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Abstract

Background: We and others have shown a significant proportion of interventional trials registered on ClinicalTrials.gov have their primary outcomes altered after the listed study start and completion dates. The objectives of this study were to investigate whether changes made to primary outcomes are associated with the likelihood of reporting a statistically significant primary outcome on ClinicalTrials.gov.

Methods: A cross-sectional analysis of all interventional clinical trials registered on ClinicalTrials.gov as of 20 November 2014 was performed. The main outcome was any change made to the initially listed primary outcome and the time of the change in relation to the trial start and end date.

Findings: 13,238 completed interventional trials were registered with ClinicalTrials.gov that also had study results posted on the website. 2555 (19.3%) had one or more statistically significant primary outcomes. Statistical analysis showed that registration year, funding source and primary outcome change after trial completion were associated with reporting a statistically significant primary outcome.

Conclusions: Funding source and primary outcome change after trial completion are associated with a statistically significant primary outcome report on clinicaltrials.gov.
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### Introduction

Clinical trials provide the principal method with which to assess the effectiveness of therapeutic strategies\(^1\). An important principle in the good conduct of clinical trials is that a summary of the trial protocol, with a pre-defined primary outcome, should be freely available before the study commences\(^1\). In February 2000, the United States (US) Food and Drug Administration (FDA) created an online clinical trials registry named ClinicalTrials.gov\(^2\). We and others have shown a significant proportion of interventional trials registered on ClinicalTrials.gov have their primary outcomes altered after the listed study start and completion dates\(^3,4\). In this extended analysis, we sought to investigate whether changes made to primary outcomes are associated with the likelihood of reporting a statistically significant primary outcome on ClinicalTrials.gov.

### Methods

We used R\((http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/rclinicaltrials/vignettes/basics.html)\) to download data from all completed interventional clinical studies registered with ClinicalTrials.gov as of 20th November 2014, as previously described\(^5\). New to this study, we also downloaded data concerning study results for these trials; specifically the ‘p value’ fields from the ‘study results’ tab for primary outcomes.

Changes in primary outcomes were defined as previously described\(^5\). A trial was classified as not having a primary outcome changed if the original primary outcome was listed as ‘same as current’. Probable funding source was derived using the algorithm previously described\(^3\). A statistically significant primary outcome was defined as a trial having a P value less than 0.05. 1=yes; 0=no; blank=no info in all columns except “studyphase” and “sponsortype (0=public; 1=industry; 2=mixed). pom: primary outcome measure; sig: significance.

As of 20 November 2014, 13,238 completed interventional trials were registered with ClinicalTrials.gov that also had study results posted on the website. The trials were registered between 1999 and 2014 and 2555 (19.3%) had one or more statistically significant primary outcomes. There were 3934 (29.7%) trials classified as non-industry funded, 1569 (11.9%) as mixed and 7735 (58.4%) as industry funded. 12632 (95.4%) trials had a change in the primary outcome reported at initial registration; 12243 (92.5%) of these occurred after the trial completion date.

Statistical analysis showed that registration year, funding source and primary outcome change after trial completion were associated with the reporting a statistically significant primary outcome (Table 1). Mixed funding and increased year of registration (i.e. more recent calendar time) were associated with a decreased odds of reporting a statistically significant primary outcome. A primary outcome change and industry funding were associated with an increased odds of reporting a statistically significant primary outcome. We identified 123 trials that had inferiority in the title. Removing these studies from the analysis did not materially change the results.

### Results

As of 20 November 2014, 13,238 completed interventional trials were registered with ClinicalTrials.gov that also had study results posted on the website. The trials were registered between 1999 and 2014 and 2555 (19.3%) had one or more statistically significant primary outcomes. There were 3934 (29.7%) trials classified as non-industry funded, 1569 (11.9%) as mixed and 7735 (58.4%) as industry funded. 12632 (95.4%) trials had a change in the primary outcome reported at initial registration; 12243 (92.5%) of these occurred after the trial completion date.

