

Peer Review Comments

Article: Vanpaemel, W, Vermorgen, M, Deriemaecker, L and Storms, G 2015 Are We Wasting a Good Crisis? The Availability of Psychological Research Data after the Storm. *Collabra*, 1(1): 3, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/collabra.13>

Article type: Original research report

Subject: Psychology

Handling editor: Rolf Zwaan

Senior editor: Rolf Zwaan

Article submitted: 4 April 2015

Editor decision: 2 June 2015; 25 August 2015; 27 August 2015

Revision submitted: 24 August 2015; 27 August 2015

Article accepted: 27 August 2015

Article published: 09 October 2015

Responses for Version 1

Reviewer 1: Richard Morey

Affiliation: School of Psychology, Cardiff University, UK

Competing Interests Statement: I am working on several manuscripts with the first author, though we have never to date published together.

Review Completed: 1 June 2015

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1) General comments and summary of recommendation:

Describe your overall impressions and your recommendation, including changes or revisions. Please note that you should pay attention to scientific, methodological, and ethical soundness only, not novelty, topicality, or scope. A checklist of things to you may want to consider is below:

- Are the methodologies used appropriate?
- Are any methodological weaknesses addressed?
- Is all statistical analysis sound?
- Does the conclusion (if present) reflect the argument, is it supported by data/facts?
- Is the article logically structured, succinct, and does the argument flow coherently?
- Are the references adequate and appropriate?

I did not have any major complaints about the article.

* I could not access the text of the email sent to the researchers. OSF gave me the error:

"Forbidden: You do not have permission to perform this action. If this should not have occurred and the issue persists, please report it to support@osf.io."

* The figures seem to be a bit light. It would be nice to see everything broken down by journal, including overall statistics and the reasons.

* This paper gives an interesting case where sharing the underlying data leads to questions. For instance: I assume that the authors will share the underlying data. However:

The authors state: "This study is a case in point, as making the response to our data request public would constitute a breach of confidentiality." One could argue that all authors gave implicit consent when they published in an APA journal. This is argued here, for instance: <http://blogs.plos.org/everyone/2011/11/02/the-%E2%80%9Cresponsible-conduct-of-research%E2%80%9D-is-not-limited-to-properly-obtained-consent/> What did the ethics committee that approved this study allow, and why? Since this is a study about data sharing and reasons for lack of compliance, it would be interesting to know this.

b. Even in the case that some of the data will not be shared, some can be even if confidentiality

concerns apply (and I'm not convinced they do). Where will *that* data eventually be shared, and what will be anonymized? In the post above, Tractenberg argues that "The journals' and APA ethics policies are public and require data sharing, so neither the requests nor the failures to comply with those requests can be considered privileged. In short, no feature of the data in this manuscript can be considered to be privileged." I have to say I agree with this, and unless there was something specifically in the email granting confidentiality, I don't see why the responses are confidential.

2) Figures/tables/data availability:

Please comment on the author's use of tables, charts, figures, if relevant. Please acknowledge that adequate underlying data is available to ensure reproducibility (see open data policies per discipline of Collabra here).

More data should be provided in figure form (see above comments).

3) Ethical approval:

If humans or animals have been used as research subjects, and/or tissue or field sampling, are the necessary statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.

If not, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement/follow-up is required.

More detail is needed here.

4) Language:

Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and any need for improvement beyond the scope of this process.

Yes.

Reviewer 2: Jelte Wicherts

Affiliation: Tilburg University, Netherlands

Competing Interests Statement: Although I am a supporter of more openness to psychological research data, I have no competing interests of any financial kind.

Review Completed: 28 April 2015

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1) General comments and summary of recommendation:

Describe your overall impressions and your recommendation, including changes or revisions. Please note that you should pay attention to scientific, methodological, and ethical soundness only, not novelty, topicality, or scope. A checklist of things to you may want to consider is below:

- *Are the methodologies used appropriate?*
- *Are any methodological weaknesses addressed?*
- *Is all statistical analysis sound?*
- *Does the conclusion (if present) reflect the argument, is it supported by data/facts?*
- *Is the article logically structured, succinct, and does the argument flow coherently?*
- *Are the references adequate and appropriate?*

This paper reports on the largest study to date on the willingness of psychological researchers to share data after publication upon request. The study is rigorous and the paper is well written.

2) Figures/tables/data availability:

Please comment on the author's use of tables, charts, figures, if relevant. Please acknowledge that adequate underlying data is available to ensure reproducibility (see open data policies per discipline of Collabra here).

The linked OSF page is not yet made publicly available. This is easily done in OSF and would allow readers to read the email sent to authors.

3) Ethical approval:

If humans or animals have been used as research subjects, and/or tissue or field sampling, are the necessary

statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared. If not, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement/follow-up is required.

Although I cannot view the editorial letter, the study appears to follow the relevant APA code of ethics.

4) Language:

Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and any need for improvement beyond the scope of this process.

Yes, the paper is well written.

Editor Decision for Version 1

Editor: Rolf Zwaan

Affiliation: Erasmus University, Netherlands

Editor decision: Revisions required

Decision date: 2 June 2015

Dear Dr. Vanpaemel,

I have now received two reviews of your manuscript. As you will see, both reviewers are positive toward publication of your manuscript. I agree with the reviewers' assessment that this a piece of work worthy of publication. The research was carried out rigorously, the paper is clearly written, and the message it carries is important to the field.

There are a few small issues that you need to address. A key issue is that none of use were able to read the information on osf. This obviously needs to be fixed. Reviewer 1 has some additional comments.

The Collabra editorial system doesn't give me the option of "minor revisions." However, the required revisions are minor and thus I expect to receive your revised manuscript soon, after which I will accept it for publication.

