

29 August 2023

Dear Dr Karhulahti,

Thank you for the decision letter and reviews for our manuscript #462 entitled "Investigating the barriers and enablers to data sharing behaviours: A qualitative Registered Report".

We thank you and the reviewers for your thoughtful and constructive insights that have improved the design and precision of our Stage 1 manuscript. We have given careful consideration to each of the points raised. Below we have copied each reviewer comment in full (in italics) and have inserted our response beneath each comment (indented). Note that all page numbers refer to the track changes version of the manuscript.

We hope our revisions address all your comments, and we look forward to your response to our revision.

Yours sincerely

Emma Henderson

Editor comments

Dear Emma Henderson and co-authors,

Thank you for submitting a scheduled Stage 1 to PCI RR. We have now received two of the three commissioned reviews of your submission. Because the third reviewer was unable to deliver in promised time but the two other reviews are of very high quality, I have decided to make a decision based on these two reviews and my own assessment. Evidently, both reviews consider this Stage 1 proposal of high interest and quality overall. I will add a few comments of my own, partly overlapping with what is already said in the reviews.

1. Both reviews highlight that the method, while generally appropriate for the data and goals, is not fully optimal for the present design. I agree with these observations. Although it is true that some previous studies have carried out first inductive analysis and then classified the results into existing categories, this seems like unnecessary double workload. If the aim is to explore how the existing categories manifest in the present data, why not do deductive analysis and save a lot of scarce resources? If the goal would be to challenge the COM-B/TDF framework, then it would be logical to go inductive and see what themes don't fit COM-B/TDF. Because these priors have already been considered in designing the interview frame and the goal is to seek them in general, everything points to a deductive approach. I'm not going to insist that you abandon the inductive approach but please consider it and see the next comment.

Following your comments and those of the reviewers, we have carefully considered and discussed our coding approach. We agree that thematic template analysis and a more deductive approach is most appropriate, and we have amended the manuscript (primarily on pages 24 - 27) to reflect this. We have also slightly amended the 'sample size justification' section on p. 17, and updated points 9, 22, 24, and 26 of the COREQ checklist.

While it is not our aim to challenge COM-B and TDF, the present study is among the first to apply these frameworks to open research behaviours. Therefore, we will use the COM-B/TDF as our initial coding template (see version 1 at [OSF | Materials & Procedures](#)), but as suggested by Brooks et al. (2015), we will modify these themes if they are ineffective at characterising the data. We will transparently report all versions of our coding template and have noted this in the text.

2. If I follow Braun & Clarke's guidelines for editors (2021) and ask "Is there a good 'fit' between the theoretical and conceptual underpinnings of the research and the specific type of TA (i.e. is there conceptual coherence)?" (p. 345), it seems that the current study design is not necessarily the best fit with reflexive TA because you wish to map barriers and enablers comprehensively in existing models. In reflexive TA, one cannot cover more than 2-6 themes in any depth (according to Braun & Clarke's own estimation -- but I understand you also plan to move sub-thematic codes to the theoretical model). One reviewer suggest an alternative thematic analysis method, thematic template analysis, which I agree would fit perfectly with the current RQs and theoretical frame. Again, I'm not going to say you must abandon reflexive TA, and based on the positionality statement I understand there have been notable preparations to explicitly use reflexive TA. I will support the use of any working approach, including reflexive TA, but also wish to highlight that the differences between reflexive TA other TA options are not always very big and it's good to keep in mind that Braun and Clarke's reflexive TA is by no means the only qualitative or even TA method where reflexivity is an important part of the analysis! (I.e., it wouldn't be a huge leap to move to using thematic template analysis or similar.)

As mentioned above, we will now use thematic template analysis instead, and appreciate your guidance and that of the reviewers on this matter.

3. As pointed out in reviews, discussing the epistemological assumptions of the study would be very useful. I'm personally ok with having the COREQ supplement and find it as a useful checklist from an editorial/reviewer point of view. For the record, however, I should note that reflexive TA opposes the use of COREQ quite strongly. In addition to the critiques in the works you have already cited, see the points listed by Victoria Clarke (I know it's a bit sad to cite Twitter but I cannot currently find other locations and I want you to have the Stage 1 decision today): <https://twitter.com/drvicclarke/status/1497213812545671170?s=20>

On p. 24 - 25 we have clarified both our ontological and epistemological positions. See below further details in our response to Peter Branney.

