

Author's response: *General response to the reviewers and recommender: Please accept our sincerest thanks for the opportunity to revise this manuscript. We would also like to express our gratitude for your precious time and willingness to read and comment on the manuscript. Below, we address all suggestions and lay out the revisions made.*

Major comments:

1. The focus group questions place attention on the umbrella term of “open science” rather than specific OSPs (e.g., preregistration) as is the case with the individual interviews with researchers. Whilst this is understandable given that the focus group sample will be media representatives and policymakers, there is a potential risk that the questions will yield very shallow answers or that respondents will answer in very broad and generic terms. How will you mitigate against this, and will you analyse/report the focus groups in a different way than the individual interviews? The latter could be better clarified in the analysis section.

Author's response: *Regarding focus groups, each discussion will be facilitated by two moderators (i.e., the authors of the study), who will be provided with the same instructions and undergo training with simulated discussions before conducting the focus groups. One of the moderators will serve as the primary moderator, whose responsibility is to maintain the focus of the discussion on the central issue. The secondary moderator will ensure that all topics (in this case, specific OSPs) are thoroughly discussed within the group. If the participants give superficial responses, it will be the responsibility of both moderators to encourage the participants to elaborate or clarify their points. It will be solely the moderators' task to create a positive atmosphere and ensure that each topic is discussed.*

The process of analyzing transcripts from the focus groups will be carried out in the same manner as it is for interviews. We have also added additional description to the manuscript.

2. Each author of this manuscript may want to reflect on their subject discipline in the reflexivity (thank you for sharing this on the OSF): the authors come from different disciplines (e.g., Psychology vs. Arts) and may therefore have different perceptions and experiences with open science generally and different open science practices more specifically (i.e., Registered Reports may be an appropriate open science practice for a researcher in social sciences, but perhaps less so for a researcher in the Arts).

Author's response: *Based on a comment from Dr. Branney, we have decided to create individual positionality statements instead of a group one. Although all authors come from a research background in psychology, it is true that each of us has a different background, a unique motivation and varying experiences with OSP, and is at a different stage in our careers. All these factors can influence the way we will analyze data or conduct interviews in distinct ways. To mitigate issues regarding methodological integrity, we will describe the process of managing authors' perspectives based on individual positionality statements (APA, 2020). We would like to thank the reviewer for the suggestion on a similar preregistration, which inspired us in crafting our positionality statements. Each author has recorded their own positionality statement on OSF: <https://osf.io/ryqx6/>.*

3. I agree with the reviewer comment by Emma Norris regarding the structure of the Introduction. I noticed that you introduce open science practices (OSP) but then subsequently discuss how doubt has been cast on the credibility of research findings due to issues of low reproducibility and QRPs. The structure seems 'off' here – surely you should mention issues of reproducibility and QRPs before introducing the concept of open science which has been proposed as a corrective mechanism against these issues?

Author's response: *We would like to clarify that our intention was to structure the Introduction around the practices of Open Science (OSP) as a positive and desirable approach. Rather than criticizing past research and potentially casting a more negative tone, we opted to underscore the current state of OSP usage. Our research does not primarily focus on the replication crisis, its causes, or its shortcomings. Hence the mention of the credibility crisis played only a minor role. However, to avoid interfering with the flow of the text, we decided to omit it altogether. In its present form, the Introduction has been fully restructured, and its focus now aligns more closely with the core objective of our research. We hope this clarifies our perspective more thoroughly.*

4. The second paragraph states: "The slow adoption of OSP cannot be solely attributed to researchers.", but there is no citation/evidence to support such a claim – how do we know it's slow? Slow in Slovakia, or slow globally? References to bolster this point would be helpful.

Author's response: *We agree that this statement was problematic. Thus, we have revised it as follows. First, we searched for articles dedicated to the examination of open-science practices in various contexts and added references to the text (i.e., Gopalakrishna et al., 2022; Hardwicke et al., 2022; Rajčáni et al., 2023), including one article from Slovakia (Rajčáni et al., 2023). Second, based on their findings, we reformulated the sentence to state that the adoption of open-science practices still has room for improvement, as lower than optimal adoption has been observed on several occasions in various contexts. For example, Hardwicke et al. (2022) found that sharing raw data, analysis scripts, and research protocols was relatively rare. Similarly, Gopalakrishna et al. (2022) found that less than half of academics in the Netherlands pre-register research protocols, and Rajčáni et al. (2023) found that among Slovak psychology researchers, although 63% of participants know what preregistration is and consider it quite important (approximately 70% of average importance), only about 14% have already pre-registered a study.*

5. You state: "For instance, nearly one-third of journal editors do not deem the implementation of registered reports as important. Similarly, almost one-sixth do not prioritize the publication of null or negative results. Furthermore, approximately half of the research funders do not mandate the sharing of raw data and pre-registration of studies" Where are each of these findings from? If these are also from the European Commission (2022) report, you should clarify this (e.g., "this report highlights that..").

Author's response: *We apologize for the misleading text. You are correct; we were referring to the European Commission's 2022 report results. Sentence corrected.*

6. In the Introduction you state "The barriers to adopting OSP vary not only between disciplines (Bouter, 2018) but very likely also between institutions, countries and cultures, and different parts of the research ecosystem". Surely OSPs also vary between distinct methodologies too (e.g., quantitative vs. qualitative). Will your methodology capture this? The Stage 1 RR does not acknowledge these different tensions (e.g., see Pownall's 2023; 2024 papers on tensions for qualitative research). Consider whether this needs to be included specifically within your Research Questions.

Author's response: *Thank you for your comment. We appreciate your suggestion to include a focus on qualitative research. In the context of qualitative research, there is often a discussion about the suitability of replications, the lack of guidelines for preregistration, the difficulty of data sharing, and the role of contributorship statements. We plan to capture barriers and facilitators present both in quantitative and qualitative research by explicitly including qualitative researchers in the sample (at least 2 researchers who conducted most of their research [but not necessarily current] using qualitative approaches) and adding the question: How does this differ in qualitative research? at the end of the interview questions*

for each OSP practice (6 times together). We have added another question to the students' focus group questions: *What is the difference, in your opinion, between quantitative and qualitative approaches in terms of barriers and facilitators?*

7. Methods: You suggest that there is an “absence of generally accepted rules” for sample size guidelines when using thematic analysis. However, Braun and Clarke (2013, e.g. pp. 50) provide some guidelines for this that may bolster your sample size rationale. Reference: Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A Practical Guide for Beginners* (First Edition). SAGE Publications.

