SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES AND TABLES

Supplementary Figure 1. Summary of the results of the risk of bias assessments.



Halewin 2020 Image in the image in th		D1	D2	Risk of bias	D4	Overall		D1	D2	Risk of bia	s D4	Overall
Nakaki Al2111 S <	Adewumi 2020	+	+	X	+	X	Sherry 2020	+	+	X	+	X
Adverse 2020 Image: 201 Image: 201<	Alsheikh-Ali 2011	X	-	+	X	X	Siebert 2020	+	+	+	+	+
Burell 201 B	Anderson 2020	+	+	X	+	X	Smith 2020	+	+	×	+	X
Concurso Concurso <td< td=""><td>Bonetti 2021</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>X</td><td>Sumner 2020</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>+</td><td>X</td><td>X</td></td<>	Bonetti 2021	+	-	+	+	X	Sumner 2020	+	-	+	X	X
Catarizza 2000 O	Cenci 2020	+	-	X	X	X	Thelwall 2020	+	-	+	+	X
Decisive 2021 O <tho< th=""> O O <tho< th=""> <th< td=""><td>Colavizza 2020</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>X</td><td>X</td><td>X</td><td>Vassar 2019</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>X</td><td>+</td><td>X</td></th<></tho<></tho<>	Colavizza 2020	+	-	X	X	X	Vassar 2019	+	-	X	+	X
Definic 200 O <td< td=""><td>Danchev 2021</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>X</td><td>+</td><td>X</td><td>Wallach 2018</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>X</td><td>×</td><td>X</td></td<>	Danchev 2021	+	-	X	+	X	Wallach 2018	+	+	X	×	X
Evene 2019 •	DeBlanc 2020	+	-	X	X	X	Walters 2019	+	+	X	+	X
Pedere 2019 O O O O O O O O Pade 2019 O	Evans 2019	+	+	X	+	X	Wicherts 2017	+	-	X		X
Flade 2019a Image: Construction of the c	Federer 2018	+	•	X	X	X	Witwer 2013	+	-	X	X	X
Pade 2019 •	Fladie 2019a	+	+	X	+	X	Womack 2015	+	-	X	X	X
Adaelica 2019 O <	Fladie 2019b	+	+	X	+	X	Wright 2020	+	+	X	+	X
Gkouras 2020 G <t< td=""><td>Gabelica 2019</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>X</td><td>+</td><td>X</td><td>Anderson 2019</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>X</td><td>+</td><td>X</td></t<>	Gabelica 2019	+	-	X	+	X	Anderson 2019	+	+	X	+	X
Cormin 2020 • <td< td=""><td>Gkiouras 2020</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>X</td><td>+</td><td>X</td><td>Ascha 2022</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>X</td><td>+</td><td>X</td></td<>	Gkiouras 2020	+	-	X	+	X	Ascha 2022	+	+	X	+	X
Grant 2018 0	Gorman 2020		-	+	X	X	Bergeat 2022	X	+	X	+	X
Graying 200 G <td< td=""><td>Grant 2018</td><td>•</td><td>-</td><td>X</td><td>+</td><td>×</td><td>Borghi 2022</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>×</td><td>+</td><td>X</td></td<>	Grant 2018	•	-	X	+	×	Borghi 2022	+	+	×	+	X
Hanson 2020 Image: Constraint of the second sec	Grayling 2020	•	-	+	X	X	Collins 2022	+	-	×	×	
Hardwicka 2021 Herington 2022 Herington 2021 Herin	Hanson 2020		-	×	X	X	Duan 2022	+	-	×	+	
Heliwelf 2020a Image: Construction of the second secon	Hardwicke 2021	•	(+	+	+	Errington 2021	X	(+	+	
Ioanndis 2007 Image: Construction of the second of the	Helliwell 2020a	•	-	×	X	X	Gabelica 2022	+	-	X	X	
Ioannidis 2008 •	Ioannidis 2007	•	-	×	+	×	Hamilton 2022	+	+	+	×	
Iqbal 2016 Image: Constraint of the co	Ioannidis 2008	•	-	X	+	X	Hardwicke 2018	+	-	+	x	
Jansen 2020 • <td< td=""><td>lqbal 2016</td><td>•</td><td>(</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>Heckerman 2022</td><td>+</td><td>(</td><td>X</td><td>+</td><td></td></td<>	lqbal 2016	•	(+	+	+	Heckerman 2022	+	(X	+	
Johnson 2018 O Image 202	Janssen 2020	•	-				Heller 2019	+	-	x	-	-
Juhnson 2019 1 0 0 <t< td=""><td>Johnson 2018</td><td></td><td>-</td><td>x</td><td>x</td><td>x</td><td>Huang 2022</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>x</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></t<>	Johnson 2018		-	x	x	x	Huang 2022	+	-	x	-	-
