

An Analysis of Controlled Human Infection Studies Registered on ClinicalTrials.gov

Danny Toomey¹, Jupiter Adams-Phipps¹, James Wilkinson¹, John Pietro¹, Jake Littman^{1,2}, Steffen Kamenicek¹, Daniel Kaufman¹, Euzebiusz Jamrozik^{3,4,5#}, Joshua Osowicki^{6,7}, Meta Roestenberg⁸, Ian J. Saldanha⁹

¹ 1Day Sooner Research Team

² University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine

³ Ethox and Pandemic Sciences Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

⁴ Royal Melbourne Hospital Department of Medicine, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁵ Monash Bioethics Centre, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁶ Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, VIC, Australia.

⁷ Infectious Diseases Unit, Department of General Medicine, Royal Children's Hospital Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia.

⁸ Leiden University Center for Infectious Diseases, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, The Netherlands.

⁹ Center for Clinical Trials and Evidence Synthesis, Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

Corresponding author

Funding:

This research was funded in whole, or in part, by the Wellcome Trust [203132] and [221719] and 1Day Sooner. The funders had no role in the collection, analysis and interpretation of the data, the writing of the manuscript, or the decision to submit the paper for publication.

The Trust and Confidence research program at the Pandemic Sciences Institute at the University of Oxford is supported by an award from the Moh Foundation.

For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

Keywords: Human challenge; CHIS; CHIM; Reporting; Adverse event reporting; ClinicalTrials.gov

COI: All authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Abstract

OBJECTIVES: Controlled human infection studies (CHIS) involve intentional exposure of human volunteers to infectious agents. Given the small size of CHIS, aggregating data across studies is critical to the field. The objectives of the current analysis were to (1) evaluate the use of ClinicalTrials.gov for CHIS data reporting and (2) compare CHIS clinical trial participant flow and AE reporting in ClinicalTrials.gov with the same data in corresponding published articles.

DESIGN: ClinicalTrials.gov records that described a CHIS were included and data were accessed using the AACT API. These data were compared with results extracted from publications associated with included records' NCT identifiers and compared in groups stratified by sponsor type, cohort size, and risk of bias in selection of the reported result as determined by Domain 5 of the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0 tool.

RESULTS: We screened 5,131 ClinicalTrials.gov records for inclusion, reviewed 410 records in full, and included 344 records. The overall prevalence of any discrepancy was 40%. Compared with their respective groups, significant discrepancies were observed in publicly funded trials, trials in the 3rd quartile of study size, and trials with a high risk of bias in selection of the reported result. Five studies reported a total of five SAEs in ClinicalTrials.gov records but not in any associated publications.

CONCLUSION: We identified an overall prevalence of discrepancy of 40% in CHIS, which is comparable to the prevalence observed in other types of clinical trials. In general, medium-sized, publicly funded trials tended to have more discrepancies in reporting, which may reflect the resources typically available to large, privately funded trials or the relative ease of reporting in smaller trials with fewer overall AEs. These results highlight the need to facilitate clear and consistent reporting in CHIS.

Strength and Limitations

- This is the first study comparing CHIS AE reporting with trial registry data.
- This study contributes to a sparse general literature on reporting discrepancies.
- We provide recommendations for best practices to reduce the problems we identify.
- Our data likely exhibit heterogeneity arising from our aggregating across studies of different infectious agents.
- Only ClinicalTrials.gov was evaluated, and it is possible that trials that would have met inclusion criteria are registered in other databases.

1 Introduction

Controlled human infection studies (CHIS) model an encounter between human hosts and pathogens by deliberately exposing selected volunteers to a well-characterized infectious agent under controlled conditions [1,2]. CHIS are used for many purposes, such as studying the transmission and pathogenesis of infectious diseases and evaluating the efficacy of vaccines or other interventions [3]. Records of such trials date back to the 18th century, although many early challenge experiments would not have met modern ethical research standards set forth in the 1970s [4]. Although CHIS are a powerful tool that can be used to expedite the development of vaccines and therapies for infectious diseases [1,5–7], their use has been relatively sporadic, potentially reflecting ethical or efficacy concerns or a lack of sustained investment [3,4,8]. The benefits of the data gathered in CHIS would be enhanced by comprehensive reporting as well as standardization of study protocols. Additionally, the use of data sharing principles such as Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reuse (FAIR) greatly aid in the aggregation and reuse of CHIS data, which is vital due to their small size compared to other clinical trials [9].

To investigate the safety of modern CHIS, we previously conducted a systematic review of adverse events (AEs) and serious adverse events (SAEs) in CHIS published between 1980 and 2021 [10]. Serious adverse events (SAEs) are defined as an adverse event that results in a serious outcome, such as hospitalization, permanent disability, and death [11]. Some AEs that occur during a study may be directly related to study interventions while others may be incidental. Our previous review found that a minority of participants in modern CHIS experienced challenge-related severe AEs (as defined by study authors) or SAEs [10]. Across 187 studies that reported SAE data, 23 of 10,016 participants (0.2%) experienced at least one SAE. The most frequent SAEs were severe vomiting and/or diarrhea, hepatitis, and hyperbilirubinemia. Across 94 studies that reported data on severe AEs (grade 3 or higher), between 285 and 801 of 5,083 participants¹ (5.6% to 15.8%) experienced at least one severe AE [10].

Although the above findings generally support the safety of modern CHIS, the review also identified issues related to non-standardized reporting of CHIS [10,12], including regarding the classification of this type of research. Previous work has discussed the wide ranging terminology in use for CHIS [12], with the predominant issues posed being difficulty identifying CHIS across different models and fields. This ambiguity is related to a lack of consistency with what constitutes a ‘challenge’ with a microorganism. Some intuitive definitions, such as defining a challenge agent as a known infectious organism, would exclude studies evaluating therapeutic infection or phase 1 live attenuated vaccine trials. Studies aiming to produce colonization rather than symptomatic infection are another borderline case. The review also found an inconsistent use of trial registries [10], with approximately 75% of CHIS started in the 2010's listed in at least one registry.

¹ A range of values was given to account for unclear data reporting in some studies.

ClinicalTrials.gov, the world's largest repository for clinical trial data, was launched in February 2000 by the US National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the FDA as a public registry of medical studies in human volunteers, and is maintained by the US National Library of Medicine [13–15]. Database fields detailing study AEs were subsequently made publicly available in September 2008 [13]. Although the rate of study registration has increased over time as a result of regulatory requirements and voluntary registration on the part of sponsors and investigators [13], some studies still do not get registered on ClinicalTrials.gov or any other registry. Among those registered, many fail to post results, with a recent report identifying over 3,000 clinical trials across all fields with missing results that have been overdue since February 2018 [16].

A key finding of our previous review was that AE reporting is often unclear or missing in CHIS publications [10]. To understand whether AE reporting is more clear or complete in ClinicalTrials.gov records than in publications, the current analysis (1) evaluates the use of ClinicalTrials.gov for CHIS registration and data reporting and (2) compares CHIS clinical trial participant flow and AE reporting in ClinicalTrials.gov with the same data in corresponding published articles.