Author's response: *Thank you for your suggestion to refer to Braun and Clarke's guidelines on sample size to bolster our rationale. In response to your comment, we acknowledge that while there is flexibility in determining sample size for thematic analysis, Braun and Clarke (2013) do provide helpful guidelines that can inform our approach. Specifically, Braun and Clarke suggest considering the scope and complexity of the research project when determining sample size, 10 - 20 participants for medium projects and 3-6 focus groups.*

Based on these recommendations and others questioning the concept of statistical models for determining sample size in thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2016) while also guided by literature referenced in the recommended PCI preregistration by Henderson et al. (2023), we have decided to conduct 12-20 individual interviews with Researchers and PhD students groups, and 3 focus group discussions (with 6 - 9 participants per group) with Students group. For pragmatic reasons - the difficulty of obtaining a specific sample of Policy makers and Media representatives we would like to keep our sample size in these two groups low (6-12 participants per group).

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). Successful qualitative research: A Practical Guide for Beginners (First Edition). SAGE Publications.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2016). (Mis)conceptualising themes, thematic analysis, and other problems with Fugard and Potts' (2015) sample-size tool for thematic analysis. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 19(6), 739–743.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2016.1195588>

Minor:

1. The Abstract/Intro focuses on the replication crisis underscoring that the mechanism of self-correction in science may not be functioning effectively. It would be worthwhile to specify that the ‘replication crisis’ stemmed from the social sciences/psychology.

Author's response: *In order to keep the focus of the Introduction on the OSP only, we have decided to omit the reference to the credibility crisis (see also our comment above).*

2. The Abstract states that the study aims to “conduct a qualitative examination of the barriers and facilitators of transparent and responsible research practices in the field of psychology in Slovakia” and then later states “Data will be collected through interviews and focus groups with a diverse sample of master’s and PhD students, researchers, policy makers, and media representatives.” It would be useful to specify here that the policy makers and media representatives will also be from a psychology background.

Author's response: *Corrected.*

3. The opening sentence of the Introduction states: “Corrections can only be made through concerted, targeted action and collaboration among all stakeholders in the research ecosystem, including researchers, institutions, funders, publishers, and learned societies (Munafò et al., 2022).” Another relevant reference here, which states exactly this, is: <https://bmccresnotes.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13104-022-05949-w>

Author's response: Thank you for your suggestion. Reference included.

4. In paragraph 2 of the Introduction, you introduce the concept of “the credibility crisis”, but elsewhere you use the term “replication crisis”; please be consistent with whichever term you decide to use throughout.

Author's response: As previously mentioned, we have omitted the section regarding the credibility crisis.

5. Introduction: “Obviously, implementing OSP faces different barriers”; do you mean “individuals implementing OSP face different barriers?”. This sentence reads rather awkwardly.

Author's response: Thank you for pointing this out. We have rephrased the part as follows:

“Obviously, the implementation of OSP faces different barriers at both the structural and individual levels. Therefore, it is necessary to look for facilitating factors that could be present in various parts of the research ecosystem.”

6. There are some typos throughout that should be fixed (e.g., “(Directive EU 2019/1024 of the European Parliament), „Member States must adopt policies”).

Author's response: Thank you for pointing this out. Corrected.

7. You abbreviate to “OSPs” early on in the manuscript but then revert back to “open science practices” in the analysis plan – be consistent with this abbreviation.

Author's response: Thank you for pointing this out. Corrected.

Review by anonymous reviewer 1, 03 May 2024 13:24

The proposal deals with an important and timely topic, e.g., barriers and facilitators of openscience usage.

My comments concern mainly the methodology:

1. There should be at least 25 interviews with researchers - in order to study researcher on different levels (Post-doc, assistant, professor, etc.)

Author's response: Thank you for your feedback regarding the number of interviews with researchers. In response to your suggestion, we recognize the importance of capturing diverse perspectives across various levels of experience within the research community. A similar recommendation (although focused on sample size rather than sample heterogeneity) was also requested by a recommender and another reviewer. Based on a reference provided by a recommender (Reference: Braun & Clarke, 2013), we have decided to increase our sample size range to 12-20 participants for both Researcher group and group of PhD Students. We were also inspired by the referenced preregistration:

Henderson, E., Marcu, A., Atkins, L. & Farran, E.K. (2023). Investigating the barriers and

enablers to data sharing behaviours: A qualitative Registered Report. In principle acceptance of Version 3 by Peer Community in Registered Reports. <https://osf.io/2gm5s>

in which its authors justify the sample size by stating: "a recent systematic review of qualitative sample sizes found that on average 12 – 13 interviews reached saturation (Hennink & Kaiser, 2022), confirming previous work that also reported saturation at 12 interviews (Guest et al., 2006). We understand that our sample size limited by our possibilities also limits the amount of heterogeneity we are able to ensure. In order to achieve this, we will proceed as follows when selecting the sample: All members of the population will be approached for interviews. From those who agree to be interviewed we will then select those to represent all career stages and methodological approaches (at least 2 researchers who have conducted qualitative research). However, the criterion that only one person from an institution will be retained.

2. I do not see what the student focus groups should add to the present topic. These could be omitted and - see my point 1 - more effort could be taken to study researchers.

A relevant article here could be: Gute wissenschaftliche Praxis und Open Science im Empiriepraktikum: Wissenschaftlicher Kompetenzerwerb durch Replikationsstudien. Christoph Scheffel, , Franziska Korb,, Denise Dörfel, , Julian Eder, , Marcus Möschl, Martin Schoemann und Stefan Scherbaum

Published Online: 13 Sep 2023 Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1026/0033-3042/a000643>

Author's response: *We hold the view that students' perspectives are just as valuable as those of researchers. Students form an integral part of the research ecosystem and are often the first to encounter both QRP and OSP in their research journey. For Master's students, this usually happens during their final thesis work. To the best of our knowledge, in Slovakia, it's not uncommon for data from these theses to be utilized in scientific publications. Thus, the viewpoints of PhD students, who are directly involved in executing research projects, are especially significant. Also, both Master's and PhD students are the researchers of the future. Therefore, it's more effective to encourage and cultivate the adoption of OSP right from the outset, rather than attempting to correct inappropriate practices, such as QRP, at a later stage. We believe that any change in the research ecosystem needs to start with student education - implying that the educators themselves need to adapt. Hence, understanding the barriers that exist at this level of research when implementing OSP is also of great value.*

3. A study by Abele-Brehm et al. (Abele-Brehm, A.E., Gollwitzer, M., Steinberg, U. & Schönbrodt, F. (2019). Attitudes towards Open Science and Public Data Sharing: A Survey among Members of the German Psychological Society. *Social Psychology*, 50, 252-260. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a00038420>) studied attitudes towards open science, and this research might help to develop coding categories.

