.g., yes, no), center (e.g., single) and funding sources (e.g., industry supported).

For systematic reviews contaminated by these trials, the following data were collected: DOI, title, date of publication, date of submission, date of the literature search, number of retracted trials synthesized, metadata and number of trials within each meta-analysis. Date of publication, submission and literature search were collected from the review reports or journal websites by one author (Y.T) and cross-verified by another (Z.P). All other data were obtained directly from VITALITY Study dataset.

Exposure and Outcomes

The primary outcome was the likelihood of evidence contamination, with the exposure of interest defined as the different time intervals from trial publication to retraction (i.e., time-to-retraction). The secondary outcome was the difference in the median number of contaminated systematic reviews before and after retraction across the trials. We also estimated the time-to-first contamination, which was defined as the time interval from the publication of the problematic trial to the publication of the first systematic review that was contaminated by the trial. Notably, a single systematic review may be contaminated by multiple trials, the number of counts of the contaminated systematic reviews were thus performed separately for each trial. For example, if both Trial A and Trial B contaminated the same systematic review, this would be counted as one contamination for Tral A and one for Trial B.

Statistical analysis

The baseline characteristics of the eligible trials were summarized using proportions and

median values with inter-quartile ranges (IQR), according to the nature of the data. The median time-to-first contamination with its IQR was estimated via Kaplan-Meier curve analysis [32]. The differences in the median number of contamination events before versus after retraction were assessed using the Mann-Whitney U test [33].

The judgement of whether the contamination happens before or after the retraction was based on two time points, namely, the retraction date of problematic trials (T0) as well as the start date of systematic reviews (T1). We used the start date (T1) instead of the publication date (T2) of systematic reviews to account for the publication delay (Tm), during which new retractions unknown to the authors may occur. We estimated Tm as the median time from submission to publication and estimated T1 as $T2 - Tm$. Contamination before the retraction is therefore defined as T1 < T0, otherwise, contamination after the retraction. When the submission time was unavailable, the literature search date was used as a proxy.

A generalized linear model was employed to examine the association between time-to-retraction and the likelihood of evidence contamination, with cluster-robust standard errors to accounts for potential clustering effect for retractions by the same authors. We stratified time-to-retraction into four categories in terms of its 25%, 50% and 75% quartiles. To identify potential confounders, a directed acyclic graph (DAG) was employed to explore causal paths between time-to-retraction (exposure) and evidence contamination (outcome) (Supplementary **Figure S1**). According to DAG plot, the following covariables were identified as important confounders and were adjusted: journal ranking (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, and no information), retraction initiators (editor initiated vs. author initiated), source of funding (industry supported, non-profit, no funding, and not reported), and registration status (Yes vs. No).

Sensitivity analyses were conducted by using the 25th and 75th percentiles of the time from submission to publication as alternative publication delays (Tm). Data analysis was undertaken using Stata/SE 18.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA), with an alpha of 0.05 as the statistical significance level.

Results

Table 1 presents the baseline characteristics of the 1,330 retracted trials. Most of the trials were retracted either after 2022 (43.7%, n = 581) or between 2011 and 2022 (51.9%, n = 691). The majority of retractions were initiated by the journals (85.0%, n = 1,131), while only 9.2% (n = 123) were initiated by trial authors. Amongst the 1,330 retracted trials, 426 (32.0%) led to evidence contamination, resulting in 1,106 contamination events (855 before retraction vs. 251 after retraction), and embodied in a total of 847 systematic reviews. Among the 847 contaminated systematic reviews, the majority of reviews (89.0%, n = 754) were contaminated by a single retracted trial, while 11.0% (n = 93) were contaminated by at least two retracted trials.

For the 847 systematic reviews, the median time from submission to publication for was 0.48 year (IQR: 0.28 to 0.81), which was used to address the publication delays. The time-to-first contamination ranged from 0.2 to 30.9 years, with a median of 3.3 years (95% CI: 3.0 to 3.9). The 10th percentile of time-to-first contamination was 1.0 year (95% CI: 0.8 to 1.2), 25th percentile was 1.7 years (95% CI: 1.5 to 1.9), and 75th percentile was 6.6 years (95% CI: 6.1 to 7.4), see Figure 1.