2 Methods

A full protocol is available in the supplementary materials. Patients and members of the public were not involved in the design of the study. This analysis was pre-registered at Prospero, number CRD42022330047.

2.1 Eligibility criteria for CHIS

Studies registered on ClinicalTrials.gov that involved intentional exposure of human volunteers to an infectious agent for the purpose of developing or using a model of infection, commonly known as CHIS or human challenge trials, were included. There is ongoing debate regarding the precise definition of a CHIS [12,17]. For our review, we examined studies that involved intentional exposure of human volunteers to wild-type or attenuated organisms (infectious agents). Challenges with candidate vaccine viruses were also included, as were studies in which previously challenged participants were challenged again with the same infectious agent (i.e., rechallenges). Studies involving live attenuated vaccines were only included when the vaccine strain was used as a challenge agent.

2.2 Identification of CHIS registered on ClinicalTrials.gov

Searches were performed as structured query language (SQL) queries using the Aggregated Analysis of ClinicalTrials.gov application programming interface (AACT API) on June 30, 2022. The search was updated on April 15, 2023. The full search strategy, including specific queries, is included in the Supplementary Materials. This search was conducted as a systematic review according to PRISMA guidelines [18].

2.3 Identification of Full Publications of CHIS

We used two strategies to identify full publications of CHIS: (1) publications listed in the ClinicalTrials.gov record for each included CHIS, and (2) to identify additional articles that were not listed in the ClinicalTrials.gov record, a PubMed search using each National Clinical Trial (NCT) number. Articles were included if they were peer-reviewed and reported AEs in the CHIS linked by NCT number. Articles published before the date the record was first posted on ClinicalTrials.gov were excluded, as were articles reporting secondary analyses of data from registered CHIS.

2.4 Study Categorization

Studies were categorized according to recruitment status to differentiate between those that were still recruiting, ongoing, suspended and/or terminated, withdrawn, completed, or of unknown status (missing updates). Studies that had been completed were further grouped by whether they posted results on ClinicalTrials.gov and whether a corresponding published article discussing results of the study was listed within the ClinicalTrials.gov study record or identifiable through a PubMed search for the record's NCT number.

2.5 Screening and Data Extraction Process

Each record was screened independently by two of six investigators. Titles and study descriptions were reviewed to evaluate whether the record described a CHIS. Where feasible, data were automatically extracted from the AACT database. Data that were extracted automatically were independently reviewed by at least two reviewers for verification. Data that could not be extracted automatically were extracted manually by two reviewers working independently. For records with a corresponding published article discussing results from the same study, data were likewise extracted manually. Any discrepancies in screening or data extraction were either resolved by discussion among the reviewers or by JAP or DT. Participant flow and AE data were not extracted from associated publications if results were not posted on the ClinicalTrials.gov record, as data from both a ClinicalTrials.gov record and a publication are necessary for comparison. Studies registered on ClinicalTrials.gov less than 1 year before April 15, 2023 (the date of our last query of the database) were excluded.

2.6 Assessment of risk of bias in the selection of the reported result

Risk of bias in the selection of the reported result was assessed using domain 5 of the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0 Tool [19]. Assessments were performed by DT and confirmed by 1 of 6 reviewers. Disputes were resolved by JAP or DT.

2.7 Synthesis Methods

ClinicalTrials.gov records that posted results and included at least one publication were included in data synthesis. Data were tabulated to create summary statistics by relevant parameters. We calculated the prevalence of discrepancies between reporting in ClinicalTrials.gov records and associated publications. Data were analyzed by study sponsor type (private, public, and public-private partnership), cohort size (1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quartiles), and risk of bias in the selection of

the reported result (low, some concerns, and high). Where applicable, data for the number of volunteers challenged, infected, with AEs, or with SAEs were recorded as a range to account for ambiguous reporting.

Studies sponsored by government organizations were categorized as public, studies sponsored by private for-profit or not-for-profit organizations were categorized as private, and studies sponsored by an organization that was formed as an independent collaborative partnership between a governmental organization and a private organization were categorized as public-private partnerships.

Discrepancies were defined as any instance in which the same metric (number challenged, infected, with AEs, or with SAEs) was unambiguously reported differently in the record and its associated publications. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were used to compare the likelihoods of discrepancy. These analyses were performed *post hoc*. Records with data recorded as a range due to ambiguous reporting were excluded from statistical analysis. The relationship between study size, risk of bias, and sponsor type was evaluated *post hoc* using one-way ANOVAs for continuous data and chi-square tests of independence for categorical data. Statistical significance was defined at a 5% level for all analyses.

3 Results

3.1 Study Selection

The search returned 5,131 records, of which 4,721 records were excluded during screening (Supplementary Figure 1). The remaining 410 records were screened in full, of which 66 were excluded for not meeting the definition of a CHIS. The remaining 344 records met inclusion criteria. A complete list of records excluded for these reasons is included in the Supplementary Materials.

3.2 Reporting in Individual CHIS

Among the 344 included CHIS, 264 (76.7%) were completed, 13 (3.8%) were active and not recruiting, 22 (6.4%) were either recruiting or enrolling by invitation, 12 (3.5%) were terminated, and 16 (4.7%) were of unknown status. Among all 264 completed CHIS, 66 (25.0%) posted results, and 156 (59.1%) listed at least one published article. Among the 344 included CHIS, there were 46 studies (13.4%) that both posted results and linked to a publication, and 209 studies (60.8%) that had results available in some form (either as results posted on ClinicalTrials.gov or by linking to a publication) (Supplemental Table 1).

3.3 Challenges, Infections, and Adverse Event Reporting

Among completed CHIS, 46 ClinicalTrials.gov records both reported results and listed at least one associated publication, with 195 associated publications listed in total (median 1, range 1 to 82 publications per CHIS). The most common challenge agents were plasmodium species (17 records), influenza (8 records), respiratory syncytial virus (4 records), and rhinovirus (4 records). Data were not extracted from the 474 associated publications whose ClinicalTrials.gov record did not post results. Where applicable, data are provided as ranges to account for ambiguous reporting. A total of 3,574 volunteers were enrolled, of whom between 2,998 (83.9%) and 3,131 (87.6%) were challenged with a pathogen, and between 1,297 (41.4 - 43.3%) and 1,608 (51.4-53.6 %) were reported to have laboratory confirmed infection or symptoms diagnostic for infection. In associated publications, total reported enrollment was 3,399, with 2,615 (76.9%) to 2,620 (77.1%) challenged volunteers and 1,437 (54.8 - 54.9%) to 1,455 (55.5 - 55.6%) confirmed infections. ClinicalTrials.gov records reported that 1,921 (61.4 - 64.1%) to 2,166 (69.2 - 72.2%) volunteers experienced at least one AE, whereas associated publications reported 1,532 (58.5 - 58.6%) to 1,730 (66.0 - 66.2%) volunteers experienced at least one AEs. Twenty-nine SAEs were reported in ClinicalTrials.gov records and 25 SAEs were reported in associated publications (Table 1).