Statistical analysis showed that registration year, funding source and primary outcome change after trial completion were associated with the reporting a statistically significant primary outcome (Table 1). Mixed funding and increased year of registration (i.e. more recent calendar time) were associated with a decreased odds of reporting a statistically significant primary outcome. A primary outcome change and industry funding were associated with an increased odds of reporting a statistically significant primary outcome. We identified 123 trials that had inferiority in the title. Removing these studies from the analysis did not materially change the results.

When including study phase in the analysis (10633 studies with study phase data available), mixed funding and registration year became non-significant.

### Table 1. Association of funding status and primary outcome change after trial completion with reporting a statistically significant primary outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Odds Ratio (95% confidence interval)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed funding</td>
<td>0.79 (0.67–0.94)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry funding</td>
<td>1.39 (1.25–1.54)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No primary outcome change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary outcome change</td>
<td>1.53 (1.12–2.10)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration year (per additional year)</td>
<td>0.97 (0.95–0.99)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

1. An important principle in the good conduct of clinical trials is that a summary of the trial protocol, with a pre-defined primary outcome, should be freely available before the study commences.
2. ClinicalTrials.gov
3. Mixed funding and increased year of registration (i.e. more recent calendar time) were associated with a decreased odds of reporting a statistically significant primary outcome.
4. A primary outcome change and industry funding were associated with an increased odds of reporting a statistically significant primary outcome.
5. We identified 123 trials that had inferiority in the title. Removing these studies from the analysis did not materially change the results.
Conclusions
We found that the reporting of statistically significant outcomes on ClinicalTrials.gov was more likely for trials with primary outcomes that had been changed and also those funded by industry. Previous studies have documented these associations\textsuperscript{5,6}, and we confirm these using ClinicalTrials.gov data. There are limitations to our analyses: we have not investigated in any detail the nature of the primary outcome change and the potential effect this would have on the statistical analysis/outcomes. As discussed previously\textsuperscript{1}, some primary outcome changes that we have identified may be typographical/semantic and may not reflect actual changes to the nature of the outcome. We also did not look specifically to see whether a changed primary outcome was the one with a statistically significant finding, just whether a statistically significant finding was found for any primary outcome for the study. The vast majority of studies with results reported on ClinicalTrials.gov had a primary outcome change. This suggests that these trials are ones where the registrations have more diligent data updating. Nevertheless, this should be seen in equal measure for trials with and without statistically significant primary outcomes. In summary, funding source and primary outcome changes are associated with the reporting of statistically significant primary outcomes on ClinicalTrials.gov.
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Ramagopalan and colleagues have expanded on their previous work to assess the relationship between changes in the primary endpoint on clinicaltrials.gov and both funding source and a “positive” trial result. The authors found that changes to the primary listed endpoint were associated with both industry funding and with a positive outcome.

Their sample included completed interventional clinical trials listed on clinicaltrials.gov. They defined trials as having a positive result if they had a listed p-value <0.05. This may be problematic since it appears that their sample included non-inferiority trials (though it is not clear how many) and for these trials a non-significant p-value may indicate a “positive” (or at least non-inferior) result. Since there have been growing numbers of non-inferiority trials published in recent years, this may be a substantial issue. The authors may want to consider identifying non-inferiority trials and considering their results differently, or at least reporting the prevalence of non-inferiority trials if possible.

Aside from this methodologic weakness the other methods are rather straightforward and clear. However, the authors found that 95.4% of trials had changed the primary outcome at some point during the registration period. In contrast, in their previous work the same authors found that 32% of trials registered with clinicaltrials.gov had changed the primary endpoint. The reason for this dramatic difference is not clear, and the authors do acknowledge that the vast majority of studies changed their primary endpoint.
and that many of the changes may have been trivial. Further, in spite of this surprising finding the authors still found significant associations. However, the near-total prevalence of changes to the primary endpoint certainly suggests that changing a primary endpoint in the registry is highly routine and likely does not reflect fundamental change to the study. This weakens the relevance of the findings.
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