

Supplementary 1. This table represent a part of data sharing for all the retrieved trials with their corresponding publications to report the reasons for SOR, timing of registration, discrepancy in study start date, discrepancy in follow up period, discrepancy in sponsorship by comparing the data collected from the protocol to the data collected from publication.

Registration numbers, and web link for the 34 RCTs published (first author and publication reference) *	Timing of registration	Discrepancy in study start date	Discrepancy in follow-up period	Discrepancy in sample size	Discrepancy in the sponsorship	Primary outcome downgrade or omitted or secondary outcome upgraded	New 1ry outcome	Discrepancy in 1ry outcome time frame	SOR
NCT04265833, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Sahin N et al. 25(6):3945-3955;Jun 2021)	(retrospective) Registered in February 2020, the study start date in the registry was February 2015	Incomplete declared in the RCT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NCT03756025, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov	(retrospective) Registered in November 2018, the study start date in	incomplete declared in the RCT	-	-	Institute discrepancy. In the registry was hospital Nossa Senhora da Conceição	-	-	in the registry was 12 months, in the publication 48 months	Yes

* **Note:** we have extracted the data from the 34 published article but included in the analysis only 30 “with the same primary outcome and longest follow up “. We have extracted the data for these 4 publications to decide which is the same primary outcome or/and longest follow up periods.

(Faustino-Silva, D.D., et al. 23 , 3721–3729 2019)	the registry was June 2008				but in the RCT was Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul
NCT03220360, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Ma Xiao-hong et al. 21(22): 34943500 2017)	(retrospective) Registered in July 2017, the study start date in the registry was June 2016	In the registry was June 2016, but in the publication from September 2016	-	-	Institute discrepancy In the registry was Chengdu Maternal and Children's Health Care Hospital, but in the publication was the Popular Application Project of Health and Family Planning Commission of Sichuan Province.
NCT03100773, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Salas Huamani JR et al. 97:191-197 Oct 2018)	(retrospective) Registered in April 2017, the study start date in the registry was January 2015.	incomplete declared in the RCT			Institute discrepancy, in the protocol did not declare CAPES Since they have 6 primary outcomes in the registry, we consider the primary outcome according to sample

									calculation. In RCT, the sample calculation is based on salivary biomarkers and HR. They have upgraded the cognitive and behavioral analysis and downgrade the salivary biomarkers and HR	-	-	Yes
NCT03030690, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (El-Housseiny AA et al. 50(7):522-532 2019)	(retrospective) Registered in January 2017 , the study start date in the registry was November 2016.	In the RCT October 2015 but in the registry November 2016	In the registry 6,12,18, 24 months but in the RCT 6 and 12 months	-	-	-	-	-			In the registry 24 months but in the RCT 12 months	Yes
NCT02969538, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Cavalheiro CP et al. 34, e081 2020)	(prospective) Registration date was at the same month of the study start date in the registry (November 2016)	In the registry was November 2016 , but in the RCT was April 2016	-	In the registry was 70 , but in the RCT was 130.	Institute discrepancy. The protocol did not declare the CNPq and CAPES.	-	-	-	-	-		

NCT02799927, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Garrocho-Rangel A 39(5):377-382 Sep 2017)	(retrospective) Registered in June 2016, the study start date in the registry was November 2014.	incomplete declared in the RCT	In the registry 3,6,12,18 and 24 months , but in the RCT 1,3,6,12 months.	-	incomplete declared in the RCT	the primary outcome in the registry was pain (presence/ absence) it downgrades and replace by new primary outcome (success rate) in RCT that join all the primary and secondary outcomes from the registry	In the registry only pain (presence/ absence) is the primary outcome, but in the RCT was clinical and radiographi c success rate.	In the registry 24 months, but in the RCT was 12	Yes
NCT02734420, , URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Costa-Santos, L. et al. 3, 275– 281 November 2019)	(retrospective) Registered in April 2016, the study start date in the registry was September 2013.	In the registry was September 2013 but in the RCT was October 2016	In the registry it was 6,12 and 24 months, but in the RCT it was 3,6 and 9 months.	-	Institute discrepancy, in the registry did not include FAPESP as in the RCT	-	-	In the registry 24 months, but in the RCT 48 and 72 hour	Yes
NCT02569047, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Araujo, M.P. et al 20, 318 2020)	(prospective) Registered in October 2015, the same month of study start date in the registry	-	-	The sample size was 131 in the registry, but 124 in the RCT	Institute discrepancy, in the registry did not include FAPESP, CNPq and CAPES	-	-	-	-

<p>NCT03855527, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Matar, L. et al. adjalexu.2020.32224.1074)</p>	<p>(retrospective) Registered in February 2019, the study start date in the registry was January 2018</p>	<p>In the registry was January 2018, but in the study was February 2018</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>In the registry was 60, but in the RCT was 40.</p>	<p>Institute discrepancy, in the registry was personal funding but in the RCT declared no specific funding</p>	<p>Since they have 6 primary outcomes in the registry, we consider the primary outcome according to sample calculation. In RCT, the sample calculation based on reduction in mean (SD) of log transformed TVC after 2 weeks. They have upgraded the baseline microbiological assessment in each group and compared the two groups. Also, downgrade the reduction of the bacterial count after 14 days</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Yes</p>
---	---	---	----------	---	--	---	----------	----------	------------