Jurburg 2020 + - & & & + <t< td=""><td>Johnson 2019</td><td>•</td><td>(</td><td>x</td><td>+</td><td>Ň</td><td>Hughes 2022</td><td>+</td><td></td><td>x</td><td>(</td><td></td></t<>	Johnson 2019	•	(x	+	Ň	Hughes 2022	+		x	(
Kaufmann 2019 Image: Constraint of the second s	Jurburg 2020		-	x		x	Jalali 2020	X	-	x	+	
Kemper 2020 Image: Constraint of the second of the sec	Kaufmann 2019	Ĥ	-	X	x	X	Johnson 2021	+		x	Ŧ	x
Kobres 2019 • <td< td=""><td>Kemper 2020</td><td></td><td>-</td><td>x</td><td>x</td><td>Ň</td><td>Kirouac 2019</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>+</td><td>x</td><td>x</td></td<>	Kemper 2020		-	x	x	Ň	Kirouac 2019	+	-	+	x	x
López-Nicolás 2021 1 - 8 1 8 1 1 0 8 8 1 1 0 8 8 1 1 0 8 8 8 1 1 0 8 8 8 1 1 0 8	Kobres 2019	A	-	X	x	x	Littmann 2020	+	-	x	Ŧ	Ř
McGuinness 2021 Image: Constraint of the constraint of t	López-Nicolás 2021	+	-	X	+	X	Louderback 2022	+	+	X	X	X
Mila 2012 • • S • • Myakawa 2020 • • S • S Naudet 2018 •	McGuinness 2021	•	+	+	+	+	Meyer 2021	+	-	x	x	X
Naudel 2018 + + * + * + * + * + * <th< td=""><td>Milia 2012</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>X</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>Miyakawa 2020</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>X</td><td></td><td>X</td></th<>	Milia 2012	+	-	X	-	-	Miyakawa 2020	+	-	X		X
Noor 2006 + - S S Munro 2021 - S S Nutu 2017 + + S S S Norris 2022 + + S S S Okonya 2020 + + S + S S S Norris 2022 + + S	Naudet 2018	+	+	X	+	X	Munkholm 2019	+	+	X	+	X
Nutu 2017 Image: Constraint of the second secon	Noor 2006	•	-	×	X	X	Munro 2021	+	-	×	+	
Okonya 2020 Image: Constraint of the c	Nutu 2017	•	+	×	×	×	Norris 2022	+	+	×	+	X
Papageorgiou 2019 • • •	Okonya 2020	•	+	X	+	X	Norris 2021	+	+	×	+	X
Pellen 2021 Image: Constraint of the second sec	Papageorgiou 2019	•	+	X	+	X	Nuijten 2017	+	+	+	+	+
Piwowar 2007 • <t< td=""><td>Pellen 2021</td><td>•</td><td>+</td><td>×</td><td>+</td><td>×</td><td>Page 2017</td><td>+</td><td>×</td><td>×</td><td>×</td><td></td></t<>	Pellen 2021	•	+	×	+	×	Page 2017	+	×	×	×	
Piwowar 2010a • • •	Piwowar 2007	•	-	+	-	-	Page 2022	+	+	+	+	+
Rauh 2020 Image: Constraint of the second secon	Piwowar 2010a	•	<u> </u>	+	<u> </u>	-	Park 2022	+	-	+	+	X
Rauh 2022 Image: Constraint of the second secon	Rauh 2020	•	+	X	+	X	Rauh 2021	+	+	×	+	X
Reidpath 2001 - <	Rauh 2022	•	+	X	+	X	Read 2021	+	+	X	X	X
Ridel 2020 - - 8	Reidpath 2001	•	-	X	Ō	X	Rhee 2022	+	-	X	+	X
Rowhani-Farid 2016 - Image: Constraint of the state of the st	Riedel 2020	•	-	X	X	X	Rousi 2022	+	•	X	×	X
Rowhani-Farid 2018 -	Rowhani-Farid 2016	•	•	X	×	X	Schultz 2022	+	+	+	+	+
Rufiange 2019 Image: Constraint of the second s	Rowhani-Farid 2018	Ŧ	ē	×	×	×	Sofi-Mahmudi 2022	+	+	×	Ň	
Sarker 2015 • <th< td=""><td>Rufiange 2019</td><td>×</td><td></td><td>X</td><td>+</td><td>X</td><td>Strcic 2022</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td></th<>	Rufiange 2019	×		X	+	X	Strcic 2022	+	+	+	+	+
Savage 2009 Source Source Source Source Source Uribe 2022 Image: Source Image: Source	Sarker 2015	•		×	-	-	Tedersoo 2021	×	<u> </u>	×	x	X
Seibold 2021 + - + - + - * <t< td=""><td>Savage 2009</td><td>×</td><td>-</td><td>×</td><td>Ŏ</td><td>X</td><td>Uribe 2022</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>×</td><td>X</td><td>X</td></t<>	Savage 2009	×	-	×	Ŏ	X	Uribe 2022	+	+	×	X	X
Serghiou 2021a + + *	Seibold 2021	•	-	+	X	X	Vanpaemal 2015	+	-	×		X
Serghiou 2021b + - + & X Zavalis 2022 + + + X Zavalis d sampling bas	Serghiou 2021a	•	+	X	+	X	Weissgerber 2021	+	-	+		
D1: Risk of sampling bias Judgement	Serghiou 2021b	•	-	+	X	×	Zavalis 2022	+	+	×	x	X
D2: Risk of selective reporting bias		-	-	-	-			D1: Risk of sa D2: Risk of se	mpling bias lective reporting	bias	J	udgement