3.4 Comparison of Results Reported in ClinicalTrials.gov Records versus Associated Publications

Completed records that both posted results to ClinicalTrials.gov and linked to a published article discussing results were compared to identify discrepancies in data reporting. Among included records, 23 were sponsored by private organizations, 18 by public organizations, and 5 by public-private partnerships, with 60, 127, and 8 associated publications, respectively (Table 2). Results were posted for 25.7%, 14.6%, and 50.0% of privately sponsored records, publicly sponsored records, and public-private partnerships, respectively. Records were divided into quartiles by the number of volunteers enrolled, with the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quartiles being 6 to 26 volunteers, 27 to 58 volunteers, 59 to 79 volunteers, and 80 to 440 volunteers, respectively (Table 3). Twenty-six ClinicalTrial.gov records had low risk, 1 had some concern, and 19 had high risk of bias related to selection of the reported result (Table 4).

a) Relationships Between Variables

To evaluate the relationship between sponsor type, risk of bias in selection of the reported result, and study cohort size, several *post hoc* analyses were performed. The relationship between sponsor type and study size was evaluated by a one-way ANOVA, which did not indicate a significant relationship ($F=2.62$, $df=2$, $p=0.08$). The relationship between risk of bias in selection of the reported result and study size was evaluated by a one-way ANOVA, which did not indicate a significant relationship ($F=0.20$, $df=2$, $p=0.82$). The relationship between sponsor type and risk of bias in selection of the reported result was

evaluated by a chi-square test for independence, which did not indicate a significant relationship ($X=0.69$, $df=8$, $p=0.99$).

b) Volunteers Challenged

Twenty-eight records were included in statistical analysis for discrepancies among the number of volunteers challenged, with discrepancies observed in 14.3%. Publicly sponsored studies were more likely than other studies to have discrepancies (OR: 2.43, 95% CI: 1.10-5.37). Studies in the 2nd quartile (OR: 3.00, 95% CI: 1.35-6.64) and 3rd quartile (OR: 5.00, 95% CI: 2.25-11.11) of study size were more likely than studies in the other quartiles to have discrepancies. Studies with a low risk of bias in selection of the reported result were more likely than studies with some concerns or studies with a high risk of bias to have discrepancies (OR: 3.00, 95% CI: 1.24-7.25), and studies with a high risk of bias were less likely than studies with some concerns or a low risk of bias to have discrepancies (OR: 0.39, 95% CI: 0.17-0.94) (Table 5). Among the 4 records with discrepancies in the number of volunteers challenged, ClinicalTrials.gov records were more complete in all instances.

c) Volunteers Infected

Twenty-two records were included in statistical analysis for discrepancies among the number of volunteers with signs of infection after challenge, with discrepancies observed in 13.6%. Studies in the 3rd quartile of study size were more likely than studies in the other quartiles to have discrepancies in the number of volunteers infected after challenge (OR: 10.67, 95% CI: 4.23-26.88). All records with some concerns for bias had discrepancies in the number of volunteers infected after challenge (Table 5). Of the 3 records with discrepancies in the number of volunteers infected, associated publications were more complete compared to ClinicalTrials.gov in all instances.

d) AE Reporting

Twenty-one records were included in statistical analysis for discrepancies among the number of volunteers with AEs, with discrepancies observed in 61.9%. All 11 studies in the 3rd quartile of study size had discrepancies in the number of volunteers with AEs. Studies with a high risk of bias in selection of the reported result were more likely than studies with a low risk of bias or some concerns to have discrepancies in the number of volunteers with AEs (OR: 2.00, 95% CI: 1.13-3.54). Studies in the 1st quartile (OR: 0.18, 95% CI: 0.10-0.33), 2nd quartile (OR: 0.55, 95% CI 0.31-0.96), and 4th quartile (OR: 0.30, 95% CI: 0.17-0.54) of study size were less likely than studies in the 3rd quartile to have discrepancies in the number of volunteers with AEs (Table 5). Of the 13 records with discrepancies in the number of volunteers with AEs, ClinicalTrials.gov records were more complete in 9 (69.2%) instances and associated publications were more complete in 4 (30.8%) instances.

e) SAE Reporting

Thirty-four records were included in statistical analysis for discrepancies among the number of volunteers with SAEs, with discrepancies observed in 8.8%. Studies sponsored by publicly funded organizations were more likely than other trials to have discrepancies in the number of reported SAEs (OR: 4.89, 95% CI: 1.65-14.50). Studies with a high risk of bias were more likely than studies with a low risk of bias or some concerns to have discrepancies (OR: 3.17, 95% CI: 1.10-9.14) (Table 5). Of the 3 records with discrepancies in the number of volunteers with SAEs, ClinicalTrials.gov records were more complete in 2 (66.7%) instances and associated publications were more complete in 1 (33.3%) instance.

f) Overall Completeness of AE reporting

Across 71 studies (66 completed, 5 terminated) that reported results on ClinicalTrials.gov and in associated publications, between 696 and 818 participants experienced AEs that were reported in ClinicalTrials.gov records but not in associated publications. Between 257 and 348 participants experienced AEs that were reported in associated publications but not in ClinicalTrials.gov records. The median time to post results to the ClinicalTrials.gov record was 1,382 days (interquartile range [IQR] 774 to 2,191). Ninety-four percent of ClinicalTrials.gov records reported AEs individually, rather than grouping related symptoms together into sets, compared with 60.9% of associated publications. There were 6 to 13 AEs that were reported after rechallenge in ClinicalTrials.gov records that were not reported in associated publications.

There were five participants that each experienced one SAE that was reported in ClinicalTrials.gov records but not in any associated publication: fractured wrist, breast cancer in situ, peripheral parasitemia, ruptured Achilles tendon, and pulmonary embolism. One record (NCT01024686) was terminated and so is not included in analyses, but is included in this summary for completeness. The relatedness of these SAEs to challenge was not discussed in their respective records. No participants experienced SAEs that were reported in associated publications but not in ClinicalTrials.gov records (Supplementary Table 2). An additional six participants experienced SAEs that were reported in ClinicalTrials.gov records that had no associated publications: asthma, rhabdomyolysis, acute coronary syndrome, acute psychosis, and fetal death.

4 Discussion

In this analysis, we compared results available in ClinicalTrials.gov records with results available in these records' associated publications and quantified the prevalence of discrepancies

between these sources. The likelihoods of discrepancies among the number of volunteers challenged, infected, with AEs, and with SAEs were 14.3%, 13.6%, 61.9%, and 8.8% respectively. Among all records eligible for analysis, 39.1% had some discrepancy. We also identified 5 SAEs that were reported in ClinicalTrials.gov records and not discussed in any publication of the results.