Thank you for highlighting the point about COREQ and providing the link (we also could not find another central location other than Twitter). We have added the following text on p. 15 that acknowledges the critiques of COREQ: “We note that the COREQ is controversial, with criticisms including the inability to replicate the development of COREQ (Buus & Perron, 2020), a focus on data saturation (Braun & Clarke, 2021c) and on the interviewer gender over other relevant characteristics (Clarke, 2022). In the present study, the COREQ checklist did not guide our decisions, but provides a quick summary of the research. Additionally, we supplement interviewer characteristics by providing positionality statements (see “Positionality” component on the OSF https://osf.io/d4sjk/?view_only=d2ada9f1d54141c28d3dd3714c86ea46).”

4. As pointed out in reviews, the two RQs seem to overlap significantly. One reviewer suggests removing RQ2, but I'm personally thinking whether dropping RQ1 would affect the study design at all, no? You're free to choose whatever option feels best (I understand splitting the RQ is motivated by the initial 2-part analysis plan), but please reflect on the RQs carefully one more time with your epistemological and theoretical premises outlined.

The reviews have been very useful in prompting reflection on our research questions. We have removed RQ2 and kept RQ1 (p. 14) “What are the barriers and enablers to data sharing experienced by researchers?”.

5. I very much like how there are clear inclusion and exclusion criteria! Reviewers make important suggestions for further improving this section. Adding to that, I'm also a bit puzzled why only those with data sharing experiences are included, and one must also work in a team? Based on my own experience, the barriers manifest most visibly in the experiences of those colleagues who have never shared. Why are they not included? There is a note saying “to ensure that participants can talk about their experiences of barriers and enablers” but I'm not sure why researchers without such experience wouldn't be able to talk about, e.g. their lacking motivations to share? It feels that this is an important group of experiences related to the RQs. As for the criterion about working in a team, I'm also thinking of many good discussions about data sharing I've had with ethnographers, design researchers, and other scholars who mainly do solo-authored work. I believe they would also have valuable and relevant experiences to share.

The aim of including the word “teams” was to include those who may no longer directly collect data themselves but nonetheless have views on data sharing. We have reworded the text on p.15 to make this clear: “Inclusion criteria: Researchers who work in teams that produce potentially shareable data in their research or work in a team that does so, and self-report as one or more of the following...”

It is absolutely our intention to hear from both those with and without data sharing experience. We designed the third criterion on p.15 to capture those that are aware of open research concepts and that have thought about data sharing but have never done so. We have changed the wording on this inclusion criterion from “familiar with” to

“aware of” to reflect the broader and more inclusive wording that’s used in the recruitment screening survey: “or (c) They are ~~familiar with~~ aware of two or more of the aforementioned Open Research practices and have considered data sharing, but have not yet engaged with it.” We chose this criterion to ensure that we capture the perspective of those that have not shared data, but have enough knowledge of the topic to engage with the questions. If this criterion does not cover what you were thinking, we are happy to relook at it with your guidance.

6. The section “Previous Research on Qualitative Sample Sizes” seems unnecessary because it talks about saturation which is not used here.

We would prefer to leave this section in (and we note that Peter Branney commended the sample size section in general) because it is the only one of the three justifications that provides some numerical estimate of sample size. We have reordered the section to make it clear that the Braun and Clarke recommendations do not relate to data saturation. Please let us know if you would prefer us to keep just the Braun and Clarke sentence and delete the other sentences in this section.

7. This comment is not about the design but a suggestion that you may wish to consider in general. You’re planning to anonymize the data, which is ok for this study. But I’m also thinking, wouldn’t it be valuable to keep the option to return to the interviewees e.g., in 3 years and see if the ongoing policy changes and new academic incentives have changed their data sharing habits and perceptions? To keep this option, you’d need to pseudonymize the data and keep the identifier key. Of course, if that’s not something you’re interested in, just ignore this.