Supplementary Figure 2. Risk of bias traffic light plot.



Supplementary Figure 3. Proportion of primary articles assessed by eligible meta-research studies flagged as potential duplicates.

Supplementary Figure 4. Declared private data sharing rates since 2016.

									Weight
Study	Source	Coding	ROB	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	(random)
Hardwicke 2021	IPD	Manual	Low	0	49	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.07]	3.2%
Rauh 2022	IPD	Manual	High	0	113		0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.3%
Wright 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	108		0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.2%
Nutu 2017	IPD	Manual	High	1	203	+ +	0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.8%
Ascha 2022	IPD	Manual	High	1	159	· · · ·	0.01	[0.00; 0.03]	4.6%
Hughes 2022	IPD	Manual	High	1	122		0.01	[0.00; 0.04]	4.4%
Anderson 2019	IPD	Manual	High	1	83	- 1 I	0.01	[0.00; 0.07]	3.9%
Okonya 2020	IPD	Manual	High	1	71		0.01	[0.00; 0.08]	3.7%
Wallach 2018	IPD	Manual	High	1	52		0.02	[0.00; 0.10]	3.3%
Johnson 2019	IPD	Manual	High	2	103		0.02	[0.01; 0.07]	4.2%
Adewumi 2020	IPD	Manual	High	3	154		0.02	[0.01; 0.06]	4.6%
Smith 2020	IPD	Manual	High	3	138		0.02	[0.01; 0.06]	4.5%
Johnson 2021	IPD	Manual	High	3	128		0.02	[0.01; 0.07]	4.4%
Anderson 2020	IPD	Manual	High	4	150		0.03	[0.01; 0.07]	4.6%
Rauh 2020	IPD	Manual	High	5	168		0.03	[0.01; 0.07]	4.7%
Evans 2019	IPD	Manual	High	4	133		0.03	[0.01; 0.07]	4.5%
Fladie 2019a	IPD	Manual	High	5	121		0.04	[0.02; 0.09]	4.4%
Sherry 2020	IPD	Manual	High	6	140		0.04	[0.02; 0.09]	4.5%
Rauh 2021	IPD	Manual	High	6	129		0.05	[0.02; 0.10]	4.4%
Serghiou 2021a	IPD	Manual	High	11	207		0.05	[0.03; 0.09]	4.9%
Fladie 2019b	IPD	Manual	High	6	106	•	0.06	[0.03; 0.12]	4.2%
Walters 2019	IPD	Manual	High	10	116	· · · ·	0.09	[0.05; 0.15]	4.3%
Hamilton 2022	IPD	Manual	High	38	305	_	0.12	[0.09; 0.17]	5.1%
Random effects (G	LMM met	hod)			3058	-	0.02	[0.02; 0.04]	
Random effects (H	IKSJ meth	od)				\diamond	0.02	[0.01; 0.04]	100.0%
Prediction interval		-						[0.00; 0.10]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 8$	0%, τ ² < 0.0	1, <i>p</i> < 0.01						_	
						0 0.05 0.1	0.15 0.2		

Supplementary Figure 5. Declared private code sharing rates since 2016.

									Weight
Study	Source	Coding	ROB	Events	Total	Pro	portion	95%-CI	(random)
Adewumi 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	154		0.00	[0.00; 0.02]	5.4%
Evans 2019	IPD	Manual	High	0	133	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.8%
Fladie 2019a	IPD	Manual	High	0	121		0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.4%
Fladie 2019b	IPD	Manual	High	0	106	•	0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	3.9%
Hardwicke 2021	IPD	Manual	Low	0	49		0.00	[0.00; 0.07]	2.0%
Johnson 2019	IPD	Manual	High	0	103	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	0.00	[0.00; 0.04]	3.8%
Okonya 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	72		0.00	[0.00; 0.05]	2.8%
Rauh 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	168	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.02]	5.8%
Rauh 2022	IPD	Manual	High	0	113	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.2%
Smith 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	138	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.9%
Wallach 2018	IPD	Manual	High	0	52	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.07]	2.1%
Walters 2019	IPD	Manual	High	0	116	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.3%
Wright 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	108	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.0%
Anderson 2019	IPD	Manual	High	0	83		0.00	[0.00; 0.04]	3.2%
Ascha 2022	IPD	Manual	High	0	159		0.00	[0.00; 0.02]	5.5%
Hughes 2022	IPD	Manual	High	0	122	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.4%
Johnson 2021	IPD	Manual	High	0	128	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.6%
Rauh 2021	IPD	Manual	High	0	129	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	4.7%
Serghiou 2021a	IPD	Manual	High	1	207		0.00	[0.00; 0.03]	6.8%
Anderson 2020	IPD	Manual	High	1	150		0.01	[0.00; 0.04]	5.3%
Sherry 2020	IPD	Manual	High	1	140		0.01	[0.00; 0.04]	5.0%
Hamilton 2022	IPD	Manual	High	2	274		0.01	[0.00; 0.03]	8.3%
Random effects (GI	LMM meth	nod)			2825	•	0.00	[0.00; 0.00]	
Random effects (HI	<sj meth<="" td=""><td>od)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>þ</td><td>0.00</td><td>[0.00; 0.00]</td><td>100.0%</td></sj>	od)				þ	0.00	[0.00; 0.00]	100.0%
Prediction interval						—	_	[0.00; 0.00]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$	o, τ ² < 0.01	, <i>p</i> = 0.84						-	

0 0.02 0.04 0.06 0.08

8

Supplementary Figure 6. Success rates of private requests for data from published medical research by declaration type.

Study	Journal policy	Data type	Source	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-Cl
Available on request								
Milia 2012	Mixed	Sequence data	IPD	0	1		0.00	[0.00; 0.79]
Bergeat 2022	No policy	Trial data	IPD	0	5		0.00	[0.00; 0.43]
Gabelica 2019	Mixed	Trial data	Paper	1	24	••	0.04	[0.01; 0.20]
Gabelica 2022	Not reported	No restrictions	Author	102	1540		0.07	[0.05; 0.08]
Rowhani–Farid 2016	Share on request	No restrictions	IPD	4	32		0.12	[0.05; 0.28]
Naudet 2018	Share on request	Trial data	IPD	10	23		0.43	[0.26; 0.63]
Tedersoo 2021	Mixed	No restrictions	IPD	2	2		1.00	[0.34; 1.00]
Stodden 2018	No restrictions	Share on request	NA	NA	NA		NA	[NA; NA]
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 83\%$, τ^2	= 0.22, <i>p</i> < 0.01							
No availability statemen	nt							
Naudet 2018	Share on request	Trial data	IPD	0	1	÷	0.00	[0.00; 0.79]
Bergeat 2022	No policy	Trial data	IPD	4	119	*	0.03	[0.01; 0.08]
Reidpath 2001	No policy	No restrictions	Paper	1	29	•	0.03	[0.01; 0.17]
Gabelica 2019	Mixed	Trial data	Paper	23	595	.	0.04	[0.03; 0.06]
Hardwicke 2018	Not reported	No restrictions	IPD	7	73		0.10	[0.05; 0.18]
Savage 2009	Share on request	No restrictions	Paper	1	10		0.10	[0.02; 0.40]
Tedersoo 2021	Mixed	No restrictions	IPD	7	23		0.30	[0.16; 0.51]
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 65\%$, τ^2	= 0.02, <i>p</i> < 0.01							
Stated as not available								
Naudet 2018	Share on request	Trial data	IPD	0	3		0.00	[0.00; 0.56]
Bergeat 2022	No policy	Trial data	IPD	0	6		0.00	[0.00; 0.39]
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 =$	= 0, p = 1.00							- / -
						0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8	3 1	

Supplementary Figure 7. Declared and actual public code sharing rates by journal code sharing policy.