Publicly funded trials and trials with a high risk of bias related to selection of the reported result were most likely to have discrepancies in reported SAEs. Trials in the 3rd quartile of study size and trials with a high risk of bias related to selection of the reported result were more likely to have discrepancies in reported AEs than studies in other study size quartiles and other risks of bias, respectively. There were no significant relationships identified between sponsor type, risk of bias, and study size in the occurrence of discrepancies. Data on the amount of funding trials received were not available, and it is possible that this would be a relevant factor. For example, if large, privately funded trials typically have more resources than smaller, publicly funded trials, they may have the budget to ensure proper reporting, which may have explained these results. The lower prevalence of discrepancies observed in smaller studies may reflect the relative ease of consistent reporting when the overall number of events to report is low. It is also possible that ClinicalTrials.gov reporting is more complete due to constraints on the sharing of data in the process of preparing manuscripts for peer-review and publication. At the same time, 59% of trials completed listed at least one publication in their record while only 25% had posted results, which may contextualize the relative ease of publishing a limited amount of relevant data in a peer-reviewed journal as opposed to a complete set of results in a clinical trial record.

Issues with data reporting in clinical trials are not isolated to CHIS, with a body of literature showing that reporting discrepancies are prevalent in other types of clinical trials. A recent review of trials registered on ClinicalTrials.gov in Canada found that 32% neither reported their results nor discussed them in publications [20]. A review of outcome-related discrepancies between registry entries and published reports in orthodontic RCTs identified discrepancies in 47% of publications [21], while a review of oncology trials identified a 63% discrepancy in secondary outcomes described in protocols compared with final results [22]. A random sample of 300 trials posted on ClinicalTrials.gov identified a discrepancy prevalence of 32% for SAEs in records compared with SAEs in publications of results [23]. A study investigating reporting discrepancies in a random sample of 110 phase 3 or 4 trials with results posted on ClinicalTrials.gov found that 20% of trials have inconsistencies in reported primary outcomes [24]. Our findings regarding discrepancies in the reporting of CHIS are therefore similarly observed in other types of clinical research.

We previously reported that adverse event reporting in CHIS is inconsistent [10]. Though this is not unique to CHIS, there is arguably a greater benefit to consistent reporting due to the increased value of data aggregation in a field of research where studies are typically small and where key benefits include providing results more quickly and with fewer volunteers compared to alternative trial designs (e.g., vaccine field trials). In particular, data on the numbers of

volunteers who are challenged, become infected, and subsequently experienced AEs and/or SAEs must be reported clearly, especially if related to challenge or other study procedures. Consistent reporting is important for a wide range of clinical studies. The European Union's Clinical Trials Information System (EU CTIS) clinical trial registry provides an example of a platform that facilitates consistent reporting by integrating trial registration with outcome reporting. CTIS registration requires expected AEs to be predefined. Clear reporting of which expected and unexpected AEs are noted for volunteers who do and do not receive a challenge organism would help to ensure accurate descriptions of what volunteers experience.

A key finding of the current study is that reporting is clearer in a database than in publications because it's more comprehensive and easier to compare due to standardization. Repositories also facilitate finding and aggregating data for future studies. Our experience aggregating data for the current study highlights the ClinicalTrials.gov AACT API as a powerful tool that promotes efficient data sharing with minimal modifications. We provide in the supplementary methods an open-source program that was used to generate our dataset and can be used by others [25]. Our focus on ClinicalTrials.gov is not to imply that it should be the repository for all clinical trials but rather to highlight aspects of its reporting requirements. On the data entry side, it is relatively simple to add fields by arm for AE data. On the data reuse side, the AACT API is powerful and easy to use, with a well-documented schema to simplify finding a data field of interest. These functionalities of ClinicalTrials.gov provide a simple method for sharing AE data and could be used more widely. It serves as a strong example of a platform that fulfills FAIR data sharing principles. We recommend that CHIS researchers add data fields alongside the AE and SAE outcomes for the number of volunteers challenged and infected in each arm. We make these recommendations with the goal of a) ensuring CHIS fulfill FAIR data sharing practices to the fullest degree and b) maximizing the contribution each CHIS volunteer makes to science by facilitating the ease with which other researchers may access and find new insights from their data.

Our study has the following limitations: 1) not every relevant record may have been caught by the ClinicalTrials.gov search query used; 2) not every publication associated with each record may have been identified by NCT number; 3) our results may have been influenced by publication bias, which favors significant results; 4) our data likely exhibit heterogeneity arising from aggregation across different infectious agents; and 5) only ClinicalTrials.gov was evaluated, and it is possible that trials that would have met inclusion criteria are registered in other databases.

In conclusion, we found that 40% of CHIS had at least one discrepancy between results reported in ClinicalTrials.gov records and publications describing the same results. Rather than this being unique to CHIS, we note that similar levels of suboptimal reporting have been observed in other types of trials. Publicly funded, medium-sized trials were more likely to have discrepancies in reporting, which may reflect the resources typically available to large, privately funded trials or the relative ease of reporting in smaller trials. To address these issues, we propose minimal

amendments to CHIS researchers' data entry workflow in ClinicalTrials.gov to facilitate automatic aggregation of CHIS data via the AACT API and highlight the EU CTIS as an example of an integrated registration system that facilitates clear and consistent reporting. Due to the benefits of CHIS data being shared for aggregation, it is imperative that volunteer outcomes be described in publicly available repositories so that study data can be used as broadly and effectively as possible.

Author contributions

DT and JAP conceived the study, designed the study, and performed data collection, data analysis, and manuscript writing and review. JW, SK, JL, JP, and DK performed data pipeline optimization, data collection, data review, and contributed to manuscript writing. EJ, JO, MR, and IJS assisted in study design and provided expert review of the manuscript.

Data sharing statement

All data and analyses performed are publicly available at <https://github.com/1DaySooner/CTgovSystematicReview>