Sincerely,

Rolf A. Zwaan, PhD

To access your submission account, follow the below instructions:

- 1) login to the journal webpage with username and password
- 2) click on the submission title
- 3) click 'Review' menu option
- 4) download Reviewed file and make revisions based on review feedback
- 5) upload the edited file
- 6) Click the 'notify editor' icon and email the confirmation of re-submission and any relevant comments to the journal.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been

obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing,; therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please do contact us.

Please could you have the revisions submitted by [GIVE 2 WEEK DEADLINE]. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Kind regards,

Rolf Zwaan

Erasmus University, Netherlands

rolfzwaan@gmail.com

Collabra

<http://www.collabraoa.org/>

@collabraoa

Author's Response to Review Comments for Version 1

Author: Wolf Vanpaemel

Affiliation: University of Leuven, Belgium

Revision submitted: 24 August 2015

Dear Rolf,

We would like to submit the revised version of "Are we wasting a good crisis? The availability of psychological research data after the storm," authored by Wolf Vanpaemel, Maarten Vermorgen, Leen Deriemaecker, and Gert Storms, to Collabra as a research report.

Apart from some linguistic changes and updates (all done using track changes), we changed the ms as follows, in response to the reviewers:

- 1- We included more details on the IRB approval.
- 2- It turns out that the IRB approval explicitly precludes disclosing who shares and who doesn't. We do refer to the Tractenberg blog post mentioned by Reviewer A, which questions the IRBs rationale. We thought hard on how we could make data available that respects the IRBs conditions, but we haven't found a satisfactory solution. For instance, anonymizing the authors and article titles would surely be possible, but that would lead to a large, uninteresting excel file with just 1s and 0s, the sum of which ends up being the numbers reported in the paper. We would love to hear any additional ideas on this issue, and are more than happy to collaborate.
- 3- We give details on the response types for each journal separately. We used a single Table rather than in 5 Figures, to save space. If you prefer Figures over a Table, we are happy to provide Figures.
- 4- We give more details about cited reasons not to share.
- 5- We made the associated OSF project public (it was private by an unfortunate oversight).

The ms greatly benefited from these changes, and we thank you and the reviewers for raising their

comments.

Cordially,

Wolf Vanpaemel

University of Leuven

Tiensestraat 102

3000 Leuven

Belgium

wolf.vanpaemel@ppw.kuleuven.be

Keywords: Data-sharing, replicability crisis, psychology, open science, research integrity, questionable research practices.

None of our current funding directly relates to this research.

Contact information of the other authors

Gert Storms

University of Leuven

Tiensestraat 102

3000 Leuven

Belgium

gert.storms@ppw.kuleuven.be

Maarten Vermorgen

maarten.vermorgen@student.kuleuven.be

Leen Deriemaecker

leen.derimaecker@student.kuleuven.be

Collabra

<http://www.collabra.org/>

@collabraoa

Editor Decision for Version 2

Editor: Rolf Zwaan

Affiliation: Erasmus University, Netherlands

Editor decision: Revisions required

Decision date: 25 August 2015

Dear Prof. Vanpaemel,

Thank you very much for submitting your revision of "Are we wasting a good crisis? The availability of psychological research data after the storm".

You have done a good job addressing the reviewers' concerns both in your cover letter and in the manuscript. I decided not to send the revision back to them because their initial comments were positive and their concerns minor. I agree with the way you have handled the IRB issue mentioned under 2 in your cover letter.

At this stage, I only have some very minor comments of my own, which should be very easy for you to address.

p. 3, l. 36: "among others" => "among other things"

p. 4, l. 94: "enormous" => I'd go for the less exuberant "considerable"

p. 9, l. 211: "not turning down" => delete "not"

p. 9, l. 211: "astonishingly"; I would refrain from using such subjective terms in a scientific article. A more objective statement expressing the same sentiment would be: "To our surprise."

I look forward to receiving the final version of your manuscript soon.

To access your submission account, follow the below instructions:

- 1) login to the journal webpage with username and password
- 2) click on the submission title
- 3) click 'Review' menu option
- 4) download Reviewed file and make revisions based on review feedback
- 5) upload the edited file
- 6) Click the 'notify editor' icon and email the confirmation of re-submission and any relevant comments to the journal.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please do contact us.

Please could you have the revisions submitted by [GIVE 2 WEEK DEADLINE]. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Kind regards,

Rolf Zwaan

Erasmus University, Netherlands

rolfzwaan@gmail.com

Collabra

<http://www.collabra.org/>

@collabraoa

Author's Response to Review Comments for Version 2

Author: Wolf Vanpaemel

Affiliation: University of Leuven, Belgium

Revision submitted: 27 August 2015

dear rolf,

thanks for your quick and positive response. i have now uploaded a new version, in which i have implemented your minor comments. i have made a few other very minor changes (a comma, some capitals in the references), without using track changes.

all the best,

wolf

Collabra

<http://www.collabra.org/>

@collabraoa

Editor Decision for Version 3

Editor: Rolf Zwaan

Affiliation: Erasmus University, Netherlands

Editor decision: Accept Submission

Decision date: 27 August 2015

Dear Wolf,

I am happy to inform you that I have decided to accept your submission to Collabra, "Are we wasting a good crisis? The availability of psychological research data after the storm."

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point. The accepted submission will now undergo final copyediting. You will be contacted once this is complete to answer any queries that may have arisen during copyediting and to allow a final chance to edit the files prior to typesetting. If you wish to view your submission during this time, you can log in via the journal website.

Thank you very much for an interesting and thought provoking contribution to the journal.

Kind regards,

Rolf Zwaan

Erasmus University, Netherlands

rolfzwaan@gmail.com

Collabra

<http://www.collabra.org/>

@collabraoa