Study	Code type	Source	Events	Total		Proportion	95%–CI
Reported code sharing	: No sharing po	licy					
Hamilton 2022	No restrictions	IPD	4	179	-	0.02	[0.01; 0.06]
Grayling 2020	Methods code	IPD	8	48		0.17	[0.09; 0.30]
Littmann 2020 Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 90\%$, τ^2	No restrictions = 0.02, <i>p</i> < 0.01	IPD	9	53	-	0.17	[0.09; 0.29]
Reported code sharing	: 'Encourage' p	olicy					
Hamilton 2022	No restrictions	ĪPD	3	81	-	0.04	[0.01; 0.10]
Grayling 2020	Methods code	IPD	43	106		0.41	[0.32; 0.50]
Littmann 2020	No restrictions	IPD	16	30		0.53	[0.36; 0.70]
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 97\%$, τ^2	= 0.10, <i>p</i> < 0.01						
Reported code sharing	: Mandatory sha	aring pol	icy				
Hamilton 2022	No restrictions	IPD	1	8		0.12	[0.02; 0.47]
Grayling 2020	Methods code	IPD	28	91		0.31	[0.22; 0.41]
Littmann 2020 Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 81\%$, τ^2	No restrictions $r = 0.04, p < 0.01$	IPD	26	47		0.55	[0.41; 0.69]
Actual code sharing: N	o sharing policy						
Grayling 2020	Methods code	IPD	8	48		0.17	[0.09; 0.30]
Actual code sharing: 'E	ncourage' polic	CV					
Grayling 2020	Methods code	IPD	29	106		0.27	[0.20; 0.37]
Actual code sharing: M	andatory sharir	ng policy					
Grayling 2020	Methods code	IPD	16	91		0.18	[0.11; 0.27]
Kirouac 2019	Model data	IPD	18	22		- 0.82	[0.61; 0.93]
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 97\%$, τ^2	= 0.23, <i>p</i> < 0.01						
						-	
					0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8	31	

Supplementary Figure 8. Association between data sharing and code sharing (actual availability).

			Data sharers Data witholders									Weight
Study	Source	Coding	ROB	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR		95%-CI	(random)
Anderson 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	8	2	224	<	→ 0.33	[0.00;	12970.39]	2.0%
Smith 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	4	1	241	< +	→ 0.50	[0.00;	2348130.65]	1.0%
Rauh 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	2	1	269	< + i	→ 0.50	[0.00; 403	3891717.70]	0.4%
Riedel 2020	IPD	Manual	High	6	72	4	980		20.42	[5.89	; 70.72]	31.3%
Adewumi 2020	IPD	Manual	High	2	12	0	231		41.50	[3.91	440.50]	20.4%
Fladie 2019b	IPD	Manual	High	3	11	1	161		43.91	[4.97	388.12]	22.0%
Louderback 2022	IPD	Manual	High	7	16	0	483		→ 219.31	[27.79;	1730.69]	23.0%
Evans 2019	IPD	Manual	High	0	1	0	194					0.0%
Fladie 2019a	IPD	Manual	High	0	2	0	180					0.0%
Okonya 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	1	0	121					0.0%
Sherry 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	1	0	210					0.0%
Walters 2019	IPD	Manual	High	0	3	0	191					0.0%
Wright 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	1	0	193					0.0%
Anderson 2019	IPD	Manual	High	0	3	0	124					0.0%
Ascha 2022	IPD	Manual	High	0	2	0	201					0.0%
Hughes 2022	IPD	Manual	High	0	6	0	190	1				0.0%
Johnson 2021	IPD	Manual	High	0	2	0	210					0.0%
Bandom offecto		mothod)			147		4402		40.42	[1E 4E	100 201	
Random effects	(HKS.I m	ethod)			147		4403	-	40.42	[12.45]	145 52	100.0%
Prediction interv	(u)							42.00	[0.94:	1879.62]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 =$	$0\%, \tau^2 = 1$	1.57, p = 0.	55						_	L 0.04,	1010.02]	
0.00								01 051 2 5	1000			

Favours data witholders Favours data sharers

Sup	plementary	Figure	9. Declared	public dat	a sharing rates	since 2016 by	y data type.
						•	/ /

