Qeios

Peer Review

# Review of: "Integrity of Clinical RCTs: Safeguarding Trust, Evidence, and Patient Welfare"

**Joel Lexchin**[1,2]

1. Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Canada; 2. School of Health Policy and Management, York University, Toronto, Canada

This review provides a comprehensive overview of how to maintain integrity in all aspects of clinical trials, but there are some further issues that the author needs to comment on:

1. A 2017 Cochrane review by Lundh et al found that clinical trials sponsored by pharmaceutical companies were much more likely to produce positive results and positive conclusions compared to trials with any other source of sponsorship. The authors of the review commented that this difference could not be explained through traditional sources of bias.
2. All conflicts of interest of clinical investigators need to be publicly reported in detail, whether or not the investigators consider them relevant to the particular study in question. In addition, clinical trials need to publicly report sources of funding.
3. The authors need to comment on trials being stopped for commercial reasons, e.g., a decision that the market for the treatment is too small.
4. Data from multicentre trials should be available for each individual centre, and the reasons why any centre reported results that significantly deviate from the overall findings must be explained.

## Declarations

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.



doi.org/10.32388/HUPW3J