Events of contamination before and after retraction

The median number of contaminated systematic reviews was 1 (IQR: 1 to 2) before retraction as compared to 0 (IQR: 0 to 1) after retraction ($P < 0.01$). Sensitivity analyses were performed by using the 25th and 75th percentiles of the time from submission to publication as alternative publication delays (Tm). Under the 25th percentile, median number of contaminated systematic reviews was 1 (IQR: 1 to 2) before retraction compared to 0 (IQR: 0 to 1) after retraction ($P < 0.01$). Under the 75th percentile, the median number of contaminated systematic reviews before retraction was 2 (IQR: 1 to 3) before retraction compared to 0 (IQR: 0 to 1) after retraction ($P < 0.01$).

Association between time-to-retraction and evidence contamination

For the 1,330 retracted trials, 426 retracted trials led to evidence contamination. Compared

with trials retracted more than 7.5 years after publication, those retracted among 1 to 1.8 years (OR = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.60 to 0.80, $p < 0.01$) and retracted within 1.0 year (OR = 0.69, 95% CI: 0.60 to 0.80) were associated with significant lower likelihood of evidence contamination. However, those retracted between 1.8 to 7.5 years showed comparable likelihood of evidence contamination (OR = 0.87, 95%CI: 0.75 to 1.00, $p = 0.05$).

Post-hoc analyses

We noticed that among the 426 retracted trials, 95 (22.3%) resulted in contamination only after their retraction. Therefore, post-hoc analyses were conducted to explore the potential mechanisms.

These 95 trials contaminated 124 systematic reviews (14.6%) involving 460 meta-analyses. The time-to-first contamination ranged from 0.5 to 23.9 years, with a median of 1.8 years (IQR: 0.9 to 4.0) (see Supplementary **Figure S2**). The median publication-to-retraction time for these trials was 1.1 years (IQR: 0.6 to 2.8), dramatically shorter than that median of the whole sample (5.9 years, IQR: 1.9 to 13.1). Among the 441 meta-analyses that could be replicated, exclusion of retracted trials resulted in a change in the significance of *P* value in 15.0% (95%CI: 11.8% to 18.6%; n = 66), which is comparable to the whole sample (16.0%, 95%CI: 14.2% to 17.9%).

Discussion

This study investigated the association between trial retraction and the extent of evidence contamination in systematic reviews. We found that 90% of the evidence contamination occurred after 0.9 year after the publication of retracted trials, 75% occurred after 1.7 years, and 50% occurred after 3.3 years of the publication; Whilst problematic trials continued to cause evidence contamination after their retraction, we recognize that retraction of such problematic trials can significantly reduce evidence contamination, and that a faster retraction was associated with less contamination. These findings yield two key implications for the scientific community: 1) while retracting problematic trials is a necessary step to mitigate

their harms, it is not sufficient as a standalone solution; 2) Comprehensive strategies are needed to minimize their negative impacts, for example, instituting widespread warnings of their risks, developing or updating guidelines for conducting and reporting a systematic review to identify and remove retracted trials.

Although the retraction of problematic trials is essential for maintaining the trustworthy of the evidence ecosystem, prior research indicates that the median time from the initiation of an investigation by journals to issue an outcome (e.g., retraction) can extend to 38 months [23, 34]. Such delays may reflect the complexity of misconduct investigations, inconsistencies in journal retraction policies, and limitations of post-publication assessment mechanisms [29]. However, empirical evidence on how delays in retraction affect evidence contamination remains lacking. In this study, we addressed this knowledge gap and found that retracting problematic trials within one year of publication could reduce contamination by 90%. This finding underscores the need for journals to accelerate early detection and retraction processes to mitigate the dissemination of contaminated evidence.