Study	Source	Coding	ROB	Events	Total		Proportion	95%–Cl	Weight (random)
No restrictions						I			
Hardwicke 2021	IPD	Manual	Low	0	49	L	0.00	[0.00: 0.07]	3.3%
Sofi-Mahmudi 2022	IPD	Auto	Hiah	0	11		0.00	[0.00: 0.26]	2.0%
Johnson 2019	IPD	Manual	High	1	103	←	0.01	[0.00: 0.05]	3.7%
Nutu 2017	IPD	Manual	High	3	203	+	0.01	[0.01; 0.04]	3.9%
Ascha 2022	IPD	Manual	High	4	159	+-	0.03	[0.01; 0.06]	3.9%
Uribe 2022	IPD	Both	High	197	7456	n	0.03	[0.02; 0.03]	4.1%
Sherry 2020	IPD	Manual	High	4	140	+-	0.03	[0.01; 0.07]	3.8%
Evans 2019	IPD	Manual	High	5	133	+	0.04	[0.02; 0.08]	3.8%
Rauh 2022	IPD	Manual	High	5	113	+-	0.04	[0.02; 0.10]	3.7%
Fladie 2019a	IPD	Manual	High	6	121	+	0.05	[0.02; 0.10]	3.8%
Rauh 2020	IPD	Manual	High	9	168	+	0.05	[0.03; 0.10]	3.9%
Walters 2019	IPD	Manual	High	8	116		0.07	[0.04; 0.13]	3.8%
Serghiou 2021a	IPD	Manual	High	15	206	+	0.07	[0.04; 0.12]	3.9%
Wright 2020	IPD	Manual	High	8	108		0.07	[0.04; 0.14]	3.7%
Serghiou 2021b	IPD	Auto	High	53526	689457	0	0.08	[0.08; 0.08]	4.1%
Jonnson 2021		Manual	High	10	128		0.08	[0.04; 0.14]	3.8%
Hauri 2021		Manual	High	11	129	-	0.09	[0.05; 0.15]	3.8%
Adoutumi 2020		Manual	High	11	122		0.09	[0.05; 0.15]	3.8%
Adewullii 2020		Monual	High	14	104		0.09	[0.05, 0.15]	3.0% 2.6%
Smith 2020		Monual	High	21	120		0.12	[0.07, 0.21]	3.0% 2.0%
Wallach 2018	IPD	Manual	High	21	52		0.15	[0.10, 0.22]	3.0%
Okonya 2020	IPD	Manual	High	13	71		0.15	[0.00, 0.20]	3.5%
Hamilton 2022	IPD	Manual	High	59	305		0.10	[0.11; 0.20]	4.0%
Anderson 2020	IPD	Manual	High	30	150	—	0.10	[0.14: 0.27]	3.8%
Fladie 2019b	IPD	Manual	High	25	106	_ —	0.24	[0 17: 0 33]	3.7%
Kobres 2019	Paper	Manual	High	29	73	_	0.40	[0.29: 0.51]	3.6%
Random effects (GI	LMM met	thod)	5		700054	\diamond	0.07	[0.05: 0.10]	
Random effects (HI	KSJ metł	nod)				\diamond	0.08	[0.05; 0.11]	100.0%
Prediction interval		,						[0.00; 0.30]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 96^{\circ}$	%, $\tau^2 = 0.0$	02, <i>p</i> < 0.0	1						
Review data									
Page 2022	IPD	Manual	Low	33	297	-	0.11	[0.08; 0.15]	54.2%
López-Nicolás 2021	IPD	Manual	High	18	53		0.34	[0.23; 0.47]	45.8%
Random effects (GI	LMM met	thod)			350		0.19	[0.08; 0.39]	
Random effects (H	KSJ meth	nod)					0.21	[0.00; 1.00]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 93^\circ$	%, $\tau^2 = 0.0$	03, <i>p</i> < 0.0	1						
Trial data									
Duan 2022	IPD	Manual	High	0	2		- 0.00	[0.00; 0.66]	3.6%
Papageorgiou 2019	IPD	Manual	High	15	299	*	0.05	[0.03; 0.08]	24.9%
Norris 2022	IPD	Manual	High	5	99	-	0.05	[0.02; 0.11]	23.1%
Norris 2021	IPD	Manual	High	6	100	-	0.06	[0.03; 0.12]	23.1%
Borghi 2022	IPD	Manual	High	37	528	-	0.07	[0.05; 0.10]	25.3%
Random effects (GI	LMM met	thod)			1028	\$	0.06	[0.05; 0.08]	
Random effects (H	KSJ meth	nod)				♦	0.06	[0.04; 0.08]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$	b, $\tau^2 = < 0$.	.01, $p = 0.1$	72					[0.01; 0.14]	
Model date		-							
	חסו	Auto	High	330	1336		0.05	10 23. 0 271	100 0%
Test for subgroup difference	IF D rences (ra	ndom effe	riiyii cts): √ ²	= 229 65	df = 3 (n - 1)	-0.01)	0.25	[0.23, 0.27]	100.0%
lost for subgroup diffe	101000 (Ia		οιο <i>γ</i> . χ ₃	- 223.00,	u = 0 (p <	0 0.2 0.4 0.	6 0.8 1		

Supi	plementary	Figure	10. Actual	public data	sharing rates	since 2016	by data type.
		.					