Thank you for the idea. We have changed ‘anonymised’ to pseudonymised’ throughout the manuscript. On p. 24 we have added mention of keeping an identifying key: “We will keep a pseudonymisation log of any edits and an identifying key, to be stored separately from the pseudonymised transcripts.” And we have added a footnote on the same page to explain why the data are pseudonymised: “We plan to pseudonymise the data and keep an identifying key to allow the possibility of future follow up interviews with the participants.”

Please also carefully consider the rest of the reviewers’ detailed feedback. I hope the feedback overall is helpful in revising the study, and you can contact me any time during the process if questions occur.

Best wishes
Veli-Matti Karhulahti

Reviews

Reviewed by moin syed, 19 Jul 2023 08:58

This is a well-written proposal for a study that will yield additional information about researchers' beliefs about the barriers and opportunities for data sharing. I have three substantive areas of feedback for the authors to consider before conducting their study.

1. *The project relies strongly on the COM-B and TDF frameworks, yet the analysis is characterized as being inductive. Speaking from experience attempting to do inductive work in the context of an existing theory, it is highly unlikely that the thematizing will not be influenced by these frameworks. Indeed, the questions themselves were designed to align with the domains from the frameworks. This is also a serious issue for RQ2, in which the authors intend to map the results on to the frameworks. If the purpose of this analysis (which was not entirely clear) is to illustrate the value of the frameworks, then it runs the risk of being a circular, "question begging" exercise. I understand that the coding process itself is intended to be inductive, in that themes will be generated from the data rather than predetermined, but I think that the current presentation suggests greater distance between the frameworks, data, and analysis than is actually the case. Although I could certainly be convinced otherwise, my current perspective is that this project should be situated as much more theoretically driven with respect to COM-B and TDF.*

We really appreciate your insights and agree. We have reconsidered our approach based on your comments and those of the other reviewer and the Recommender. As suggested by Peter Branney, we now use thematic template analysis with COM-B and the TDF as the basis of our initial coding template (see version 1 at [OSF | Materials & Procedures](#)).

While it is not our aim to challenge COM-B and the TDF, the present study is among the first to apply these frameworks to open research behaviours. Therefore, we will use the COM-B/TDF as our initial coding template, but as suggested by Brooks et al. (2015), we will modify these themes if they are ineffective at characterising the data. We will transparently report all versions of our coding template. We have amended the manuscript (primarily on pages 24 - 27) to reflect our revised approach.

We have also removed RQ2 and kept RQ1 (p. 14) "What are the barriers and enablers to data sharing experienced by researchers?".

2. *I was surprised to see that nearly all of the data analysis is to be completed by a single researcher. Even though others will review the analysis along the way, it is really set up to be driven by one person. One of the strengths of this kind of qualitative approach is the ability to develop a strong and diverse "interpretative community" (to use the language of Gilligan and Brown's Listening Guide method). Having multiple analysts helps to bring out unique perspectives and biases that can improve the process. For example, having two or more researchers independently develop the initial themes, which are then compared and discussed as a team, can lead to a much richer understanding of the data. To my point above, it would be especially strong to have at least one analyst who is not at all familiar with the COM-B and TDF frameworks, to avoid being overly committed to them. Note that this is not the same thing as*

having multiple independent raters that are used to develop inter-rater reliability, which I understand does not mesh with the authors' goals. The process brings a deeper understanding, not a singular one.

The use of template analysis facilitates further involvement from other analysts. On p. 25 - 26 we have added the following text that describes the coding template being developed by two authors, one of whom has limited knowledge of COM-B/TDF: "Stages 1 – 4 below will be carried out independently by the first author (ELH), who is familiar with COM-B and the TDF, and the fourth author (EKF), whose familiarity with the models is limited to this study, and who therefore brings a different perspective to the analysis. Throughout the process, coding will be discussed with all authors for the purpose of developing a richer understanding of the data. The final coding template will be agreed by all authors."

We have also added positionality statements for all authors, see "Positionality" component on the OSF

https://osf.io/d4sjk/?view_only=d2ada9f1d54141c28d3dd3714c86ea46.