It is notable that we observed about 22% problematic trials caused evidence contamination only after their retraction. Based on our post hoc analysis, these trials retracted more rapidly than the whole sample (1.1 years vs. 5.9 years), and 0.5 years earlier before the first contamination. This means authors of the systematic reviews that contaminated by these trials probably have already known the retraction status while continue to included them. We further investigated whether potential conflict of interests exist among related meta-analyses but failed to observed a signal—the impact of these trials of contaminated meta-analyses was similar to the whole sample (15.0% vs. 16.0% in terms of the change on the significance). Therefore, a more likely possibility would be owing to the missing labeling of the retraction status of such trials. Previous research has documented that less than half of the retracted studies were electronically marked as retraction [35]. In this case, review authors still remained unaware of the status and therefore included them into the evidence synthesis.

To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the impact of time-to-retraction on evidence contamination for systematic reviews. We used almost all retracted trials that were retrieved from Retraction Watch (up to November 2024) for the analysis as an effort to

maximize the representativeness. In addition, we tracked the citations of these retracted trials via both the Google Scholar and Scopus databases to capture systematic reviews that contaminated by these retracted trials, which ensures our data covered the majority of these reviews. The process of citation screening and data extraction were also rigorously conducted, with two rounds of training before the formal start. In the main analysis, we employed a before-and-after design that allowed us to control for all potential confounding factors, thereby minimizing potential biases. All these efforts reinforce the reliability of the findings of the current study.

However, there are several limitations that should be highlighted. First, our current study did not account for the contamination of retracted trials on systematic reviews without meta-analysis, systematic reviews of multiple-arm comparisons, umbrella reviews, scoping reviews, meta-analyses of proportions, etc., which is expected to underestimate the risk of evidence contamination. At the meanwhile, this study did not take retracted non-randomized studies of intervention or observational studies into consideration, and thus the findings may not reflect contamination arising from these types of study. Both would largely underestimate the extend of evidence contamination and therefore may bias our results. Further studies may consider to address such issues based on more comprehensive dataset.

In conclusion, retracting a problematic trial can reduce the evidence contamination, and a faster retraction was associated with less contamination from problematic trials in systematic reviews. Academic journals should act promptly for problematic studies to prevent these studies from having a negative impact on the evidence ecosystem. Additional comprehensive strategies beyond timely retraction are also needed to minimize their downstream effects.

Acknowledgment

None.

Financial Support

This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (72204003, 72574229), the institutional funding by Shanghai Eastern Hepatobiliary Surgery Hospital of Navy Medical University (‘TengFei Project’, TF2024YZRH03), and Hefei Comprehensive National Science Center (0301035204), and ShangHai Shenkang Hospital Development Center (SHDC12025626). Suhail Doi was supported by Program Grant #NPRP-BSRA01-0406-210030 from the Qatar National Research Fund.

Disclosure

Disclosure forms are available with the article online

Reproducible Research Statement:

Study protocol: Not available. Statistical code and data set: the original data can be found at https://osf.io/gb5ed.

Corresponding author:
Chang Xu, Department of Pharmacy, Ren Ji Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China & College of Clinical Pharmacy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China; xuchang2016@runbox.com.

Authors’ contributions

Conception and design: CX; Manuscript drafting: CX, TY, ZP; Data collection: YT, ZP; Data analysis and result interpretation: TY, ZP, CX; Statistical guidance: LL, CH, CX; Methodology guidance: SD, BM, LFK, CX; Manuscript editing: CX, ZHF, YT, JHF, ZP, YL, SD, LFK, LL, CH, BM, SG, SV. All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