Author's response: *Thank you for the recommendation. Distinguishing shared data is useful and we have used this study when creating survey response options as part of the methods triangulation (available on the OSF: <https://osf.io/abe6y>) as well as our predictions (within each RQ) that guided us in the creation of the codebook (available on the OSF: <https://osf.io/abe6y>).*

4. Generally, I think that authors did not catch all the relevant literature; and I think that the approach could be more of a mixture of bottom-up (like it is now) and top-down (like it could be by considering relevant literature).

Author's response: Thank you for the recommendation. In light of this and other recommendations from the reviewers, we have decided to modify several parts by elaborating on the concept based on the TRUST Donabedian model (Mayo-Wilson et al., 2021), the research questions, planned analysis or within the codebook to more closely reach a mixture of bottom-up and top-down approach in the context of barriers and facilitators to the adoption and implementation of OSP. Please see further comments on how we have incorporated these changes.

Review by Peter Branney, 16 May 2024 14:20

Thank you for the opportunity to peer review this Stage 1 Registered Report exploring the barriers and facilitators to open science research in Slovakia. Below, I have structured my review according to the criteria for assessing a Registered Report at Stage 1 from PCI RR (accessed 2023-07-13; [PCI Registered Reports (peercommunityin.org)] (https://rr.peercommunityin.org/help/guide_for_reviewers#h_6720026472751613309075757)).

1A. The scientific validity of the research question(s).

This criterion addresses the extent to which the research question is scientifically justifiable. Valid scientific questions usually stem from theory or mathematics, an intended or possible application, or an existing evidence base, and should be defined with sufficient precision as to be answerable through quantitative or qualitative research. They should also fall within established ethical norms. Note that subjective judgments about the importance, novelty or timeliness of a research question are NOT a relevant criterion at PCI RR and do not form part of this assessment.

- The research questions are justified to a) an argument for the need to adopt a range of open sciences practices to increase trust in science and b) a range of literature on the barriers and facilities to their uptake. Furthermore, the registered report differentiates between bottom-up and top-down approach to barriers and facilitators, emphasising that, for example, an individual researcher deciding whether or not to implement an open research practice is doing so within a wider system that may be formed of barriers or facilitators. I would note that there are other theoretical perspectives that be more useful, such as the COM-B, in outlining a more nuanced understanding of the adoption (or not) of open science practices. You might be interested in a similar Registered Report, although focused on data sharing only, that uses the COM-B: [Capability, Opportunity, and Motivation in Data Sharing Behaviour... (peercommunityin.org)](<https://rr.peercommunityin.org/articles/rec?id=462>)

Author's response: Thank you for your recommendations and suggestion to look at a similar registered report (Henderson et al., 2023) using COM-B. Based on your feedback and suggestions from other reviewers, we have decided to modify the current structure regarding the research questions and analyses. However, we have decided for the TRUST Donabedian model instead of the COM-B model. This model (adapted from the public health framework emphasizing structure-process-outcome as crucial aspects of quality of medical care; Donabedian, 2005) operationalizes transparency and open science principles through policies, procedures, and practices (Mayo-Wilson et al., 2021). Given our focus on a larger scale, we find the TRUST Donabedian model more suitable as it captures structure (e.g., rules that may either promote or hinder the adoption or implementation of open science practices); process (e.g., methods or mechanisms that could serve as levers for

implementing behavioral change, or conversely, that can inhibit such change concerning the implementation of open science practices); and outcomes (e.g., behaviors of organizations or institutions, as well as individual researchers in terms of open science principles adherence).

Donabedian, A. (2005). Evaluating the quality of medical care. The Milbank Quarterly, 83(4), 691–729. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0009.2005.00397.x>

Mayo-Wilson, E., Grant, S., Supplee, L. et al. Evaluating implementation of the Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) guidelines: the TRUST process for rating journal policies, procedures, and practices. Res Integr Peer Rev 6, 9 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-021-00112-8>

Although initially used in healthcare quality, we find Donabedian's model conceptually helpful in identifying barriers and facilitators to OSP in our study. Adapted by Mayo-Wilson et al., (2021), it incorporates principles of open science and transparency, although they used it to assess implementation by journals. For our study, we adapted it to include institutions and individuals, focusing on exploring the perceptions and experiences of the barriers and facilitators of OSP within the three domains rather than assessing quality or evaluating implementation (see codebook). We believe this model aligns with our research goals by combining the bottom-up and top-down approach to explore the perceptions and experiences of the barriers and facilitators across various parts of the system involved in adopting and implementing the OSP.

Thank you again for your valuable feedback. Please see further comments on how we have incorporated these changes within the planned analyses or codebook as well.

1B. The logic, rationale, and plausibility of the proposed hypotheses.

This criterion addresses the coherence and credibility of any a priori hypotheses. The inclusion of hypotheses is not required– a Stage 1 RR can instead propose estimation or measurement of phenomena without expecting a specific observation or relationship between variables. However, where hypotheses are stated, they should be stated as precisely as possible and follow directly from the research question or theory. A Stage 1 RR should also propose a hypothesis that is sufficiently conceivable as to be worthy of investigation. The complete evaluation of any preliminary research (and data) in the Stage 1 submission (see [**Section 2.7**](https://rr.peercommunityin.org/help/guide_for_reviewers#h_615430411266161330950361)) is included within this criterion.

- Regarding the research questions, can you clarify your theoretical perspective? In particular, can you clarify your ontology and epistemology as this will help the reader to assess the ability of this study to generate knowledge that is relevant for the research questions. What is it, for example, to identify in a qualitative study that a factor is 'most helpful'? Are you, for example, taking a naïve realist approach in which an interviewee's reports of what is helpful is treated unquestionably as truth? Or are you doing something else? Also, could you explain how this relates to your theoretical perspective or bottom-up and top-down approaches to barriers and facilitators (or to another theoretical approach if you adapt something like COM-B).

Author's response: *Based on this and other similar recommendations, we have redrafted several parts. Given the interconnectedness of the parts, we realized that we needed a*

deeper conceptual grasp in terms of a theoretical perspective and a philosophical position on which to base the subsequent parts. Therefore, we decided to use the TRUST Donabedian model, clarify the epistemological and ontological position, and modify the individual parts (regarding research questions, planned analysis or codebook).