References

- [1] World Health Organization. WHO guidance on the ethical conduct of controlled human infection studies. n.d.
- [2] World Health Organization. Human challenge trials for vaccine development: regulatory considerations, Annex 10, TRS No 1004 n.d. <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/human-challenge-trials-for-vaccine-a10-trs-no-1004> (accessed May 23, 2023).
- [3] Miller F, Grady C. The Ethical Challenge of Infection-Inducing Challenge Experiments. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2001;33:1028–33. <https://doi.org/10.1086/322664>.
- [4] Jamrozik E, Selgelid MJ. History of Human Challenge Studies. In: Jamrozik E, Selgelid MJ, editors. *Human Challenge Studies in Endemic Settings*: Ethical and Regulatory Issues, Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2021, p. 9–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41480-1_2.
- [5] Eyal N, Lipsitch M, Smith PG. Human Challenge Studies to Accelerate Coronavirus Vaccine Licensure. *J Infect Dis* 2020;221:1752–6. <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiaa152>.
- [6] Sekhar A, Kang G. Human challenge trials in vaccine development. *Semin Immunol* 2020;50:101429. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smim.2020.101429>.
- [7] Mosley JF, Smith LL, Brantley P, Locke D, Como M. Vaxchora: The First FDA-Approved Cholera Vaccination in the United States. *P T* 2017;42:638–40.
- [8] Hope T, McMillan J. Challenge studies of human volunteers: ethical issues. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 2004;30:110–6. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2003.004440>.
- [9] Wilkinson MD, Dumontier M, Aalbersberg IJ, Appleton G, Axton M, Baak A, et al. The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Sci Data* 2016;3:160018. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>.
- [10] Adams-Phipps J, Toomey D, Więcek W, Schmit V, Wilkinson J, Scholl K, et al. A Systematic Review of Human Challenge Trials, Designs, and Safety. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2023;76:609–19. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciac820>.
- [11] Commissioner O of the. What is a Serious Adverse Event? FDA 2023.
- [12] Adams-Phipps J, Toomey D. Standardizing Controlled Human Infection Study Reporting Discussion and Guidelines 2023. <https://doi.org/10.22541/au.167785775.55591277/v1>.
- [13] ClinicalTrials.gov Background - ClinicalTrials.gov n.d. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/about-site/background> (accessed May 10, 2022).
- [14] WHO. Clinical trials databases 2023. <https://www.who.int/observatories/global-observatory-on-health-research-and-development/resources/databases/databases-on-processes-for-r-d/clinical-trials> (accessed June 7, 2023).
- [15] Zarin DA, Tse T, Williams RJ, Rajakannan T. Update on Trial Registration 11 Years after the ICMJE Policy Was Established. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376:383–91. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsr1601330>.
- [16] Bruckner T. Missing clinical trial results in America: Violations of federal law and FDA response. *TranspariMED*; 2022.
- [17] Pollard AJ, Sauerwein R, Baay M, Neels P, Balasingam S, Bejon P, et al. Third human challenge trial conference, Oxford, United Kingdom, February 6–7, 2020, a meeting report. *Biologicals* 2020;66:41–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biologicals.2020.04.004>.

- [18] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>.
- [19] Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4898. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4898>.
- [20] Alayche M, Cobey KD, Ng JY, Ardern CL, Khan KM, Chan A-W, et al. Evaluating prospective study registration and result reporting of trials conducted in Canada from 2009 to 2019. *FACETS* 2023;8:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2022-0208>.
- [21] Koufatzidou M, Koletsi D, Fleming PS, Polychronopoulou A, Pandis N. Outcome reporting discrepancies between trial entries and published final reports of orthodontic randomized controlled trials. *Eur J Orthod* 2019;41:225–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejo/cjy046>.
- [22] Serpas VJ, Raghav KP, Halperin DM, Yao J, Overman MJ. Discrepancies in endpoints between clinical trial protocols and clinical trial registration in randomized trials in oncology. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2018;18:169. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0627-2>.
- [23] Tang E, Ravaud P, Riveros C, Perrodeau E, Dechartres A. Comparison of serious adverse events posted at ClinicalTrials.gov and published in corresponding journal articles. *BMC Medicine* 2015;13:189. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-015-0430-4>.
- [24] Hartung D, Zarin DA, Guise J-M, McDonagh M, Paynter R, Helfand M. Reporting Discrepancies between the ClinicalTrials.gov Results Database and Peer Reviewed Publications. *Ann Intern Med* 2014;160:477–83. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M13-0480>.
- [25] Supplemental Materials. GitHub n.d. <https://github.com/1DaySooner/CTgovSystematicReview/> (accessed November 17, 2023).

Tables

Table 1 - Adverse Events in ClinicalTrials.gov records and Associated Publications									
Adverse Events in ClinicalTrials.gov records									
	Number of CT records	Enrollment in CT records	Number of volunteers challenged in CT records (min)	Number of volunteers challenged in CT records (max)	Volunteers determined positive for infection in CT records (min)	Volunteers determined positive for infection in CT records (max)	Volunteers with AEs in CT records (min)	Volunteers with AEs in CT records (max)	Volunteers with SAEs in CT records
Totals	46	3574	2998	3131	1297	1608	1921	2,166	29
Adverse Events in Associated Publications									
	Number of associated Publications	Enrollment in associated publications	Number of volunteers challenged in associated publications (min)	Number of volunteers challenged in associated publications (max)	Volunteers determined positive for infection in associated publications (min)	Volunteers determined positive for infection in associated publications (max)	Volunteers with AEs in Associated Publications (min)	Volunteers with AEs in Associated Publications (max)	Volunteers with SAEs in Associated Publications
Totals	195	3399	2615	2620	1437	1455	1532	1,730	25

Table 2 - Adverse Events by Sponsor in ClinicalTrials.gov Records and Associated Publications

ClinicalTrials.gov Adverse Events by Sponsor									
Sponsor Type	Number of CT records included in analysis	Enrollment in CT records	Number of volunteers challenged in CT records (min)	Number of volunteers challenged in CT records (max)	Volunteers determined positive for infection in CT records (min)	Volunteers determined positive for infection in CT records (max)	Volunteers with AEs in CT records (min)	Volunteers with AEs in CT records (max)	Volunteers with SAEs in CT records
Private	23	2337	2050	2062	786	870	1298	1541	18
Public	18	1165	879	998	483	710	560	562	10
Public-Private	5	72	69	71	28	28	63	63	1
<i>Totals</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>3574</i>	<i>2998</i>	<i>3131</i>	<i>1297</i>	<i>1608</i>	<i>1921</i>	<i>2166</i>	<i>29</i>
Associated Publications Adverse Events by Sponsor									
Sponsor Type	Number of associated Publications	Enrollment in associated publications	Number of volunteers challenged in associated publications (min)	Number of volunteers challenged in associated publications (max)	Volunteers determined positive for infection in associated publications (min)	Volunteers determined positive for infection in associated publications (max)	Volunteers with AEs in Associated Publications (min)	Volunteers with AEs in Associated Publications (max)	Volunteers with SAEs in Associated Publications
Private	60	2238	1757	1760	785	800	1167	1293	15
Public	127	1089	789	789	598	599	301	372	9
Public-Private	8	72	69	71	54	56	64	65	1
<i>Totals</i>	<i>195</i>	<i>3399</i>	<i>2615</i>	<i>2620</i>	<i>1437</i>	<i>1455</i>	<i>1532</i>	<i>1730</i>	<i>25</i>

Table 3 - Adverse Events by Study Size in ClinicalTrials.gov and Associated Publication