3. *I appreciated the detailed discussion of sampling, but I still had some concerns. Most notably, I was unsure why the study was being restricted to one university, especially given that the interviews will be conducted online. Fitting with the reflexive approach, it would also be important for the authors to situate their project and findings in the UK context, which has unique privacy, ethics, infrastructure, funding landscapes, and so on, which may (or may not) constrain the generality of the findings. Although the authors intend to recruit a broad sample, I did not see any assurances that they would do so. That is, there is nothing in the current proposal that would prevent the final sample from consisting of senior men in STEM (at least for the first 12, before sampling discussions take place). I also wondered why the specific demographics were targeted, and why race/ethnicity was not among them (especially because this information will be collected in the survey). Given that this is a Registered Report, it is important that the authors are clear on their commitments to what the sample will look like.*

We did not make clear in the original Stage 1 that this is applied work carried out on behalf of the Open Research team at the University of Surrey. We are therefore specifically interested in the behaviour of our researchers and will use the findings from this research to inform the development of future interventions to promote data sharing at the university. While we hope that the results will be useful beyond our university, this is the reason that we limit the participants to one particular university. We now mention this on p. 3 "The present qualitative research uses a behaviour change framework to determine the barriers and enablers that researchers experience when (considering) engaging with data sharing behaviours, with a view to informing the design of future interventions." And on p. 13 we have added the following text: "From this perspective, we are particularly interested in participants from one university because the insights from this study will be used by the university to develop future interventions to encourage data sharing."

Thank you for pointing out that we had not included any assurances for diverse recruitment. We have addressed this by adding the following text to p. 16: “As a minimum, we will ensure that our final sample includes one female and one male participant from each of the four career stages (see Table 1), one participant from each of the three broad research discipline (STEM, Social Sciences, and Humanities), two participants from ethnic groups other than White British, and two participants who have not shared data.”

Re your point to situate the project and findings in the UK context, we will address this in the discussion section as appropriate given our findings.

In sum, I think this is a strong proposal for a useful study, that just needs some additional work before it is ready. I appreciate that the authors are taking on this project.

Reviewed by Peter Branney, 19 Jul 2023 10:49

Thank you for the opportunity to peer review this planned Stage 1 review. 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))

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

The argument for this research is that there is a 1) critical mass of international and national policies and guidelines promoting the data sharing and 2) evidence of poor - or superficial - engagement in sharing research data. The research questions are based on a theory of data sharing as behaviour as understood through the COM-B, which allows one to research individual behaviour within a system that potentially constitutes multiple barriers and enablers. Consequently, the research questions are aiming to identify barriers and enablers to data sharing and mapping them to the COM-B. The examples of ideal data sharing behaviours are useful in the context of the theoretical approach taken. Could you elaborate on the epistemological position you are taking in this study as I think it would be useful in understanding how these 'individual behaviours' are conceptualised, which will be particularly useful when it comes to the explanation of the way data will be analysed. Are you, for example, taking a naive realist position in which the interviews will provide us direct, unmediated accounts of their, and others', behaviours? I note that your first research question includes experience ('...experienced by researchers'), so do you need to explain your epistemological position so that we can understand how we can have knowledge about these experiences in ways that inform us of enablers and barriers according to the COM-B?

Upon reflection (based on these reviews) we have removed RQ2 and kept RQ1 (p. 14) “What are the barriers and enablers to data sharing experienced by researchers?”.

On p. 24 - 25 we have added the following text to clarify both our ontological and epistemological positions: "...Where template analysis sits on the spectrum of thematic analysis depends on researchers' epistemological position. As this research aims to explore what factors influence researchers' data sharing behaviours, we will adopt a critical realist ontology assuming that a meaningful reality exists but that our experience of it is subjective and socially influenced (Braun & Clarke, 2013). The analysis will also be underpinned by a contextualist epistemology: Contextualism aims to understand truth, but views knowledge as contextually located and influenced by the researcher's position, and therefore truth is bound to the context in which data are collected and analysed (Madill et al. 2000). This position is consistent with a data-focused approach to thematic analysis that acknowledges the active role of the researcher (Brooks et al., 2015). From this philosophical position, template analysis sits on the spectrum between codebook and reflexive thematic analysis, and on the continuum between deductive (initial themes are established before coding) and inductive (themes are developed and refined through engagement with the data) thematic analysis."