Firstly, our study adopts a constructivist approach, recognizing that knowledge is constructed through interactions between individuals and their environment (Anderson, 2003). This perspective allows us to explore how different stakeholders perceive and experience the barriers and facilitators of open science practices. We also adopt a relativist ontology, positing that reality is subjective and can vary based on individual experiences and contexts (Kelly, 1997). The TRUST Donabedian model we will use is intended to give us to better grasp the perceptions and experiences of the barriers and facilitators operating at different levels of the academic ecosystem (i.e. structure it as structure-policies, process-procedures and outcomes-practices for a combination of bottom-up and top down).

Anderson, D., Lucas, K. B., & Ginns, I. S. (2003). Theoretical perspectives on learning in an informal setting. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 40(2), 177–199. Portico.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.10071>

Kelly, G. J. (1997). Research traditions in comparative context: A philosophical challenge to radical constructivism. *Science Education*, 81(3), 355–375.

[https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1098-237x\(199705\)81:3<355::aid-sce6>3.0.co;2-d](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1098-237x(199705)81:3<355::aid-sce6>3.0.co;2-d)

- Given the range of research on barriers and facilitators you summarise, I wonder if it would be useful to synthesis it in a table or figure and clarify the potential overlap between the studies (which may prove useful in your discussion)

Author's response: Thank you for this suggestion. We have prepared a table (Table S1) in the form of a live updateable document that can help during the discussion. The table is available at OSF: <https://osf.io/qf834>. In addition, in this table, we have attempted to sort the identified barriers and facilitators into rows based on our suggestions for pairing identified barriers with identified facilitators of OSP.

1C. The soundness and feasibility of the methodology and analysis pipeline (including statistical power analysis where applicable).

This criterion assesses the validity of the study procedures and analyses, including the presence of critical design features (e.g. internal and external validity, blinding, randomisation, rules for data inclusion and exclusion, suitability of any included pilot data) and the appropriateness of the analysis plan. For designs involving inferential statistics and hypothesis-testing, this criterion includes the rigour of the proposed sampling plan, such as a statistical power analysis or Bayesian alternative, and, where applicable, the rationale for defining any statistical priors or the smallest effect size of interest. For programmatic RRs (see [**Section

2.15**](https://rr.peercommunityin.org/help/guide_for_reviewers#h_52492857233251613309610581)), this criterion captures the assessment of whether the separate study components are sufficiently robust and substantive to justify separate Stage 2 outputs.

- Could you give a brief description of the overall population from which you are sampling? As you are likely to be writing for an international audience, readers may benefit from this brief introduction to the research landscape in Slovakia.

Author's response: Thank you for your suggestion. We did not realize that we had

overlooked the context. We have added a section about the context of Open Science in Slovakia at the end of the Introduction.

- Can you check if abbreviations are necessary, and if they are, please ensure all are defined. E.g. Table 1 has a few.

Author's response: *We concur that the abbreviations listed in Table 1 were superfluous. As a result, we have replaced them with the full names of the respective organizations. Additionally, we have standardized the use of "OSP" as an abbreviation for Open Science Practices.*

- Can you clarify what language/s the interviews will be conducted?

- Can you clarify what language/s the analysis will be conducted?

Author's response: *We have added the information that the interviews will be conducted in Slovak language to the Method, Procedure section. The analysis will be conducted also in Slovak language (information in Analysis section updated).*

- After clarifying your theoretical and epistemological position (as mentioned above), can you ensure your analysis is consistent with it? If you continue to draw upon Braun and Clarke for your thematic analysis, can you please describe how you are conceptualising a theme according to their four dimensions (of a theme; in their 2016 paper)?

Author's response: *Thanks for the recommendation. Due to the clarification of the mentioned parts, several parts of the manuscript have been edited (please see other comments). In this case, we will first analyze data inductively. After initial themes are identified, refinement will align these themes with deductive elements (see codebook). Throughout the process, we will maintain our philosophical position regarding the constructivist approach and ensure that semantic themes are interpreted as represented in the data (please see more in the analysis part).*

- As you are doing a reflexive thematic analysis, can you following the APA Journal Article Reporting Standards for qualitative studies and ensure you provide a researcher description? For example, could you include a positionality statement akin to [Capability, Opportunity, and Motivation in Data Sharing Behaviour... (peercommunityin.org)](<https://rr.peercommunityin.org/articles/rec?id=462>) or <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/5yw4z>. Given the topic of this research, it would be interesting to highlight your positions in relation to the open practices you mention.

Author's response: *Thank you very much for this suggestion and a recommended preregistration. It has inspired us in crafting our individual positionality statements. Each author has recorded their own positionality statement on OSF: <https://osf.io/3vqma>.*

- Given the topic, can you give more details on how you are negotiating data sharing for this study? Perhaps an appendix where you 1) show how you are achieving it with relevant items in the information given to potential participants and in the consent form, 2) a mapping of the FAIR principles against your planned data archive (as in the example in Tables 2 and 3 in <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12728>) and 3) perhaps reflections on and/or descriptions about the support you have had and/or anticipate having in sharing the data (that may need completing at Stage 2). If you look at the FAIR principles, I would have imagined a dedicated

data archive, such as the UK Data Service, which you mention, would help in terms of making it 'reusable' because of the range of standardised meta-data they request. For example, I've seen other OSF projects where the data is difficult to find and would question if they would appear through library database or Internet search. Note that I raised a similar point in reviewing the Registered Report mentioned above and you can see how they resolved it [OSF | Henderson-etal-PCIRR-Stage1-V3-Clean.pdf](https://osf.io/bz9h6?view_only=c91a36012190462e8416cba250bdb8ed).

Author's response: Thank you very much for your very thought-provoking comment. It made us realize that we had forgotten to include informed consent (for which we apologize) and the anonymisation options we can provide to participants. Please, find the informed consent here: <https://osf.io/mxjn3>

We have also included the following (but slightly edited) section into the Procedure part of the manuscript:

“As part of the informed consent process, each participant will be offered three options regarding how the transcript of their conversation will be handled: 1) not to share the transcript at all, 2) to share in an anonymized form, 3) to share in an anonymized form only after the participant’s review.

Before the start of the interview or focus group, participants will be advised to avoid mentioning specific names, institution names, or events that could identify them or others. The anonymization will be carried out by members of the research team without the institutional support of a specialized facility, such as a Data Archive (which unfortunately does not exist at our institution). For thorough anonymization, we will proceed as follows: anonymization will always be carried out by two authors in a serial manner, where the second person will check the anonymization of the first. Any disclosive data or specific parts of the text that cannot be anonymized due to their nature (description of a specific institution, event, person, etc.) will be removed/redacted entirely. Within the blurring process, and in line with the guidelines provided by Campbell et al. (2023), we will convert numerical data to an interval range, use superordinate categories, replace specific text with more generalized ones, remove redacted text, and insert summaries of large redactions when feasible.”