ClinicalTrials.gov Adverse Events by Study Size

Study Size	Number of CT records included in analysis	Enrollment in CT records	Number of volunteers challenged in CT records (min)	Number of volunteers challenged in CT records (max)	Volunteers positive for infection in CT records (min)	Volunteers positive for infection in CT records (max)	Volunteers with AEs in CT records (min)	Volunteers with AEs in CT records (max)	Volunteers with SAEs in CT records
1st Quartile - 6 to 26 volunteers	12	194	178	186	106	106	121	121	2
2nd Quartile - 27 to 58 volunteers	11	493	456	461	226	252	321	341	6
3rd Quartile - 59 to 79 volunteers	11	721	660	670	339	383	486	503	6
4th Quartile - 80 to 440 volunteers	12	2166	1704	1814	626	867	993	1201	15
<i>Totals</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>3574</i>	<i>2998</i>	<i>3131</i>	<i>1297</i>	<i>1608</i>	<i>1921</i>	<i>2166</i>	<i>29</i>

Associated Publication Adverse Events by Study Size

Study Size	Number of associated Publications	Enrollment in associated publications	Number of volunteers challenged in associated publications (min)	Number of volunteers challenged in associated publications (max)	Volunteers positive for infection in associated publications (min)	Volunteers positive for infection in associated publications (max)	Volunteers with AEs in Associated Publications (min)	Volunteers with AEs in Associated Publications (max)	Volunteers with SAEs in Associated Publications
1st Quartile - 6 to 26 volunteers	100	140	137	139	112	115	107	112	1
2nd Quartile - 27 to 58 volunteers	40	364	341	341	268	268	222	267	4
3rd Quartile - 59 to 79 volunteers	28	687	492	492	320	332	348	324	7
4th Quartile - 80 to 440 volunteers	27	2208	1645	1648	737	740	855	1027	13
<i>Totals</i>	<i>195</i>	<i>3399</i>	<i>2615</i>	<i>2620</i>	<i>1437</i>	<i>1455</i>	<i>1532</i>	<i>1730</i>	<i>25</i>

Table 4 - Adverse Events by Risk of Bias in ClinicalTrials.gov Records and Associated Publications

ClinicalTrials.gov Adverse Events by Risk of Bias Due to Selection of the Reported Result									
Risk of bias in records and publications	Number of CT records included in analysis	Enrollment in CT records	Number of volunteers challenged in CT records (min)	Number of volunteers challenged in CT records (max)	Volunteers positive for infection in CT records (min)	Volunteers positive for infection in CT records (max)	Volunteers with AEs in CT records (min)	Volunteers with AEs in CT records (max)	Volunteers with SAEs in CT records
Low risk	26	2088	1698	1816	863	1159	1050	1144	10
Some concerns	1	24	24	24	23	23	24	24	0
High risk	19	1462	1276	1291	411	426	847	998	19
<i>Totals</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>3574</i>	<i>2998</i>	<i>3131</i>	<i>1297</i>	<i>1608</i>	<i>1921</i>	<i>2166</i>	<i>29</i>
Associated Publications Adverse Events by Risk of Bias Due to Selection of the Reported Result									
Risk of bias in records and publications	Number of associated Publications	Enrollment in associated publications	Number of volunteers challenged in associated publications (min)	Number of volunteers challenged in associated publications (max)	Volunteers positive for infection in associated publications (max)	Volunteers positive for infection in associated publications (max)	Volunteers with AEs in Associated Publications (min)	Volunteers with AEs in Associated Publications (max)	Volunteers with SAEs in Associated Publications
Low risk	137	2081	1482	1487	952	970	671	844	7
Some concerns	1	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	0
High risk	57	1294	1109	1109	461	461	837	862	18
<i>Totals</i>	<i>195</i>	<i>3399</i>	<i>2615</i>	<i>2620</i>	<i>1437</i>	<i>1455</i>	<i>1532</i>	<i>1730</i>	<i>25</i>

Table 5 - Odds Ratio Comparisons

Prevalence of discrepancy between ClinicalTrials.gov records and associated publications among the reported number of volunteers:


	Challenged			Infected			with AEs			with SAEs		
	OR	95% CI LB	95% CI UB	OR	95% CI LB	95% CI UB	OR	95% CI LB	95% CI UB	OR	95% CI LB	95% CI UB
<i>Sponsor type</i>												
Privately vs not private	0.85	0.38	1.87	1.45	0.64	3.33	0.80	0.46	1.40	0.41	0.15	1.17
Public vs not public	2.43*	1.10*	5.37*	1.40	0.63	3.09	1.75	0.99	3.10	4.89*	1.65*	14.50*
Public-Private vs not public-private	0.00	N/A	N/A	0.00	N/A	N/A	0.70	0.40	1.22	0.00	N/A	N/A
<i>Study size</i>												
4th quartile vs not 4th	0.00	N/A	N/A	0.00	N/A	N/A	0.30*	0.17*	0.54*	0.00	N/A	N/A
3rd quartile vs not 3rd	5.00*	2.25*	11.11*	10.67*	4.23*	26.88*	N/A**	N/A	N/A	1.44	0.55	3.73
2nd quartile vs not 2nd	3.00*	1.35*	6.64*	0.00	N/A	N/A	0.55*	0.31*	0.96*	2.08	0.82	5.31
1st quartile vs not 1st	0.00	N/A	N/A	1.40	0.63	3.09	0.18*	0.10*	0.33*	1.44	0.55	3.73
<i>Risk of bias</i>												
Low vs not low	3.00*	1.24*	7.26*	0.56	0.24	1.29	0.80	0.46	1.40	0.36	0.13	1.03
Some concern vs not some concern	0.00	N/A	N/A	N/A**	N/A	N/A	0.00	N/A	N/A	0.00	N/A	N/A
High vs not high	0.39*	0.17*	0.94*	0.45	0.19	1.05	2.00*	1.13*	3.54*	3.17*	1.10*	9.14*

Higher OR indicates a higher prevalence of discrepancy in the reference group.

*Significant at an alpha level of 0.05

**The prevalence of discrepancy in the reference groups in these comparisons was 100%, precluding OR analysis

Supplementary Figure 1 – PRISMA Flowchart



*Reason for exclusion based on title or abstract	Number excluded
Did not meet the definition of CHIS	4,203
Used a challenge trial design but not use a pathogenic substance	518
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4,721</i>

**Requirements for inclusion	Number excluded for failing to meet requirement
Did not meet the definition of a CHIS despite initially appearing to do so	66
<i>Total:</i>	<i>66</i>

ClinicalTrials.gov Systematic Review Protocol

Objectives

The proposed review aims to investigate the use of ClinicalTrials.gov for CHIS registration and data reporting, and how this compares with data reporting in corresponding published articles describing CHIS. With the goal of evaluating the current use of ClinicalTrials.gov as a registration platform and recommending guidelines for future use, the present review seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How many CHIS registered on ClinicalTrials.gov have at least one published article to report their results and how many post results to the CT record?
 - a. Reported in Section 3.2
2. Of those that post results, how many volunteers were challenged and infected? How many experienced AEs and SAEs?
 - a. Reported in Section 3.3
3. How do these results compare with reporting in published articles, specifically:
 - a. Are there discrepancies in the number of reported volunteers challenged?
 - i. Reported in Section 3.4 B
 - b. Are there discrepancies in the number of reported volunteers positive for infection?
 - i. Reported in Section 3.4 C
 - c. Are there discrepancies in AE reporting?
 - i. Reported in Section 3.4 D
 - d. Are there discrepancies in SAE reporting?
 - i. Reported in Section 3.4 E
 - e. Are there discrepancies in the level of detail of reported adverse events?
 - i. Reported in Section 3.4 F
4. Based on the quality of data reporting and record metadata (such as length of trials and number of trials that are not completed), do CHIS make effective use of ClinicalTrials.gov?
 - a. Reported in Section 3.4 F