I have some minor thoughts to share as reflections rather than anything I would require that is changed. 1) First, the argument for this study (the critical mass of policies and poor engagement) risks treating data sharing as relatively new and therefore ignoring either its longer history (P. Branney et al., 2019) or the different ways in which data sharing has been performed, such as in the domain of interaction analysis (Huma & Joyce, 2022). Indeed, one could argue that informal data sharing has been occurring as long as data has been collected but the the development of technologies, such as the Internet, and principles, particularly the FAIR principles of data management and stewardship, created the conditions for new ways of sharing research data.

2) Second, given the theoretical approach taken (COM-B) there seems to be quite a leap between the critical mass or international policies and guidelines promoting data sharing and the evidence of lack of engagement. That is, from a COM-B perspective would one be surprised that these policies and guidelines haven't (yet) been matched by evidence of sufficient data sharing behaviour? Is there scope to say that this study focuses on one area - individual behaviour - but that from a COM-B perspective there would also need to be other areas of focus? 3) Or, if that is not possible, is there a need to situate this study within the literature for and against data sharing, particularly for qualitative data (P. Branney et al., 2017, 2019; P. E. Branney et al., 2023; British Psychological Society, 2020; Broom et al., 2009; DuBois et al., 2018a, 2018b; Karhulahti, 2023; McCurdy & Ross, 2018; Neale & Bishop, 2011; Parry & Mauthner, 2004; Pownall et al., In Press; Roller & Lavrakas, 2018)? 4) Last, Is this study about 'data stewardship' rather than 'data sharing'? My reading of this manuscript is that the FAIR principles are about 'data sharing' and 'data reuse' but isn't this a subtle but important shift from Wilkinson's original focus on 'data management and stewardship'? Given your ideal data sharing behaviours, I wonder if it would be more appropriate to frame this paper around data stewardship.

1. On p. 3 we have added text to acknowledge the longer history of data sharing: Though formal data sharing has existed for over 100 years (Branney et al., 2019; Karhulahti, 2022; Sieber, 2015), it was the digital age and electronic access to data that created the conditions to facilitate widespread sharing.”
2. Policy options (one of which is ‘guidelines’) make up the outer ring of the Behaviour Change Wheel (BCW; see our Figure 1). To systematically design and develop theory-based behaviour change interventions, one works outwards from the centre of the BCW: First performing a behavioural diagnosis, such as the present study, using COM-B to understand the influences on behaviour, before mapping those influences/what needs to change to appropriate intervention types (red ring) and then policy options (grey ring). Historically, open research interventions have not been developed using a behaviour change framework (Norris & O’Connor, 2019), so we don’t know whether the current policies are the most effective ways to drive change.
We agree that researchers are only part of a wider system of data sharing (we note this on p. 4) but because they have ultimate responsibility for sharing their data, they are a key conduit for change. The interviews focus on understanding how other actors in the system (the institution, colleagues etc) do/could help facilitate data sharing. If the interviews reveal that other areas would benefit from a COM-B analysis, this will be mentioned as part of our findings. Note also that we plan to create a behavioural map that plots data sharing behaviours and their dependencies within the broader university system, and shows relationships between actors, behaviours, and influences (barriers and enablers), see p. 14.
3. Thank you very much for the references. On p. 6, we have added a new paragraph on concerns about data sharing: “Debates about data sharing commonly focus on qualitative human data (Karhulahti, 2022), and point particularly to concerns over epistemology, informed consent, and privacy (e.g., Parry & Mauthner, 2004). Issues of epistemology relate to the reflexive, subjective, and contextually-bound nature of qualitative research that suggests that reuse could lead to misinterpretation (e.g., Broom et al., 2009). The key concerns raised about informed consent are whether researchers are less willing to be candid about sensitive topics (MacLean et al., 2019), and whether participants truly understand the implications of consent (Parry & Mauthner, 2004). Relatedly, concerns have been raised about ensuring anonymisation of qualitative data, particularly for sensitive data or small, potentially re-identifiable communities (Broom et al., 2009; Parry & Mauthner, 2004). However, it is possible for these issues to be overcome with careful planning and sufficient resources (see, Bishop, 2005; Branney et al., 2019, 2023; DuBois et al., 2018; Karhulahti, 2022 for proposed solutions). Furthermore, the majority of participants consent to share their deidentified data (e.g., Mozersky et al., 2020), even for research on sensitive topics such as abortion (VandeVusse et al., 2022) and GP-patient conversations (Amelung et al., 2020; discussed in Whitaker, 2021), citing helping others as their primary motivation (VandeVusse et al., 2022).”
4. We acknowledge your point about data sharing/stewardship by adding a footnote on p. 5: “The terms ‘data sharing’ and ‘data stewardship’ have been used somewhat interchangeably. In the present research we use the term data sharing because our