References

1. Concato J, Shah N, Horwitz RI. Randomized, controlled trials, observational studies, and the hierarchy of research designs. N Engl J Med. 2000;342(25):1887-92.
2. Sibbald B, Roland M. Understanding controlled trials. Why are randomised controlled trials important? BMJ. 1998;316(7126):201.
3. Hernán M, Robins J. Causal Inference: What If. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC; 2020.
4. Deaton A, Cartwright N. Understanding and misunderstanding randomized controlled trials. Soc Sci Med. 2018; 210:2-21.
5. Phillips R, Cro S, Wheeler G, Bond S, Morris TP, Creanor S, et al. Visualising harms in publications of randomised controlled trials: consensus and recommendations. BMJ. 2022 May 16;377:e068983.
6. Murad MH, Asi N, Alsawas M, Alahdab F. New evidence pyramid. Evid Based Med. 2016;21(4):125-7.
7. Song Y, Bracchiglione J, Meneses-Echavez JF, de Carvalho Gomes H, Albiger B, Sola I et al. Frameworks to support evidence-informed decision-making in public health and infectious disease prevention and control: a scoping review. Euro Surveill. 2025;30(19).
8. Abel U, Koch A. The role of randomization in clinical studies: myths and beliefs. J Clin Epidemiol. 1999 Jun;52(6):487-97.
9. Kotz D, West R. Key concepts in clinical epidemiology: addressing and reporting sources of bias in randomized controlled trials. J Clin Epidemiol. 2022;143:197-201.
10. Xu C, Zhang F, Doi SAR, Furuya-Kanamori L, Lin L, Chu H, et al. Influence of lack of blinding on the estimation of medication-related harms: a retrospective cohort study of randomized controlled trials. BMC Med. 2024 Mar 7;22(1):83.
11. Saini P, Loke YK, Gamble C, Altman DG, Williamson PR, Kirkham JJ. Selective reporting bias of harm outcomes within studies: findings from a cohort of systematic reviews. BMJ. 2014 Nov 21;349:g6501.
12. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Juni P, Moher D, Oxman AD et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ. 2011;343: d5928.

13. Barker TH, Stone JC, Sears K, Klugar M, Tufanaru C, Leonardi-Bee J et al. The revised JBI critical appraisal tool for the assessment of risk of bias for randomized controlled trials. JBI Evid Synth. 2023;21(3):494-506.
14. Wang Y, Keitz S, Briel M, Glasziou P, Brignardello-Petersen R, Siemieniuk RAC, et al. Development of ROBUST-RCT: Risk Of Bias instrument for Use in SysTematic reviews-for Randomised Controlled Trials. BMJ. 2025 Mar 25;388:e081199.
15. Crocker TF, Lam N, Jordao M, Brundle C, Prescott M, Forster A et al. Risk-of-bias assessment using Cochrane's revised tool for randomized trials (RoB 2) was useful but challenging and resource-intensive: observations from a systematic review. J Clin Epidemiol. 2023; 161:39-45.
16. Kataoka Y, Banno M, Tsujimoto Y, Ariie T, Taito S, Suzuki T et al. Retracted randomized controlled trials were cited and not corrected in systematic reviews and clinical practice guidelines. J Clin Epidemiol. 2022; 150:90-7.
17. Boughton SL, Wilkinson J, Bero L. When beauty is but skin deep: dealing with problematic studies in systematic reviews. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2021;6(6): ED000152.
18. Wiedermann CJ, Joannidis M. Correction to: The Boldt scandal still in need of action: the example of colloids 10 years after initial suspicion of fraud. Intensive Care Med. 2021;47(2):264.
19. Wadhwa RR, Rasendran C, Popovic ZB, Nissen SE, Desai MY. Temporal Trends, Characteristics, and Citations of Retracted Articles in Cardiovascular Medicine. JAMA Netw Open. 2021;4(7): e211826
20. Van Noorden R. More than 10,000 research papers were retracted in 2023 - a new record. Nature. 2023;624(7992):479-81.
21. Baldridge AS, Bellinger GC, Fleming OM, Rasmussen LV, Whitley EW, Welty LJ. The epidemiology of errors in data capture, management, and analysis: A scoping review of retracted articles and retraction notices in clinical and translational research. J Clin Transl Sci. 2024;8(1): e110.