Search Strategy

A query was performed on 4/15/23 using the AACT API with the following terms:

```
select * from studies where  
study_type = 'Interventional'  
and  
enrollment < 1000
```

```
and
study_first_submitted_date < '2022-06-30'
and
(
  (official_title ilike '%challenge%') or
  (official_title ilike '%immunization%' and official_title ilike '%sporozoites%') or
  (official_title ilike '%human%' and official_title ilike '%carriage%') or
  (official_title ilike '%infection%' and
  (official_title ilike '%controlled%' or official_title ilike '%experimental%' or official_title ilike
  '%induced%')) or
  (official_title ilike '%efficacy%' and official_title ilike '%vaccine%') or
  (official_title ilike '%human%' and official_title ilike '%exposure%') or
  (official_title ilike '%healthy%' and
  (official_title ilike '%naïve%' or official_title ilike '%naive%')) or
  (official_title ilike '%competitive%' and official_title ilike '%carriage%')
  OR
  (brief_title ilike '%challenge%') or
  (brief_title ilike '%immunization%' and brief_title ilike '%sporozoites%') or
  (brief_title ilike '%human%' and brief_title ilike '%carriage%') or
  (brief_title ilike '%infection%' and
  (brief_title ilike '%controlled%' or brief_title ilike '%experimental%' or brief_title ilike
  '%induced%')) or
  (brief_title ilike '%efficacy%' and brief_title ilike '%vaccine%') or
  (brief_title ilike '%human%' and brief_title ilike '%exposure%') or
  (brief_title ilike '%healthy%' and
  (brief_title ilike '%naïve%' or brief_title ilike '%naive%')) or
  (brief_title ilike '%competitive%' and brief_title ilike '%carriage%')
  OR
  (acronym ilike '%challenge%') or
  (acronym ilike '%human%')
  OR
  nct_id IN
  (select s.nct_id from studies s, keywords k where
  s.nct_id = k.nct_id and k.name ilike '%challenge%')
  OR
  nct_id IN
  (select s.nct_id from studies s, detailed_descriptions d where
  s.nct_id = d.nct_id and
  ((d.description ilike '%challenge%') and
  (d.description ilike '%infection%' or
  d.description ilike '%controlled%' or
  d.description ilike '%experimental%'))))
  OR
  nct_id IN
```

```
(select s.nct_id from studies s, brief_summaries b where
s.nct_id = b.nct_id and
((b.description ilike '%challenge%') and
(b.description ilike '%infection%' or
b.description ilike '%controlled%' or
b.description ilike '%experimental%'))
)
```

For record identified by this query, an additional query was performed to aggregate AE data:

```
select cv.nct_id, cv.number_of_nsae_subjects, cv.minimum_age_num, cv.maximum_age_num,
dg.design_groups,
iv.interventions,
oap.p_value,oac.ci_percent,
srp.pmid,src.citation,
pf.recruitment_details,
rd.AE_Count,rd.SAE_Count,rd.Mortality_Count,
re.Num_AEs_described

from (
select calculated_values.nct_id, calculated_values.number_of_nsae_subjects,
calculated_values.minimum_age_num, calculated_values.maximum_age_num
from calculated_values
where calculated_values.nct_id = '{}' ) as cv
left join (
select design_groups.nct_id, string_agg(design_groups.description, ';' ) as design_groups
from design_groups
group by design_groups.nct_id) as dg
on cv.nct_id = dg.nct_id
left join (
select interventions.nct_id, string_agg(interventions.description, ';' ) as interventions
from interventions
group by interventions.nct_id) as iv
on cv.nct_id = iv.nct_id
left join (
select outcome_analyses.nct_id, string_agg(CAST(outcome_analyses.p_value as VarChar),';
') as p_value
from outcome_analyses
group by outcome_analyses.nct_id) as oap
on cv.nct_id = oap.nct_id
left join (
select outcome_analyses.nct_id, string_agg(CAST(outcome_analyses.ci_percent as
VarChar),'; ') as ci_percent
from outcome_analyses
```

```
group by outcome_analyses.nct_id) as oac
on cv.nct_id = oac.nct_id
left join (
select study_references.nct_id, string_agg(CAST(study_references.pmid as VarChar),';') as
pmid
from study_references
group by study_references.nct_id) as srp
on cv.nct_id = srp.nct_id
left join (
select study_references.nct_id, string_agg(CAST(study_references.citation as VarChar),';')
as citation
from study_references
group by study_references.nct_id) as src
on cv.nct_id = src.nct_id
left join (
select participant_flows.nct_id, string_agg(CAST(participant_flows.recruitment_details as
VarChar),';') as recruitment_details
from participant_flows
group by participant_flows.nct_id) as pf
on cv.nct_id = pf.nct_id
left join (
select reported_events.nct_id, COUNT(DISTINCT reported_events.adverse_event_term) AS
Num_AEs_described
from reported_events
group by reported_events.nct_id) as re
on cv.nct_id = re.nct_id

left join(
select reported_event_totals.nct_id,
sum(case when reported_event_totals.classification = 'Total, other adverse events' then
reported_event_totals.subjects_affected else 0 end) as AE_Count,
sum(case when reported_event_totals.classification = 'Total, serious adverse events' then
reported_event_totals.subjects_affected else 0 end) as SAE_Count,
sum(case when reported_event_totals.classification = 'Total, all-cause mortality' then
reported_event_totals.subjects_affected else 0 end) as Mortality_Count
from reported_event_totals
group by reported_event_totals.nct_id) as rd
on cv.nct_id = rd.nct_id
```

This search returned 5,131 results. A filter by study size was applied using a cohort size of 1,000 as an upper limit. This is based on our previous systematic review, in which the largest CHIS identified had a cohort size of 437. This number was rounded to 500 and doubled to 1000 to ensure a conservative ceiling on sample size to maximize the number of eligible CHIS.

Interventional studies were used as filter criteria because CHIS are rarely classified as another type of study.

Systematic review protocol

Titles and brief descriptions for 5,131 results (ClinicalTrials.gov records) were screened for inclusion by 2 of 6 reviewers. In instances in which the title or brief description did not provide sufficient evidence for challenge, the arms of the trials were checked for challenge phases. Records that described a study that intentionally exposed human participants to an infectious pathogen for the purpose of modeling a named human disease were included. Records that did not intentionally expose a human cohort to an infectious pathogen (such as studies involving a live vaccine that was not given with intent to challenge, studies using non-infectious challenge agents, and studies that performed noxious challenges with lipopolysaccharide or endotoxin) were excluded.