From a pragmatic point of view and budgetary constraints we are unable to translate transcripts into English.

1D. Whether the clarity and degree of methodological detail would be sufficient to replicate the proposed experimental procedures and analysis pipeline.

This criterion assesses the extent to which the Stage 1 protocol contains sufficient detail to be reproducible and ensure protection against research bias, such as analytic overfitting or vague study procedures. In general, meeting this requirement will require the method section(s) of a Stage 1 protocol to be significantly longer and more detailed than in a regular manuscript, while also being clearly structured and accessible to readers. This criterion also covers the extent to which the protocol specifies precise and exhaustive links between the research question(s), hypotheses (where applicable), sampling plans (where applicable), analysis plans, and contingent interpretation given different outcomes. Authors are strongly encouraged to include a design summary table in their Stage 1 protocols that make these links clear (see [**Section

2.16**](https://rr.peercommunityin.org/help/guide_for_reviewers#h_27513965735331613309625021) for examples). Note that in some circumstances, authors may wish to propose a more general analysis plan involving a [blinded analyst](<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11229-019-02456-7>) rather than a precise specification of data analyses. Such submissions are acceptable and will meet this criterion provided the blinded analysis procedure is specified in reproducible detail, and provided the blinding procedure itself is sufficiently robust.

- I think describing the epistemological position would help in understanding how the rationale for the study, research questions and data analysis link up and how they will link up with the findings in Stage 2.

Author's response: *Thank you for the recommendation. We have elaborated on the individual sections (please see other comments) and hope that this version more clearly communicates our theoretical perspectives, concept or philosophical position and that these sections in the edited version will link up with the findings better. In addition, we have modified some of the wording in the text to be consistent with our epistemological and ontological position (e.g. regarding research questions and focus on perceptions and experiences, etc.).*

1E. Whether the authors have considered sufficient outcome-neutral conditions (e.g. absence of floor or ceiling effects; positive controls; other quality checks) for ensuring that the results obtained are able to test the stated hypotheses.

- NA

Review by Emma Norris, 02 May 2024 13:44

Thank you very much for sharing the Registered Report "Barriers and facilitators to the adoption and promotion of Open Science practices in psychology: The case of Slovakia" with me and asking for feedback.

The report presents a qualitative study to assess current barriers and facilitators of responsible research practices in psychology within Slovakia.

The report is relatively clearly structured but various points of clarification are required. My overall review is positive.

Important points

1. The structure of the Introduction requires clearer structure: currently changing between discussions of transparency, what OS practices are and why they're important, extent they are carried out. Sub-headings may support a clearer structure. Paragraphs are extremely long in places e.g page 4.

Author's response: *We confirmed this has been checked and re-structured.*

2. The Slovakia-specific context of Open Science in Slovakia is not discussed in the Introduction. For example, data on the extent Open Science practices are implemented within Slovakia is not clear. Can you pull-in examples to illustrate the extent this is an issue? What institutional structures exist to facilitate Open Science e.g Slovak Reproducibility Network? It is not sufficient to provide a table of Slovak Open Science initiatives as a supplementary document – please summarise within the introduction to add important context.

Author's response: *We have added a short description of the context of Open Science in*

Slovakia from the Supplementary material to the last paragraph of the Introduction. For more detailed information, we maintain a link to a living document that we will update infrequently.

3. It would be useful to distinguish qualitative research that has investigated Open Science practices, from quantitative (e.g survey) research. What has been learned from qualitative studies? Why is a qualitative approach important here? How have these qualitative studies specifically informed this study?

Author's response: *Thank you for the suggestion to distinguish between qualitative and quantitative research. We recognize the importance of both qualitative and quantitative research traditions. In Table S1, we have prepared a summary of the findings about potential barriers and facilitators of adopting Open Science Practices (OSP). In this table, we distinguish between different sources of references (qualitative vs. quantitative) which focused on barriers and facilitators of OSP. Based on our analysis, qualitative research is particularly valuable in this context because it provides insight into nuanced interactions across various levels of the scientific ecosystem. Specifically, it allows for greater flexibility and a deeper understanding of the intricate complexity and broader context, especially concerning different stakeholder groups and their mutual relationships.*

4. Rationale for individual interviews ('researchers', PhD students') and focus groups ('students', 'policy makers' and 'media) are not clearly justified. What are the theoretical and pragmatic reasons for these methodological decisions?

Author's response: *We would like to express our sincere apologies for the oversight in our manuscript regarding the absence of justification for differing sample sizes and methods for various groups. There are two primary reasons for this discrepancy.*

Firstly, the smaller sample size in the groups of Policy Makers and Media Representatives is due to pragmatic reasons - the challenge of locating these participants within the relatively small population of Slovakia.

We have chosen to use focus groups for these groups because the insights and opinions that emerge from focus group discussions with peers in the same profession or similar organizations tend to be more intriguing than their initial, unfiltered viewpoints. Since there has been limited progress in the field of OSP by grant agencies and university leadership in Slovakia, for Policy Makers, engaging in a mutual exchange of perspectives—identifying obstacles to progress in the field of OSP and discussing necessary changes—holds greater value than relying solely on uncorrected original opinions without feedback. In the Media representatives and Students group we anticipate that most participants will not have experience and, consequently, a defined opinion on OSP practices. We believe that their initial opinions (based on lack of information and experience) may be less interesting than their views and opinions after focus group discussion with peers.

5. Sample size estimations by group seem relatively arbitrary and not justified. Why are the same number of 'researcher's to be recruited versus 'students' (undergraduate and master students) for example?

Author's response: *Thanks to feedback from other reviewers and a recommender, we have completely redesigned our sample description and justification. We believe that our newly formulated rationale and sample sizes in each group are both more meaningful and feasible.*

6. The summary of your measures (interview and focus group schedules) is vague. What Open Science practices are asked about? What informed the development of your

interview/focus group schedules? Were these informed by previous qualitative studies – if so, how?