Study	Source	Coding	ROB	Events	Total			Proportion	95%-CI	Weight (random)
No rostrictions						I		·		. ,
Hardwicko 2021	חסו	Monual	Low	0	40			0.00	0.00.0.071	2 00/
Indiawicke 2021	ורט	Manual	High	0	103	L		0.00	[0.00, 0.07]	3.0% 4.0%
Bauh 2022	חסו	Manual	High	0	113	L		0.00	[0.00, 0.04]	4.0%
Sharry 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	140	Ĺ		0.00	[0.00, 0.03]	4.0%
Wright 2020	IPD	Manual	High	0	108	Ĩ,		0.00	[0.00, 0.00]	4.0%
Rauh 2021	IPD	Manual	High	Ő	129	-		0.00	[0.00, 0.00]	4.0%
Sofi-Mahmudi 2022	IPD	Auto	High	0	11			0.00	[0.00: 0.26]	3.0%
Rauh 2020	IPD	Manual	High	1	168			0.01	[0.00: 0.03]	4.1%
Evans 2019	IPD	Manual	High	1	133	+		0.01	[0.00: 0.04]	4.0%
Johnson 2021	IPD	Manual	High	1	128	+		0.01	[0.00; 0.04]	4.0%
Fladie 2019a	IPD	Manual	High	1	121			0.01	[0.00; 0.05]	4.0%
Ascha 2022	IPD	Manual	High	2	159	+		0.01	[0.00; 0.04]	4.1%
Okonya 2020	IPD	Manual	High	1	72	-		0.01	[0.00; 0.07]	3.9%
Smith 2020	IPD	Manual	High	2	138	-		0.01	[0.00; 0.05]	4.0%
Uribe 2022	IPD	Both	High	112	7506	0		0.01	[0.01; 0.02]	4.2%
Walters 2019	IPD	Manual	High	2	116	+		0.02	[0.00; 0.06]	4.0%
Hughes 2022	IPD	Manual	High	3	122			0.02	[0.01; 0.07]	4.0%
Louderback 2022	IPD	Manual	High	16	499	+		0.03	[0.02; 0.05]	4.1%
Anderson 2019	IPD	Manual	High	3	83	+		0.04	[0.01; 0.10]	4.0%
Anderson 2020	IPD	Manual	High	6	150	+		0.04	[0.02; 0.08]	4.1%
Serghiou 2021a	IPD	Manual	High	10	207	-		0.05	[0.03; 0.09]	4.1%
Adewumi 2020	IPD	Manual	High	8	154			0.05	[0.03; 0.10]	4.1%
Fladie 2019b	IPD	Manual	High	7	106			0.07	[0.03; 0.13]	4.0%
Riedel 2020	IPD	Manual	High	72	1052	+		0.07	[0.05; 0.09]	4.2%
Hamilton 2022	IPD	Manual	High	49	306		-	0.16	[0.12; 0.21]	4.1%
Random effects (GI		(nod)			11873	0		0.02	[0.01; 0.03]	100.0%
Random effects (HI	KSJ metr	100)				¢		0.02	[0.01; 0.03]	100.0%
Hotorogonaity: $l^2 = 00$	0/ =2 = =1	0.01 p < 0	0.1						[0.00; 0.11]	
Theterogeneity. T = 90	/o, t = < t	5.01, <i>p</i> < 0	.01							
Review data						_				
Page 2022	IPD	Manual	Low	12	297			0.04	[0.02; 0.07]	51.1%
Bonetti 2021	IPD	Manual	High	8	75	-	_	0.11	[0.06; 0.20]	48.9%
Random effects (GI	LMM met	hod)			372	\diamond		0.06	[0.03; 0.12]	
Random effects (HI	KSJ meti	10d)				<			[0.00; 0.77]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 75^{\circ}$	%, τ [⊥] = < 0	0.01, p = 0	.04							
Trial data										
Duan 2022	IPD	Manual	High	0	36			0.00	[0.00; 0.10]	31.7%
Norris 2022	IPD	Manual	High	1	99	÷		0.01	[0.00; 0.06]	34.1%
Norris 2021	IPD	Manual	High	2	100	+		0.02	[0.01; 0.07]	34.2%
Random effects (Gl	LMM met	thod)			235	\diamond		0.01	[0.00; 0.04]	
Random effects (HI	KSJ metł	10d)						0.01	[0.00; 0.06]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 6\%$	$t_{0}, \tau^{2} = < 0.$	01, $p = 0.3$	34							
Sequence data										
Huang 2022	IPD	Unclear	Unclear	40	93			0.43	[0.33; 0.53]	34.0%
Rhee 2022	IPD	Manual	High	158	321			0.49	[0.44; 0.55]	35.1%
Meyer 2021a	IPD	Manual	High	24	30			• 0.80	[0.63; 0.90]	30.9%
Random effects (Gl	LMM met	thod)			444			0.56	[0.38; 0.73]	
Random effects (HI	KSJ meth	nod)				-		0.57	[0.12; 0.96]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 86$	%, $\tau^2 = 0.0$	04, <i>p</i> < 0.0	1				, <u>,</u> ,			
lest for subgroup diffe	rences (ra	ndom effec	$\chi_3^2 = 4$	1.43, df =	З (<i>p</i> < 0.	.01) '		2 0 9		
						υ	J.Z U.4 U.6	J U.O		

Supplementary Figure 11. Data and code sharing rates among studies investigating COVID-19.

									-	Weight
Study	Data type	Source	Coding	Events	Total		Pi	roportion	95%-CI	(random)
Reported data sharin	g rates									
Sofi-Mahmudi 2022	No restrictions	IPD	Auto	0	11			0.00	[0.00; 0.26]	23.0%
Weissgerber 2021	No restrictions	IPD	Auto	587	4243			0.14	[0.13; 0.15]	38.5%
Collins 2022	No restrictions	IPD	Auto	655	3550			0.18	[0.17; 0.20]	38.5%
Random effects (BGL Random effects (HKS Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$	SJ method) $\tau^2 = 0.04, p < 0.0$	1			7804			0.16 0.09	[0.13; 0.19] [0.00; 0.57]	 100.0%
Actual data sharing r	ates	חפו	Auto	0	11			0.00	10 00: 0 261	01 7%
Streic 2022	No restrictions	IPD	Manual	123	888			0.00	[0.00, 0.20]	24.7%
Gkiouras 2020	No restrictions	IPD	Manual	11	35			0.14	[0.12, 0.10]	34.2%
Random effects (BGL	_MM method)		manaa		934			0.16	[0.09; 0.29]	
Random effects (HKS Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 84\%$	3J method) , τ ² = 0.07, <i>p</i> < 0.0	1						- 0.11	[0.00; 0.76]	100.0%
Reported code sharin	ng rates									
Sofi-Mahmudi 2022	No restrictions	IPD	Auto	0	11			0.00	[0.00; 0.26]	22.9%
Weissgerber 2021	No restrictions	IPD	Auto	757	5667			0.13	[0.12; 0.14]	38.5%
Collins 2022	No restrictions	IPD	Auto	654	4407			0.15	[0.14; 0.16]	38.5%
Random effects (BGL	Limethod)				10065	V		0.14	[0.13, 0.15]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 82\%$	$, \tau^2 = 0.03, p < 0.0$	1						0.05	[0.00, 0.00]	100.078
Actual code sharing	rates	חפו	Manual	16	999	+		0.02	[0 01 · 0 03]	54 6%
Gkiouras 2020	No restrictions	Paner	Manual	10	35			0.02	[0.01, 0.03]	04.0% 45.4%
Bandom effects (BGL	MM method)	i upci	Wandai		923	0		0.02	[0.01: 0.03]	
Random effects (HKS) Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$,	SJ method) $\tau^2 = < 0.01, p = 0.6$	68				\diamond		0.02	[0.00; 0.05]	100.0%
						0 0.2 0	0.4 0.6	0.8		

Supplementary Table 1. Deviations from the original review protocol.