Eligibility criteria

Clinical trial records will be reviewed for the following criteria:

- 1) Trial intentionally exposes at least one volunteer to an infectious pathogen

Clinical trial records will be excluded for the following criteria:

- 1) Trial record is not in english
- 2) Trial record does not have sufficient information to determine the procedure and primary outcomes of the trial
- 3) Trial does not intentionally expose at least one volunteer to an infectious pathogen.

Trials that expose volunteers to live-attenuated pathogens will be included, unless the agent used is explicitly attenuated to the degree of being entirely non-pathogenic. Non-pathogenic agents often used in challenge studies, such as lipopolysaccharide or gluten, will not be included. In the current definition, an infectious agent must be a biological agent with the capacity to reproduce and cause infection in its wild-type, unattenuated form.

Methods for identifying full-text articles

Because ClinicalTrials.gov lists publications of trial results as part of the record, full-text articles will be identified from the list given in the record. All publications listed in the ClinicalTrials.gov record will be evaluated. A PubMed search for the trial's NCT number will be performed to identify publications not listed in the ClinicalTrials.gov record.

Statistical analysis plan

Trials that have been completed or are currently ongoing will be included in data analysis. Trials that have not yet begun, have been withdrawn, or were completed within 1 year of the date data collection was completed (4/15/23) will be included but not analyzed.

The unit of analysis will be the rate of discrepancy between reporting in ClinicalTrials.gov records and associated publications. Data will be divided into groups by sponsor type (private, public, and public-private partnership), study size (1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quartiles), and risk of bias (low, some concerns, high).

Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals will be used to evaluate significance between the rates of discrepancy with each subgroup compared to the remainder of its group. These analyzes will be performed post-hoc and were not pre-registered.

Data items:

Reported AE's will be assessed for the following qualities:

- a) reporting of frequency of AE assessment,
- b) duration of follow up for AEs,
- c) investigators attribution of the cause of SAEs, categorized as related or unrelated to challenge,
- d) what proportion of AEs determined by the investigators to be unexpected

The following data will be automatically extracted from CT records:

- Status of trial (Active but not recruiting, Completed, Enrolling by invitation, Not yet recruiting, Terminated, Unknown status, or Withdrawn)
- The date the study was posted
- The date results were posted
- Study type
- Enrollment
- Minimum age
- Maximum age
- Number of volunteers with at least 1 SAE
- Number of volunteers with at least 1 AE
- All cause mortality
- Number of potential AEs described
- Study sponsor

The following data will be manually extracted from CT records:

- Number of volunteers in challenge groups
- Number of volunteers in challenge groups that became infected with the pathogen
- Are AEs detailed individually? (true/false)
- Total number of publications
- Number of publications automatically indexed
- Number of volunteers with AEs prior to challenge
- Number of volunteers with AEs after challenge
- Number of volunteers with AEs after rechallenge

The following data will be manually extracted from associated publications:

- Study enrollment
- Number of volunteers in challenge groups
- Number of volunteers in challenge groups that became infected with the pathogen
- Number of volunteers with at least 1 SAE
- Number of volunteers with at least 1 AE
- All cause mortality
- Are AEs detailed individually? (true/false)
- Number of volunteers with AEs prior to challenge
- Number of volunteers with AEs after challenge
- Number of volunteers with AEs after rechallenge

Automatic data extraction will be reviewed by 2 of 6 reviewers. Manual data extraction for each included record and any publications associated with the record that discuss results of the study will also be performed by 2 of 6 reviewers. Conflicting data reported by different reviewers will be resolved by DT or JAP.

Risk of bias in individual records:

Risk of bias in individual records will be assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0 Tool by 2 of 6 reviewers. The Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0 tool evaluates bias using separate algorithms to rate the risk of bias from 5 potential sources in publications. In the present study, bias arising from Domain 5, “Risk of bias in the selection of the reported result,” will be evaluated for ClinicalTrials.gov records and all associated publications. Results of these assessments for ClinicalTrials.gov records and associated publications will be combined for a single assessment given per ClinicalTrial.gov record. Disputes will be resolved by JAP or DT.

Data synthesis:

ClinicalTrials.gov records will be determined eligible for analysis if they post results and have an associated publication linked to their NCT number. Data will be tabulated to create summary statistics by relevant parameters as detailed in the analysis grouping below.

Analysis grouping:

- Trial recruitment status
 - Completed: The primary group used for analyzing data
 - Active, not recruiting: Used to analyze the number of current studies (and when they started, how long they’ve been in progress, estimated completion, etc.)
 - Recruiting (and Enrolling by invitation): Used to analyze the number of current studies (and when they started, how long they’ve been in progress, estimated completion, etc.)
 - Withdrawn (and Terminated): Used to analyze studies that were proposed (or even started) that were not finished, in order to identify and investigate any

- studies that exposed participants to a challenge agent, but did not finish the study or report results of the challenge
- Unknown status: Studies that haven't been updated within a certain timeframe; will be analyzed individually for available data
- Sponsor type
 - Private sponsorship: Private for-profit or not-for-profit organizations
 - Public sponsorship: Governmental organizations
 - Public-private partnership: An independent collaborative partnership between a governmental organization and a private organization
- Study size
 - 1st Quartile: The 1st quartile of enrollment size for all studies included in analysis
 - 2nd Quartile: The 2nd quartile of enrollment size for all studies included in analysis
 - 3rd Quartile: The 3rd quartile of enrollment size for all studies included in analysis
 - 4th Quartile: The 4th quartile of enrollment size for all studies included in analysis
- Risk of bias
 - Low risk of bias: A low risk of bias as determined by the algorithm provided Domain 5 of the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0 Tool, taking into account results reported in the ClinicalTrials.gov record and all publications associated with its NCT number.
 - Some concerns: Some concerns as determined by the algorithm provided Domain 5 of the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0 Tool, taking into account results reported in the ClinicalTrials.gov record and all publications associated with its NCT number.
 - High risk of bias: A high risk of bias as determined by the algorithm provided Domain 5 of the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0 Tool, taking into account results reported in the ClinicalTrials.gov record and all publications associated with its NCT number.



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Section 2.2
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Section 1
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Section 1
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Section 2
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Section 2
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Supplementary materials
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Section 2
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Section 2
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Section 2
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Section 2
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Section 2
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Section 2
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Section 2
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Section 2
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Section 2
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Section 2
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Section 2

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.13.24304104>; this version posted March 15, 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](#).



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Figure 1
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Supplementary materials
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Supplementary materials
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Supplementary materials
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Section 3
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Section 3
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Section 3
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Section 3
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Section 4
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Section 4
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Section 4
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Section 4
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Abstract
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Abstract
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	Logged in preregistration record
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Funding statement
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Conflicts of interest

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.13.24304104>; this version posted March 15, 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](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			statement
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Supplementary materials

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.13.24304104>; this version posted March 15, 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](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).