Author's response: *We have revised the descriptions of both the interview and focus group measures, adding more detail and explanation. Although their development was the product of team discussions and not directly based on any model, our choice of OSPs closely follows the TRUST model (which, adapted, we will use in the categorization of codes; please see other comments) used to evaluating implementation of TOP guidelines by journals (Mayo-Wilson et al., 2023). The exceptions are citation standards, which we deemed less relevant but were substituted and supplemented by open peer review, preprints, and open access publishing. The newly developed survey as a triangulation method mirrors the interview structure but was also developed based on previous work (Abele-Brehm et al., 2019; Beaudry et al., 2023; Spitzer & Mueller, 2021). Within interviews and focus groups, in addition to examining the perceptions and experiences of the barriers and facilitators of each of the Open Science Practices (OSPs) under study, we have incorporated questions to identify specific motivations for action or inaction, as well as perceptions of the meaning of science. These themes can provide additional context for specific barriers or facilitators. To ensure each interview concludes on a positive note, we have included two closing questions focused on the support and promotion of OSPs - asking what could be improved and what specific actions the participant could take to promote them.*

Minor points

7. Ensure in-text references are presented in alphabetical order e.g (Armeni et al., 2021; Nosek et al., 2015; Obels et al., 2020) rather than (Obels et al., 2020; Nosek et al., 2015; Armeni et al., 2021).

Author's response: *Corrected.*

8. Clear aims and objectives of this study are missing from the end of the Introduction.
9. Research questions should be reformulated to refer to Slovakia specifically.

Author's response: *The aim of our study is stated at the end of the first paragraph: "In this context, we aim to map perceptions and experiences of the barriers and facilitators related to the adoption and implementation of OSP in Slovakia by examining them qualitatively.". The aim is further developed and extended in the form of research questions at the end of the fourth paragraph: " All the information mentioned above led us to formulate the following research questions in our qualitative study on the perceptions and experiences of the barriers and facilitators to adopting and implementing OSP in psychology research among stakeholders in Slovakia:" further divided into Barriers and Facilitating factors. We have reformulated these parts to refer to Slovakia.*

10. How do you distinguish between 'challenges' and 'barriers'? If these are used to mean the same, please use just one throughout.

Author's response: *We apologize for not explaining the terms we mentioned earlier. Initially, by 'barriers,' we meant factors that prevent a person from using Open Science Practices (OSPs), such as management attitudes that discourage their use. We used 'challenges' to describe factors that, while not actively preventing the use of OSPs, require significant effort to overcome. However, after considerable discussion, we have concluded that this distinction is not clear-cut and only leads to confusion. Therefore, in the manuscript, we use only the term 'barriers' to encompass both concepts.*

11. Ethical approval number is missing (pg 5). Note that amendments may be required

following any subsequent protocol changes following Stage 1 review.

Author's response: *Thank you for pointing this out. We have added the ethical approval number to the text.*

12. A codebook is not described as being developed as part of the data analysis process. This would be useful supplementary material.

Author's response: *Following the work of Braun and Clarke (2006, 2016), we will combine both inductive and deductive approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of the data. Based on the previous findings and our own experiences, we formulated our expectations for each of the research questions (presented alongside the research questions). These served as the basis for creating deductive codes, which we present in the codebook (see the attachment on OSF: <https://osf.io/abe6y>). The categorization of codes into three main areas—structure, process, and outcome—closely follows the Donabedian model (Mayo-Wilson et al., 2021) described in the previous reply presented above. Originally, these three areas focused solely on institutions, but we have extended them to differentiate between individuals as well (e.g., “institutional policies” theme as a characteristic of institutions and “lack of knowledge” theme as a characteristic of individuals). We will add exemplar quotes to the codebook once we start analyzing the data. In the method section, we also describe how deductive codes will be used during the analysis process.*

Review by Crystal Steltenpohl, 13 May 2024 19:48

I would like to thank the authors for their submission to PCI RR. While my review focuses largely on my questions and suggestions (for the sake of time), I would like to say that I think this is an interesting study with the potential to produce some useful insight, and I hope the authors find my comments helpful as they refine their stage 1 RR. I would be happy to review another version of this if the recommender requests it; I am traveling quite a bit this summer but would be happy to prioritize this as much as I can.

INTRODUCTION

- It would be helpful to break the text so that there's one main idea per paragraph - there are a couple of times where a paragraph covers most if not all of the page, and it's a bit difficult to follow.

Author's response: *Corrected.*

- It's unfortunate that the positionality statement is inserted as an appendix, and without much discussion about how the authors' understanding of (open) science affects how they are approaching this work. I think it would be incredibly beneficial, both for the authors and for the audience, if the authors dig a bit deeper into their epistemological stances and how those might influence how they define open science and what practices “count” as open science - for instance, they mention open data, materials, etc., in their interview protocols, but what of member checking, participatory research, stakeholder/participant involvement? It would be great to see what, if any, strategies they are employing to highlight those perspectives and/or ensure that they do not become myopic in their approach. It would also be helpful for this to be integrated into the main text.

Author's response: *Thanks to feedback from other reviewers, we have expanded our general positionality statement to individual positionality statements in which we also evaluate the possible impact of our position towards OSP on the analysis process. Due to*

their extent, we only present them as supplementary materials. We have also supplemented our epistemological position. Thanks to your comment, we have carefully considered whether and how to incorporate member checking or participatory research techniques to “not become myopic” in our research. We believe that the size and diversity of our team (representing different career stages, gender, different research institutions and universities) along with open discussions and exchange of opposing views, is sufficient to maintain a distance when looking at the barriers and facilitators of OSP. From our perspective, we believe that the potential benefits may not outweigh the additional workload bringing in an additional researcher from another university would entail. We appreciate your understanding on this matter.

PARTICIPANTS

- I think the sampling strategy is largely fine, but it is worth noting that psychology is a very broad field. It may be helpful for the authors to include more thick description about the state of psychology within Slovakia so the audience can understand what subfields are most common in Slovakia, and/or describe how the authors will ensure that there will be diversity in each of the researcher, PhD student, and other student samples. If the state of the field of psychology in Slovakia is as broad as it might be elsewhere (I imagine it is), the authors may wish to either narrow the subfields they draw from, or sample more participants from those three groups in particular. (It's fine for the sample sizes to be different across groups.)

Author's response: Thank you for your insightful comment, which has prompted us to reconsider our sampling strategy. You're correct in stating that the field of psychology in Slovakia is diverse but on the other hand also homogeneous in the sense of the absence of specialized workplaces, labs or teams. The study of psychology, with the exception of teaching directions, is more or less uniform across the board, as it adheres to the same study program description provided by the Ministry of Education, without branching into different specializations. While the official PhD study fields may vary across universities, with some offering studies in social and work psychology, health psychology, etc., the actual content of these studies is from our point of view practically very similar, if not identical. To the best of our knowledge, Slovakia does not have specific workplaces, labs, or teams dedicated to research in specific subfields of psychology, such as counseling or work psychology. It is more common to find researchers conducting studies across various areas of psychology. This is also true at the Slovak Academy of Sciences. The only exception is the Research Institute of Child Psychology and Pathopsychology (Slovak abbr. VÚDPaP), a specific research organization focused on child psychology. However, we believe that the culture of the workplace could have a major impact on the use of OSP. Given this information, we have revised our sampling strategy. To capture a diverse range of psychology researchers in Slovakia, we plan to include a maximum of one participant from each department or faculty. With our sample size, we should be able to gather at least 12 different opinions based on the type of institutions (from a total number of 12 faculties where single-discipline psychology is taught and several others where psychology is taught in a combination with pedagogical studies). Furthermore, we have decided to include at least one person from VÚDPaP and one person from the Slovak Academy of Sciences. This approach will ensure a broad representation of the field.