Original plan	Revised plan	Reason for modification
Please refer to Table 1 in the review protocol (<u>https://f1000research.com/arti</u> <u>cles/10-491/v2 - T1</u>).	Two extra options were added to the 'risk of sampling bias' ("Sampled whole population of interest") and 'risk of article selection bias' categories ("No article screening performed"). Both items were considered low risk of bias.	The two options were added to account for meta-research articles that assessed all articles within a population of interest (e.g., assessed all articles indexed in PubMed Central a la Serghiou et al. (2021) [14]) or did not perform article screening respectively.
Prevalence rates will be transformed using the <u>Freeman-</u> <u>Tukey double arcsine</u> <u>transformation</u> and combined using standard inverse variance methods.	We pooled prevalence estimates by first stabilising the variances of the raw proportions using <u>arcsine square</u> <u>root transformations</u> , then applied random-effects models using the Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman method.	Due to large sample size imbalances between included studies, and the negative influence such skewed ranges of sample sizes can have on the harmonic mean which is used to back-transform meta-analytic estimates transformed with the Freeman-Tukey double arcsine method [Schwarzer 2019], we decided to use the arcsine square root transformation instead.
We did not plan to conduct sensitivity analyses to investigate differences in <u>pooled risk ratios</u> when using generalized linear mixed models.	We examined differences in <u>pooled</u> <u>risk ratios</u> when using generalised linear mixed models to aggregate findings [32,33].	We decided post-hoc to check the robustness of the meta-analyses of risk ratios when using bivariate generalised linear mixed effects models as proposed by Chu et al. (2012) [33]. Like the meta-analyses of proportions, we chose this method as it has been specifically recommended in situations when the event of interest is rare, and individual study sample sizes are small and circumvent the need to add arbitrary continuity corrections allowing the analysis of both single-zero and double-zero events [27; 165].
We did not plan to collect information on <u>data type</u> , nor perform a subgroup analysis to explore its effects on the study's findings.	We collected data on data type and conducted a sub-group analysis to investigate whether prevalence estimates of public data sharing differed depending on <u>the data type</u> , or	We decided to collect data on data type and perform a subgroup analysis exploring its effects on reported findings based on feedback from colleagues on the protocol.

Supplementary Table 1 continued. Deviations from the original review protocol.
--

Original plan	Revised plan	Reason for modification
We did not plan to conduct sensitivity analyses to investigate differences in pooled prevalence rates when <u>excluding studies that used</u> <u>automated coding strategies</u> .	We conducted sensitivity analyses to investigate differences in pooled prevalence rates when <u>excluding</u> <u>studies that used automated coding</u> <u>strategies</u> .	We decided to include this sensitivity analysis to evaluate whether pooled prevalence rates deviated when the results of meta-research studies which used automated coding strategies (methods have been shown to have inferior accuracy, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) when compared to manual coding strategies) were removed.
We originally planned to perform subgroup analyses to explore differences in public data sharing frequencies between primary articles reporting the results of <u>clinical</u> <u>trials or not</u> , as well as articles reporting the results of studies using <u>human participants versus</u> <u>not</u> .	We conducted analyses of association for these outcomes rather than a subgroup analysis comparing pooled proportions between groups. Consequently, these two subgroup analyses have been included as secondary outcomes.	We changed the analysis plan for these outcomes due to the availability of data that allowed us to directly explore associations between both of these factors (i.e. calculation of risk ratios)
We originally planned to perform a subgroup analysis to explore differences in public data sharing frequencies between primary articles studying <u>COVID-19 or not</u> .	We conducted a sensitivity analysis to examine how data sharing frequencies changed when analyses were restricted to meta-research studies examining COVID-19.	We decided not to compare data and code sharing rates between COVID and non-COVID research because of the large amount of methodological heterogeneity in meta-research studies examining non-COVID research.

Supplementary Table 2. Risk of bias criteria.

Item	Low risk of bias	High risk of bias	Unclear risk of bias
Risk of sampling bias	The meta-research study evaluated a random sample of primary articles or sampled the entire population of interest.	The meta-research study included a non- or pseudorandom sample of primary articles.	The sampling frame for the sample of primary articles was unclear.
Risk of selective reporting bias	Eligible outcomes and associations reported in the protocol for the meta-research study were fully reported in the results section of the publication.	Not all eligible outcomes and associations reported in the protocol for the meta- research study were reported in the results section of the publication.	It was unclear if all eligible outcomes and associations were fully reported in the results section of the publication (e.g., because a study protocol for the meta- research study was unavailable).
Risk of article selection bias	Details about which studies were excluded from the study and why have been shared and match the criteria described in the methods, or no article screening needed to be performed (e.g., because all articles identified by a literature search were analysed)	Details about which studies were excluded and why were not reported.	Details about the eligibility criteria and study selection process was unclear.
Risk of errors in the accuracy of reported estimates	All outcome data were either manually coded by at least two people independently in parallel or coded by one person and checked in full by another.	Outcome data were manually coded by one researcher, an automated algorithm, or according to another methodology different from that outlined in the Low Risk category.	The method used to extract data from the included primary studies was unclear.