starting point is the sharing of data and then we expand out to what is required to share data well (see our six-point list of behaviours below). This differs from (though overlaps with) data stewardship which comes from a data governance framework. Data stewardship captures a broad set of activities, one of which is data sharing, but focuses on long term management, storage, and preservation, and may be carried out by a data steward." We have also added "data stewardship" as a keyword.

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

The first research question is about the barriers and enablers to data sharing and is appropriate for the COM-B theoretical perspective. It would be useful to describe the epistemological position, so that we can understand how it is possible to have knowledge of these experiences through a COM-B theoretical perspective.

Is the second research question necessary? That is, if the second question is theoretical (the COM-B and TDF), does that mean the first research question is ostensibly atheoretical? Instead, isn't this entire study being conducted from a COM-B theoretical perspective? If not, can you describe this other perspective, even if it is an ostensibly atheoretical one?

As mentioned above, we have removed RQ2, and we have described our epistemological position.

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

The method section is comprehensive and provides a good level of detail about what is planned. I particularly liked the three-part approach to the sample size.

Can you develop the data analysis, so that it clearly aligns with your epistemology? The description of reflexive thematic analysis is useful but I cannot see why it is appropriate if you are taking COM-B and TDF as your theoretical perspectives. Indeed, the time and effort required for a reflexive thematic analysis seems like a waste if you are going to move onto a second top-down analysis with COM-B and TDF as your framework. Would (a single research question and single phase of analysis with) template analysis be more appropriate as some versions of it allow a good balance between the bottom-up focus on experience while using a top-down framework (Brooks et al., 2015)?

We have improved the conceptual coherence of our study by using a single research question and template analysis. As mentioned above, we have aligned our approach to template analysis with our philosophical position (p. 24 - 25). The steps we will follow to complete the template analysis are on p. 25 - 27. We have also slightly amended the 'sample size justification' section on p. 17.

It is good to see the inclusion of the positionality statement for one of the researchers. What is the role of the other contributors and can you elaborate on why there is no positionality

statement for them? Can you add more detail to the positionality statement so that it is easier to read by someone unfamiliar with you? E.g., where you write 'most of my experience has been using quantitative methods', some citations would help a little in understanding your experiences, as 'quantitative' is broad. Also, for the courses, could you give more details on who/what organisation ran them, dates and citations to any materials in the public domain? I also wonder if it would help if you added a reflection and elaboration on your own data sharing. For example, if you have shared data, could you examine it against the FAIR principles to see if and how they compare? Also, have you been a participant in research with data that has and/or has not been shared?

As a result of the change to use template analysis, other contributors now have a more active role in the analysis and we have therefore added positionality statements for all four authors. I have updated my (the first author's) positionality statement to add the details you suggested. Changes have been made using track changes and can be found along with the other statements here:

https://osf.io/d4sjk/?view_only=d2ada9f1d54141c28d3dd3714c86ea46.

Where you include urls to materials about the study, can you change them to references, highlighting what information, such as url, doi, etc. will be changed or added at Stage 2? I imagine this will be important in understanding how this particular study compares to the FAIR principles. That is, if the links to the materials are only available via the paper, they be less 'findable' than if they were on a accessible on a system that is available through library database and Internet search.