METHODS

- A few of the questions in the interview protocols are close-ended, e.g., "Have you encountered open science practices in the course of your work?", "Is open science and its role sufficiently visible in public discourse?", etc. It would be good reword

these to encourage elaboration, e.g., "How have you encountered open science practices in the course of your work?", "How do you see open science manifest in public discourse, if at all?" It may also be helpful to consider probes to assist interviewers to dig deeper on certain responses. It would also be helpful to consider how someone who supports open science might respond and how someone who is more ambivalent or antagonistic toward certain (or all) open science practices might respond to each question, as a few questions may come across as assuming the respondent's perspective.

Author's response: *We have carefully reviewed all the questions once again and have thoughtfully rephrased them into open-ended questions to encourage more detailed responses. To assist participants in digging deeper into responses, we will utilize a set of probes for each question. For example: For the question "How have you encountered open science practices in the course of your work?", probes will include: "Can you provide specific examples of open science practices you have observed?" "How did these practices impact your work or your field?" etc.. Additionally, we would like to emphasize that the facilitators conducting these semi - structured interviews are experienced and trained researchers, they can effectively navigate the conversations, using the revised questions and probes to elicit rich, detailed responses from participants. Furthermore, we will be particularly sensitive to ambivalent responses. Our experience with a pilot focus group involving students from diverse backgrounds, who shared both positive and negative experiences with open science, has prepared us to handle a wide range of perspectives. By making these revisions, we aim to gather more comprehensive and nuanced data from our interviews. We believe these changes will enhance the depth and quality of the information collected.*

- I love that the authors have included both debriefing and reflection opportunities. It would be great to read about how these will be used in the analysis of their interviews.

Author's response: *We will be documenting both immediate individual and group debriefings. The transcripts from these sessions will be analyzed in conjunction with the reflections we receive individually via email. Although the texts from these three sources will be analyzed collectively, their results will be reported separately from the primary preregistered analysis (with interviews and focus groups transcripts). We will clearly distinguish and describe these analyses and their data sources in the Results section.*

ANALYSIS

- The authors state that they will use both inductive and deductive strategies, but it's not clear what their inductive codes are.

Author's response: *Following the work of Braun and Clarke (2006, 2016), we will combine both inductive and deductive approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of the data. We will start with a deductive coding framework based on very much limited pre-existing theories and concepts (ex. Bou Zeneddine et al., 2022a, b; Masaryk et al., 2019) relevant to our research question. However, we will remain open to new themes emerging inductively from the data, allowing for flexibility and the inclusion of insights that may not fit within the initial framework. This combined approach will ensure a thorough analysis, capturing both the explicit content and the underlying meanings within the data. By doing so, we aim to generate a rich, nuanced understanding of the participants' challenges and barriers when implementing open science practices.*

Our expectations formulated for each of the research questions (presented alongside the research questions) served as the basis for creating deductive themes, which we present in the codebook (see the attachment on OSF: <https://osf.io/abe6y>). The categorization of

themes into three main areas—structure, process, and outcome—closely follows the Donabedian model (Mayo-Wilson et al., 2021) described in the previous reply presented above. Originally, these three areas focused solely on institutions, but we have extended them to differentiate between individuals as well (e.g., “institutional policies” code as a characteristic of institutions and “lack of knowledge” code as a characteristic of individuals). We will add exemplar quotes to the codebook once we start analyzing the data.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2016). (Mis)conceptualising themes, thematic analysis, and other problems with Fugard and Potts' (2015) sample-size tool for thematic analysis. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 19(6), 739–743. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2016.1195588>

Bou Zeineddine F, Saab, R., Láštiová, B., & Kende, A., & Ayanian, A. H. (2022a) “Some uninteresting data from a faraway country”: Inequity and coloniality in international social psychological publications. *J Soc Issues*, 2021; 78: 320–345. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12481>

Bou Zeineddine, F., Saab, R., Láštiová, B., Ayanian, A. H., & Kende, A. (2022b). “Unavailable, Insecure, and Very Poorly Paid”: Global Difficulties and Inequalities in Conducting Social

Masaryk, R., Petrjánošová, M., Láštiová, B., Kuglerová, N., & Stainton Rogers, W. (2019). A story of great expectations : Qualitative research in psychology in the Czech and Slovak Republics. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 16 (3), 336-353

- Will the codebooks be shared? If so, what will they include (e.g., code, definition, inclusion and exclusion criteria, exemplar quotes)?

Author's response: Please see our response to the previous comment.

- Are the authors using a consensus approach to coding, then (rather than calculating kappa, etc.)? I think this is a good approach, but it's not directly stated.

Author's response: We apologize for not including this information in the text. We have now clarified the coding procedure in the manuscript.

Consensus coding will be used in both phases of the analysis: during the initial coding and later during the theme creation. We have decided to use double coding of all transcripts with the aim of not overlooking any important information. We believe that different coders have different perspectives on things and may notice different information in the text. For this reason, after the initial coding of the entire transcript, the coders diverge to compare transcripts and agree on which codes will be retained for the second step - theme creation, during an open discussion. It is possible that the same parts of the text will be marked by both coders but the assigned codes will differ in content and meaning. The goal of the open discussion is to find a consensus - to create or retain one code that will best capture that part of the text. In case the coders have a different view on a certain part of the text, instead of a consensus and retaining only one code, both - semantically different codes will be retained.

The goal of double coding is not to see one thing the same way - therefore we do not plan to calculate kappa, but to provide the most comprehensive view of the issue.

- The authors mention that they are going to try to map out potential causal relationships. Who is determining the "potential" for the causal relationship? The

respondents? The authors? Can this be expanded upon some?