Study	Year	Discipline	Journals examined	Primary study date range	Data types	Sample size	IPD available	Exclusion reason
Helliwell 2020b	2020	COVID-19, MERS	Multiple	2019-2020, 2018-2019	Any	398 55	Partial	Reported prevalence estimates could not be coded in accordance with the study codebook
Hemkens 2016	2016	General Medical	Multiple	2012	Clinical data	124	No	Reported prevalence estimates could not be coded in accordance with the study codebook
Jiao 2022	2022	Multidisciplinary	PLOS One	2014-2020	Any	127,935*	No	Prevalence estimates not reported separately for medical articles
McDonald 2017	2017	General Medical	BMJ	2015-2017	Clinical data	237	Partial	Reported prevalence estimates could not be coded in accordance with the study codebook
Ramke 2018	2018	Ophthalmology	Multiple	2000-2014	Clinical data	153	No	Prevalence estimates not reported
Rustici 2021	2021	Biomedicine	Multiple	2009-2013, 2012	RNA-Seq, Microarray	1,114*, 347*	No	Prevalence estimates not reported separately for medical articles
Stodden 2018	2018	Multidisciplinary	Science	2009-2010	Any	204*	No	Reported prevalence estimates could not be coded in accordance with the study codebook and are also not reported separately for medical articles
Towse 202	2020	Clinical Psychology	Multiple	2014-2017	Any	1,900*	Partial	Prevalence estimates not reported separately for medical articles
Zhao 2017	2017	Multidisciplinary	PLOS One	2014-2015	Any	50*	No	Prevalence estimates not reported separately for medical articles

Supplementary Table 3. Findings of eligible meta-research studies where summary data were not available for the review (N=9).

S	Supplementary Table 4. Meta-regression results.

	Model Coefficients					Level 3 (Between-study)			Level 2 (Within-study)					
	Intercept	SE	β*	SE	95% CI	p	τ^2	l ²	k	τ^2	l ²	0	AIC	BIC
Declared data sharing														
- Three-level (All)	-18.4290	1.4417	0.0093	0.0007	0.0078-0.0107	<0.0001	0.0124	90.66%	27	0.0013	9.11%	155	-278.92	-266.80
- Three-level (Manual)	-34.0273	10.1446	0.0170	0.0050	0.0070-0.0270	0.0010	0.0117	55.06%	25	0.0032	15.05%	118	-149.50	-138.48
- Two-level (All)	-17.9399	2.4845	0.0090	0.0012	0.0066-0.0115	<0.0001	0.0084	99.62%	155	-	-	-	-195.29	-186.20
- Two-level (Manual)	-42.7527	8.9317	0.0213	0.0044	0.0126-0.0301	<0.0001	0.0132	67.64%	118	-	-	-	-114.37	-106.10
Actual data sharing														
- Three-level (All)	-9.0520	6.5014	0.0045	0.0032	-0.0018-0.0109	0.1615	0.0088	76.38%	26	0.0002	2.06%	125	-230.02	-218.77
- Three-level (Manual)	-16.0684	8.5307	0.0080	0.0042	-0.0004-0.0164	0.0604	0.0087	61.08%	25	0.0004	2.54%	119	-205.38	-194.33
- Two-level (All)	-20.4047	6.9122	0.0102	0.0034	0.0034-0.0170	0.0036	0.0057	69.65%	125	-	-	-	-197.37	-188.93
- Two-level (Manual)	-21.0863	7.5362	0.0105	0.0037	0.0031-0.0179	0.0058	0.0065	55.57%	119	-	-	-	-178.70	-170.42
Declared code sharing														
- Three-level (All)	-7.1880	0.6262	0.0036	0.0003	0.0030-0.0042	<0.0001	0.0010	82.70%	24	0.0002	15.03%	139	-428.82	-417.14
- Three-level (Manual)	-1.5145	10.6961	0.0008	0.0053	-0.0098-0.0113	0.8852	0.0014	18.54%	22	0.0000	0%	102	-236.20	-225.78
- Two-level (All)	-4.4004	0.7886	0.0022	0.0004	0.0014-0.0030	<0.0001	0.0005	94.92%	139	-	-	-	-400.39	-391.63
- Two-level (Manual)	-5.4033	11.2150	0.0027	0.0056	-0.0083-0.0137	0.6290	0.0009	13.19%	102	-	-	-	-235.61	-227.80
Actual code sharing														
- Three-level (All)	-5.1997	10.5109	0.0026	0.0052	-0.0078-0.0129	0.6199	0.0009	15.15%	21	0.0000	0%	99	-242.96	-232.66
- Three-level (Manual)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
- Two-level (All)	-11.2948	10.6347	0.0056	0.0053	-0.0048-0.0161	0.2894	0.0006	10.26%	99	-	-	-	-241.18	-233.45
- Two-level (Manual)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	-	-	NA	NA

	Declared public sharing					Actual public sharing					
	RR	95% CI	95% PI	k	²	RR	95% CI	95% PI	k	l ²	
Association between data and code sharing											
- HKSJ method	8.03	2.86-22.53	0.33-194.43	12	32%	42.05	12.15-145.52	0.94-1879.62	7	0%	
- BGLMM method (SZC)	7.88	2.44-18.01	NA	12	NA	40.42	15.45-120.39	NA	7	NA	
- BGLMM method (DZC)	10.51	3.00-18.01	NA	23	NA	52.85	9.46-132.52	NA	17	NA	
- Low ROB	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
- FAIR studies	11.84	0-1.33x10 ⁷	NA	2	82%	-	-	-	-	-	
- IPD only	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
- Manual coding	4.52	1.38-14.86	0.20-101.05	10	0%	-	-	-	-	-	
Trial versus non-trial											
- HKSJ method	0.69	0.45-1.07	0.12-4.13	23	0%	0.96	0.53-1.72	0.15-5.95	19	0%	
- BGLMM method (SZC)	0.55	0.35-0.77	NA	23	NA	0.67	0.26-1.39	NA	19	NA	
- BGLMM method (DZC)	0.56	0.37-0.79	NA	25	NA	0.69	0.27-1.52	NA	24	NA	
Human versus non-human											
- HKSJ method	0.65	0.42-0.99	0.12-3.61	19	57%	0.44	0.24-0.81	0.05-3.57	16	28%	
- BGLMM method (SZC)	0.69	0.46-1.01	NA	19	NA	0.58	0.29-1.00	NA	16	NA	
- BGLMM method (DZC)	0.69	0.48-1.00	NA	20	NA	0.59	0.30-0.97	NA	20	NA	
SZC – Did not include studies with no events in both groups in analyses. DZC – Included studies with no events in both groups in analyses											

Supplementary Table 5. Sensitivity analyses for secondary outcomes and subgroup analyses.