NCT02437565, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Pani SC et al. 16(6):461-6 Dec 2015)	(retrospective) Registered In May 2015, the study start date in the registry was August 2013.	In the RCT was April 2013 but in the registry August 2013	-	-	incomplete declared in the RCT	-	-	-	-
NCT02377297, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Olegário IC et al. 57:45-50 Feb 2017) (1 year publication)	(retrospective) registered March 2015, the study start date in the registry November 2014	In the RCT was October 2014 but in the registry was November 2014	-	-	Commercial discrepancy as in the RCT (DFL company) wasn't declare in the registry	-	-	In the registry 2 years but in the RCT was 1 year	yes
NCT02377297, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Olegário IC et al. 101:103446 October 2020)	(retrospective) registered March 2015, the study start date in the registry November 2014	In the RCT was October 2014 but in the registry was November 2014	In the RCT was 2,6,12 and 24 months but in the registry 12 months	-	Commercial discrepancy as in the RCT (DFL company) was not declared in the registry	-	-	-	-

(2 years
publication was
included)

NCT02232828, , URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Elhennawy K et al. 77:72-77 Oct 2018) (1 year publication)	(prospective) Registered September 2014, the study start date in the registry was October 2014	Incomplete declared in the registry	In the registry was 36 months but in the RCT was 12 months	In the registry was 300 but in the RCT was 74	Institute discrepancy	-	-	In the registry was 36 months but in the RCT was 12 months	Yes
---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------	---	---	---	-----

NCT02232828, , URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Elhennawy K et al. 25(2):645-652 February 2021) (2 years publication was included)	(prospective) Registered September 2014, the study start date in the registry was October 2014	Incomplete declared in the registry	As they declare in the RCT it was an interim publication with 24 months so, No discrepancy	In the registry was 300 but in the RCT was 74	Institute discrepancy	-	-	As they declare in the RCT it was an interim publication with 24 months so, No discrepancy	-
---	---	---	--	---	--------------------------	---	---	--	---

<p>NCT02217098, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Olegário, I.C et al. 23, 1761–1770 2019)</p>	<p>(retrospective) registered August 15, 2014. The study start date in the registry July 2014</p>	<p>In the registry was July 2014, but in the RCT was October 2013</p>	<p>In the registry was 1,6,12,18 and 24 months. but in the RCT was 2,6,12,18, 24 and 36 months</p>	<p>In the registry there were 530 participants, but in the RCT there were 568 participants.</p>	<p>Commercial discrepancy as they declared in RCT Dentsply and GC Europe for supplying the material that was not declared in the registry</p>	-	-	-	-
<p>NCT02093091, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Abo-Hamar SE et al. 46(5):381-8 May 2015)</p>	<p>(retrospective) registered March 2014, the study start date in the registry June 2011</p>	<p>incomplete declare in the RCT</p>	-	-	<p>incomplete declared in RCT</p>	-	-	-	-
<p>NCT02903979, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Waller MV et al. 88(1):52-57 Jan 2021)</p>	<p>(prospective) registered September 2016, the study start date in the registry was November 2016</p>	<p>In the registry was November 2016 but in the RCT was April 2016</p>	<p>In the registry 6,12,24 months. But in the RCT was before and after the treatment</p>	<p>In the registry was 108 but in the RCT was 26.</p>	<p>Institute discrepancy</p>	<p>The pulp vitality which was primary outcome in the registry omitted in the publication</p>	<p>New primary outcome introduced “mean change in GBI values before and after dental treatment.”</p>	<p>In the registry 24 months but in the RCT 6 months.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

NCT01797458 , URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Santamaría RM et al. 51(6):605-614 Dec 2017)	(retrospective) Registered in February 2013, the study start day in the registry was May 2011	Incomplete declared in the RCT	It was 24 months, but in the RCT 2.5 years	-	-	-	-	In the registry was 2 years but in the RCT 2.5 years	Yes
NCT01449136, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Ferreira JM et al. 24(1):68-73 2013)	(retrospective) Registered in October 2011, the study start date in the registry was January 2008	incomplete declared in the RCT	-	-	Incomplete declared in the RCT	-	-	-	-

ChiCTR200003 2462, URL http://www.chi-ctr.org.cn/enindex.aspx . (Xiaoxian Chen et al. 25 , 3067–3076 2021)	(retrospective) Registered in April 2020, the study start date in the registry was January 2017			In the registry 118, but in the RCT was 175.						
RBR-9kkv53 , URL https://ensaios-clinicos.gov.br/ (Hesse, D et al. 14 , 58 2014)	(retrospective) Registered December 2013, the study start date in the registry January 2010	In the registry was January 2010, but in the RCT was from 2007			Institute discrepancy as in the RCT declared CNPq and FAPESP but in the registry was faculty of dentistry, university of São Paulo					
RBR-4nwmk4 , URL https://ensaios-clinicos.gov.br/ (Moura MS et al. 24;33:e125 Jan 2020)	(retrospective) Registered January 2016, the study start date in the registry was September 2015	Incomplete declared in the RCT		In the registry was 700 but in the RCT was 728.	Incomplete declare in the RCT	The loss of restorations was upgraded which was a secondary outcome in the registry. The success of the restoration was downgrade which was primary outcome in the registry				Yes