22. Graña Possamai C, Cabanac G, Perrodeau E, Ghosn L, Ravaud P, Boutron I. Inclusion of Retracted Studies in Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Interventions: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. JAMA Intern Med. 2025 Jun 1;185(6):702-709.
23. Xu C, Fan S, Tian Y, Liu F, Furuya-Kanamori L, Clark J et al. Investigating the impact of trial retractions on the healthcare evidence ecosystem (VITALITY Study I): retrospective cohort study. BMJ. 2025;389: e082068.
24. Shi Q, Wang Z, Zhou Q, Hou R, Gao X, He S et al. More consideration is needed for retracted non-Cochrane systematic reviews in medicine: a systematic review. J Clin Epidemiol. 2021; 139:57-67.
25. Cabanac G. Chain retraction: how to stop bad science propagating through the literature. Nature. 2024 Aug;632(8027):977-979.
26. Dinh L, Sarol J, Cheng Y-Y, Hsiao T-K, Parulian N, Schneider J. Systematic examination of pre- and post-retraction citations. Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology. 2019;56(1):390-4.
27. Furman JL, Jensen K, Murray F. Governing knowledge in the scientific community: Exploring the role of retractions in biomedicine. Research Policy. 2012;41(2):276-90.
28. Fanelli D, Wong J, Moher D. What difference might retractions make? An estimate of the potential epistemic cost of retractions on meta-analyses. Account Res. 2022;29(7):442-59.
29. Bakker C, Boughton S, Faggion CM, Fanelli D, Kaiser K, Schneider J. Reducing the residue of retractions in evidence synthesis: ways to minimise inappropriate citation and use of retracted data. BMJ Evid Based Med. 2024;29(2):121-6.
30. Candal-Pedreira C, Ruano-Ravina A, Fernandez E, Ramos J, Campos-Varela I, Perez-Rios M. Does retraction after misconduct have an impact on citations? A pre-post study. BMJ Glob Health. 2020;5(11).
31. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. BMJ. 2007 Oct 20;335(7624):806-8.
32. Kaplan EL, Meier P. Nonparametric Estimation from Incomplete Observations. Journal of the American Statistical Association. 1958;53(282):457–481.

33. Whitney J. Testing for differences with the nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test. J Wound Ostomy Continence Nurs. 1997;24(1):12.

34. Shivantha S, Au NLS, Gurrin L, Thornton J, Nielsen J, Mol BW. Publishers' Response to Post-Publication Concerns About Clinical Research in Women's Health. BJOG. 2025 Jun;132(7):892-901.

35. Hu Z, Cui J, Lin A. Identifying potentially excellent publications using a citation-based machine learning approach. Inform Proc Manage. 60(3):103323, 60(3).

Table 1. Basic characteristics of 1,330 retracted trials.

	Summary of retracted trials	
	Trials cause evidence contamination (n=426)	**Trials did not cause evidence contamination (n=904)**
Characteristics		
Time-to-retraction, Median (IQR)	6.03 (1.90 to 13.28)	1.35 (0.93 to 3.72)
Year of retraction, Number (%)		
2010 and before	20 (4.7%)	38 (4.2%)
2011 to 2022	294 (69.0%)	397 (43.9%)
2023 and after	112 (26.3%)	469 (51.9%)
Trial registration, Number (%)		
Yes	109 (25.6%)	140 (15.5%)
No	317 (74.4%)	764 (84.5%)
Data-related retractions, Number (%)		
Yes	300 (70.4%)	642 (71.0%)
No	126 (29.6%)	262 (29.0%)
Funding source, Number (%)		
Industry supported	10 (2.4%)	24 (2.7%)
Non-industry supported	88 (20.7%)	224 (24.8%)
Not funded	42 (9.9%)	64 (7.1%)
Not reported	286 (67.1%)	592 (65.5%)
Data sharing statement, Number (%)		
Yes	54 (12.7%)	443 (49.0%)
No	372 (87.3%)	461 (51.0%)
Retraction procedure, Number (%)		
Author initiated	46 (10.8%)	77 (8.5%)
Journal initiated	359 (84.3%)	772 (85.4%)
Author and journal initiated	9 (2.1%)	17 (1.9%)
Unclear	12 (2.8%)	38 (4.2%)
Center information, Number (%)		
Single center	172 (40.4%)	312 (34.5%)
Multiple centers	67 (15.7%)	79 (8.7%)
Missing	187 (43.9%)	513 (56.8%)
Journal quartiles, Number (%)		
Q1	188 (44.1%)	228 (25.2%)
Q2	138 (32.4%)	258 (28.5%)
Q3	51 (12.0%)	107 (11.8%)
Q4	11 (2.6%)	30 (3.3%)
No information	38 (8.9%)	281 (31.1%)

Figure 1. Analysis of time to first contamination for retracted RCTs following publication (n = 426).



Figure 2. Association between features of retracted trials and evidence contamination