Author's response: *Thinking about your comment, we decided not to formulate causal relationships, as they would likely not be supported by data and would, therefore, be speculative. Instead, we aim to stay at the level of reflexive thematic analysis—describing themes and subthemes. In the case of combining all samples (policy makers, researchers, students...), we intend to present individual themes within a single ecosystem, outlining their connections without establishing causal relationships: For instance, a barrier that prevents funders from supporting a certain practice may be perceived as a reason for not implementing the same practice at the individual level. or Researchers may not prioritize open access due to a lack of grant support, and grant agencies may cite an inability to allocate funds for this purpose. Students may have limited awareness of open science practices, while researchers (educators) might exhibit negative attitudes toward such practices or institutional policies that do not promote transparency.*

How will transcripts be de-identified? A resource that may be helpful, at least by means of creating and describing a process (not that I think the transcripts will cover traumatic material - I just really love how Campbell and colleagues mapped their process out):

- Campbell, R., Javorka, M., Engleton, J., Fishwick, K., Gregory, K., & Goodman-Williams, R. (2023). Open-science guidance for qualitative research: An empirically validated approach for de-identifying sensitive narrative data. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 6(4), 25152459231205832.

Author's response: *Thank you for your recommendation. We have included specific suggestions on how to proceed with blurring in the anonymization procedure (as outlined in the Campbell et al.) described above.*

- I think it would be helpful for the authors to state some of the things they think they will find. This will be immensely beneficial as they analyze their results - did they only find what they expected to find? If so, is this indicative of anything? If not, what have they learned? Will they be looking for negative cases? (If so, what does a negative case look like here?)

Author's response: *Thank you. Information about what we expect to find has been incorporated into the analysis plan. If findings contrasting with expectations will be observed, negative cases will be examined and reported. If we will find only what we expect to find, this will be discussed.*

- Can we link this back to the research questions a bit more? Are the authors looking to describe? Are they looking to generalize? If so, to what extent (to what population)? How will they know if they've answered their questions?

Author's response: *Thank you for suggesting to ponder about the limitations of generalizability and the main goal of research questions. Based on philosophical underpinning, our goal is mainly to describe and understand various perspectives, experiences and interpretations of different stakeholders. Accordingly, generalization to other population could be limited. For example relativist approach acknowledges that knowledge is context-dependent and influenced by various factors (e.g., social and cultural), while constructivist approach assumes that knowledge is actively constructed by individuals based on their experiences and interactions. Thus, generalizing would be possible only to some degree; as such, It won't be universal, but linked to specific contexts. Limitations to generalizations will be reflected.*

- I think there's some opportunity to triangulate here. The authors have described a few methods - there's also the Center for Open Science's Open Scholarship Survey (<https://osf.io/nsbr3/>). Will the authors triangulate any, and if so, how?

Author's response: Thank you for suggesting that we should triangulate our results. We have decided to use the triangulation of methods and incorporate data from a survey alongside the data from interviews and focus groups. The survey questions will follow the interview structure and will be administered to researchers only. The full survey is available on OSF (<https://osf.io/abe6y>) in a text file format and administration will be done through the Psytoolkit tool. In designing the items, we took inspiration from the survey you suggested as well as from other surveys carried out so far.

OTHER NOTES

I'd like to recommend a few pieces from qualitative realm (still heavily, though not entirely, psychology) that could be helpful - the authors absolutely do not need to reference any/all of them, but they cut across a couple of epistemic discussions that the authors may find interesting and wish to include. This may also inspire them to dig a bit deeper in their positionality statements and reflexivity practices generally around the perspectives they are bringing and reinforcing through their work, either now or as they work on this project. I think it's fine to consider largely reproducibility and replicability in open science, but it's worth noting that this is not the only way to view open science (and might not even be what most people are actually motivated by when engaging with open science).

- Bahn, S., & Weatherill, P. (2013). Qualitative social research: A risky business when it comes to collecting 'sensitive' data. *Qualitative Research*, 13(1), 19-35.
- Bennett, E. A. (2021). Open science from a qualitative, feminist perspective: Epistemological dogmas and a call for critical examination. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 45(4), 448-456.
- Class, B., de Bruyne, M., Wullemin, C., Donzé, D., & Claivaz, J. B. (2021). Towards open science for the qualitative researcher: From a positivist to an open interpretation. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20, 16094069211034641.
- Field, S. M., van Ravenzwaaij, D., Pittelkow, M. M., Hoek, J. M., & Derksen, M. (2021). Qualitative Open Science—Pain Points and Perspectives.
- Humphreys, L., Lewis, N. A., Sender, K., & Won, A. S. (2021). Integrating qualitative methods and open science: Five principles for more trustworthy research. *Journal of Communication*, 71(5), 855-874.
- Jacobs, A. M. (2020). Pre-registration and results-free review in observational and qualitative research. *The production of knowledge: Enhancing progress in social science*, 221-264.
- Makel, M. C., Meyer, M. S., Simonsen, M. A., Roberts, A. M., & Plucker, J. A. (2022). Replication is relevant to qualitative research. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 27(1-2), 215-219.
- Pownall, M. (2024). Is replication possible in qualitative research? A response to Makel et al.(2022). *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 1-7.
- Pownall, M., Talbot, C. V., Kilby, L., & Branney, P. (2023). Opportunities, challenges and tensions: Open science through a lens of qualitative social psychology. *British Journal of Social Psychology*.
- Stegenga, S. M., Steltenpohl, C. N., Renbarger, R., Lee, L. E., Standiford Reyes, L., Lustick, H., & Meyer, M. S., PhD. (2023, September 5). Open Science Practices in Early Childhood Special Education Research: A Systematic Review and Conceptual Replication. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/8gbjp>
- Steltenpohl, C. N., Lustick, H., Meyer, M. S., Lee, L. E., Stegenga, S. M., Reyes, L. S., & Renbarger, R. (2022). Rethinking transparency and rigor from a qualitative open science perspective. *Journal of Trial and Error*.

- TalkadSukumar, P., & Metoyer, R. (2019). Replication and transparency of qualitative research from a constructivist perspective.
- Tuval-Mashiach, R. (2021). Is replication relevant for qualitative research? *Qualitative Psychology*, 8(3), 365.

Author's response: *We would like to express our sincere gratitude for recommending additional literature. We found these suggestions particularly helpful and have incorporated several of the recommended sources into our revised manuscript.*

FINAL THOUGHTS

I think this is an interesting project with the potential to garner insight to the workflows, working conditions, and perspectives of Slovakian researchers. This is incredibly exciting to me, and I hope my comments have been helpful. Again, I'm happy to take another look at this and will do my best to prioritize reviewing any revision(s) if they do come across my digital desk.

Author's response: *Thank you very much. We hope that our revision will provide a major improvement over the initial version.*