RBR-5sb8sb , URL https://ensaios.clinicos.gov.br/ (Stafuzza TC et al. 3;27:e2018070 0 Jun 2019)	(retrospective) Registered March 2016, the study start date in the registry was September 2015	Incomplete declared in the RCT	-	In the registry was 93, but in the RCT was 36.	Institute discrepancy as in the registry university and CAPES, but in the RCT was FAPESP	-	-	-	-
NCT03657862, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Jiang M et al. 100:103435 SEP 2020) (Primary outcome publication was included)	(retrospective) Registered September 2018, the study start date in the registry was September 2017	In the registry was September 2017, but in the RCT was October 2017	-	In the registry was 195, but in the RCT was 194	The Primary outcome which was the success of the ART restoration was downgraded and a new primary outcome which is time used to place the restoration was introduced.	The time used to place restoration had been introduced to the results. Note: it was declared in the RCT as secondary but not in the registry	-	-	Yes
NCT03657862, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Jiang M et al. 88:103171 September 2019)	(retrospective) Registered September 2018, the study start date in the registry was September 2017	Incomplete declared in the RCT	In the registry was 24 months, in the RCT was baseline and 6 months	In the registry was 195, but in the RCT was 194	-	-	In the registry the timeframe of secondary outcomes were 24 months but in the RCT was baseline and 6 months	-	Yes

(Secondary outcome publication)

RBR-954xsg, URL https://ensaios clinicos.gov.br/ (Sarti CS et al. 15;42(2):110-115 Mar 2020)	(retrospective) Registered in April 2016, the study start date in the registry was May 2015	In the registry was May 2015, but in the RCT started from 2014	In the registry was 36 months, but in the RCT was 24 months	-	Incomplete declare in the RCT	-	-	In the registry was 36 months but in the RCT was 24 months	Yes
RBR-2t54nx, URL https://ensaios clinicos.gov.br/ (Polizeli SAF 10(2):108-116 Feb 2019)	(retrospective) Registered in October 2018, the study start date in the registry was February 2013	Incomplete declared in the RCT	-	In the registry was 20, but in the RCT was 24.	Institute discrepancy, in the registry CAPES and FAPESP, but in the RCT was CAPES, FAPESP and CNPq	-	-	-	-
TCTR20170609 002, URL http://www.thaiclinicaltrials.org/# (Krongkan Thongrakkhao et al.	(retrospective) Registered in June 2017, the study start date in the registry was August 2016	Incomplete declare in the RCT	-	Incomplete declare in the registry	Incomplete declare in the registry	The radiographic examination was upgraded in the RCT which was secondary in the registry. The clinical evaluation was downgraded	-	In the registry was 6 and 12 months but in the RCT was 6 months	Yes

69(2):184-196
Jan 2019)

which was
primary
outcome in the
registry

<p>NCT03063307, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Vollú AL et al. 88:103165 Sep 2019)</p>	<p>(retrospective) Registered in February 2017, the study start date was September 2016</p>	<p>In the registry was September 2016, but in the RCT from June2016</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>In the registry 119, but in the RCT 118</p>	<p>Institute discrepancy In the registry university but in the RCT was FAPERJ</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>In the registry was 48 months but in the RCT was 12 months</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>(Primary outcome publication was included)</p>									
<p>NCT03063307, URL https://clinicaltrials.gov (Rodrigues GF et al. 42(5):373-379 September 2020)</p>	<p>retrospective) Registered in February 2017, the study start date was September 2016</p>	<p>In the registry was September 2016, but in the RCT from June2016. They have declared the questionnaires before the treatment .</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>In the registry 119, but in the RCT 118</p>	<p>Institute discrepancy In the registry university but in the RCT was CAPES</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>

(Secondary outcome publication)

RBR-4qdx3v , URL https://ensaios.clinicos.gov.br/ (de França Lopes CMC et al. 15;40(2):98-104 Mar 2018)	retrospective) Registered in July 2018, the study start date in the registry was March 2016	Incomplete declare in the RCT	In the registry was 24 months, but in the RCT was 12 months	In the registry 23 participants but in the RCT was 33 participants	Incomplete declared in the RCT	-	-	In the registry was 3,6,12,24 months but in the RCT was 6 and 12 months	Yes
ACTRN12614000844640, URL https://www.anzctr.org.au/Default.aspx (Boyd DH et al. 6(2):205-212 Apr 2021)	(prospective) Registered in August 2014, the study start date in the registry was July 2014. It was registered within 1 month	-	In the registry was 36 months, but in the RCT was 24 months	In the registry was 150, but in the RCT was 295	-	-	-	In the registry was 36 months, but in the RCT was 24 months	Yes