At Stage 2, we will change the view-only links to references as appropriate. This has been noted in the Stage 1 on p. 14. In addition, the data will be deposited in the UK Data Service and a reference added.

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 (P. E. Branney et al., 2023) 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.

Based on your recommendation, we will now use the UK Data Service in addition to the OSF repository. We have added a document mapping the FAIR principles against our planned data archiving as per tables 2 and 3 in Branney et al. (2023), see "Data" component on the OSF

https://osf.io/ejcp5/?view_only=5a52bec09805486b9af2e5a588263855. We don't anticipate needing any support with data sharing, but if we do, we will add this information at Stage 2.

Information given to participants (PIS) and the consent form are available in the "Materials & Procedures" component on the OSF

https://osf.io/w3sfq/?view_only=53487da8f8af4eb79a69784de9bc5c62.

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

As I've mentioned above, 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.

As mentioned above, we have added a description of our epistemological position on p. 24 - 25.

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

References

- Branney, P. E., Brooks, J., Kilby, L., Newman, K., Norris, E., Pownall, M., Talbot, C. V., Treharne, G. J., & Whitaker, C. M. (2023). *Three steps to open science for qualitative research in psychology*. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12728>
- Branney, P., Reid, K., Frost, N., Coan, S., Mathieson, A., & Woolhouse, M. (2019). A context-consent meta-framework for designing open (qualitative) data studies. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 16(3), 483–502. <https://doi.org/10/gf429z>
- Branney, P., Woolhouse, M., & Reid, K. (2017). The 'innocent collection of details' and journal requests to make qualitative datasets public post-consent: Open access data, potential author response and thoughts for future studies. *QMIP Bulletin*, 23, 19–23.
- British Psychological Society. (2020). *Position statement: Open data*. *British Psychological Society*. <https://www.bps.org.uk/guideline/open-data-position-statement>
- Brooks, J., McCluskey, S., Turley, E., & King, N. (2015). The Utility of Template Analysis in Qualitative Psychology Research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(2), 202–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2014.955224>
- Broom, A., Cheshire, L., & Emmison, M. (2009). *Qualitative Researchers' Understandings of Their Practice and the Implications for Data Archiving and Sharing*. *Sociology*, 43(6), 1163–1180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038509345704>

- DuBois, J. M., Strait, M., & Walsh, H. (2018a). *Is it time to share qualitative research data? Qualitative Psychology*, 5(3), 380–393. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000076>
- DuBois, J. M., Strait, M., & Walsh, H. (2018b). *Is it time to share qualitative research data? Qualitative Psychology*, 5(3), 380–393. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000076>
- Huma, B., & Joyce, J. B. (2022). 'One size doesn't fit all': Lessons from interaction analysis on tailoring Open Science practices to qualitative research. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, n/a(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12568>
- Karhulahti, V.-M. (2023). Reasons for qualitative psychologists to share human data. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, n/a(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12573>
- McCurdy, S. A., & Ross, M. W. (2018). Qualitative data are not just quantitative data with text but data with context: On the dangers of sharing some qualitative data: Comment on Dubois et al. (2018). *Qualitative Psychology*, 5(3), 409–411. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000088>
- Neale, B., & Bishop, L. (2011). Qualitative and Quantitative Longitudinal Resources in Europe. *IASSIST Quarterly*, 34(3–4), 6. <https://doi.org/10.29173/iq189>
- Parry, O., & Mauthner, N. S. (2004). Whose Data are They Anyway?: Practical, Legal and Ethical Issues in Archiving Qualitative Research Data. *Sociology*, 38(1), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038504039366>
- Pownall, M., Talbot, C. V., Kilby, L., & Branney, Peter. (In Press). Opportunities, Challenges, and Tensions: Open Science through a lens of Qualitative Social Psychology. *British Journal of Social Psychology*.
- Roller, M. R., & Lavrakas, P. J. (2018). A total quality framework approach to sharing qualitative research data: Comment on Dubois et al. (2018). *Qualitative Psychology*, 5(3), 394–401. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000081>

Peter Branney