In addition to these quantitative results, our survey also included the option for open responses on each artifact type, particularly asking for reasons why data was not shared, and for general comments at the end of the survey. We received a total of 88 comments in 2018, and 72 in 2019. After deduplication (some responses had been entered for multiple artifact types by the same respondent), we performed exploratory coding on the remaining 121 unique comments, resulting in the following themes:

* Lack of resources, particularly in relation to lack of incentives (22% of deduplicated comments). Commenters shared a general feeling that preparing research artifacts for public release would just add another chunk to the already significant workload faced by researchers, without any clear benefit to themselves. Exemplary quotes:

*"In my opinion, unless publication venues do not make authors submit their data to the website or publicize their data, authors may not intend to open their data. Publicizing data requires a step for refinement and it takes much time if the data size is not small. For example, if I have to open my data and related documents, then I need to check all the files and revise them. But if I had to submit these to SIG CHI [sic] conference as a mandatory process then I would do it by all means." (2018)*

*"Lack of time to prepare these supporting materials will be a big issue. Post docs already have significant problems trying to fulfil all their obligations. Getting these materials ready to share will be another burden on them. Whilst sharing this information is clearly of value, how can post-docs benefit from this process? Or, how can time be made for them to complete this extra task? Also, how will this material be used by others? Will we still assume the paper is the correct interpretation of the data? Or will we also now be required to "check" the validity of a paper, both in reviewers and when we are referencing work?" (2018)*

*"Honestly, a big thing that also keeps me from making any of my data available is fear that I'll be criticized for practices that I have (or don't have). As a newer researcher it's stressful and difficult to get published as it is - giving everybody out there yet another avenue to tear my research apart sounds terrifying. I know that maybe isn't the best scientific attitude to have, but this community can be extremely critical (to the point of seeming unprofessionally mean) and I dread exposing even more of myself to that." (2018)*

*"No one has asked for them and I am lazy." (2018)*

*"We plan on making the materials public in a Github repository, but haven't found the time yet to do so." (2019)*

*"For showing the original field notes and transcripts, that maybe helpful -- because the cited comments were selected as important and representative parts of the original transcripts. However, that need a lot of work to clean the format, typo, etc., to make it as part of the paper. I guess that is the main reason -- for the ~5% value gain, authors have to spend 30%-40% time formatting the data." (2019)*

* Lack of utility beyond the paper (17%). Commenters in this category generally were convinced that sharing the raw data would not provide any value in addition to the contents of the paper itself. Exemplary quotes:

*"The contribution of this paper stands on its own, without requiring these materials." (2018)*

*"I believe in sharing code and data. Most of my other recent papers share source-code and data on GitHub. This was just a project where it did not seem to add much value." (2018)*

*"We haven’t found a reason to articulate more fully than in the paper." (2019)*

*"All relevant/pertinent quotes (participant feedback) were provided in the paper." (2019)*

*"While there may be some marginal benefit to making them public, given the detail already provided in the paper, it didn’t seem worth spending any extra time on" (2019)*

* Legal/IRB/privacy reasons (18%). Commenters expressed concern that sharing user-generated data might cause legal issues, be difficult to anonymize properly, or be vetoed by a review board. Exemplary quotes:

*"Due to legal reasons, we couldn't make our dataset available for public download. Instead, we indicated in a footnote in the paper that the data can be obtained by contacting the first author. After clarifying some points, we then share the data with the researcher who requested it." (2018)*

*"As the spreadsheets still contain the answers of the participants and I understand them as being sensitive, I think I would need to prepare (i.e. anonymize) them first in a proper way to share them. I would like to do that and share it, under the condition that my coauthors agree to this procedure." (2018)*

*"One of the options was "we haven't received participants' consent [to make their data publicly available]" -- but another realistic possibility is that the IRBs for studies often do not allow making entire datasets freely available online. There is also a question of whether datasets can truly be "anonymized" and the risks to participants therein." (2018)*

*"The community I research is very small, participants can be easily identified, and the topics discussed in my CHI paper are very sensitive." (2019)*

*"even ‘anonymised’ (pseudonymised) data can be de-anonymised with enough effort; putting things online increases risk" (2019)*

*"I told the ethics board I wouldn’t share them." (2019)*

* Other reasons (25%). These include, e.g., general defensive comments, plans to use the research artifacts in additional publications, concerns that hardware and physical artifacts can't be shared, or potential language barriers.

*"The processed data can be reproduced via the scripts we shared, but we did not want to bias future research to do the same analyses we had done." (2018)*

*"Part of them will be available when my theses is published, however, I still do not see the point to make them available to public as they are in [foreign language], and not understandable to many." (2018)*

*"The entries are written in [foreign language]." (2019)*

*"Sometimes sharing data is a good thing, but you never know whether this data can be useful for yourself in other papers someday. Like in [a specific type of brain] study, you can always repeatedly analysis the data and present it in different ways with different metrics" (2019)*

*"The artefact is physical, and therefore it's impossible to upload it onto the web" (2019)*

* Positive comments. A separate minor category of comments (8%) expressed approval of our survey, encouragement to pursue this topic further, and suggestions for future directions of CHI. Exemplary quotes:

*"I personally would really like to see our community moving towards sharing more research materials, in addition to the paper. Many projects now share the source code on Github which is great, but what I really would like to see is a platform for sharing user study data and the steps the authors took for analyzing those data. I understand that there are risks associated with sharing raw quantitative/qualitative data, but if done carefully this would be invaluable. Maybe we can encourage authors to create Jupyter notebooks allowing people to explore the data and submit those along with the paper?" (2018)*

*"I see tremendous value in releasing the source code and compiled software associated with a paper. Yet doing so is non trivial- it requires extensive additional effort in cleaning and organizing the source, providing documentation, and supporting and maintaining the software itself.  I feel these efforts are rarely incentivized by the HCI community. Releasing your code is often considered a "nice thing to do", but rarely viewed as an essential component of a systems paper. HCI publication venues are incredibly competitive, and there's currently an overwhelming incentive to publish as quickly as possible above all else.  I think there need to be formal incentives, requirements, or forms of recognition that encourage researchers to release their code (and other related materials), if we actually want to see it adopted as a widespread practice." (2018)*

*"As a researcher of building a tool for researchers, I'm looking forward to seeing the result of your study. It must have valuable information that will justify my own works, too." (2019)*

* Suggestions for survey improvement. Another minor category (10%) focused on potential gaps or issues within the survey itself, such as:

*"This survey was unclear at points. For example, all parts of the project -- at least tangentially -- support or refute the hypotheses of the paper. I took the question to mean "most directly." Additionally, it is possible that some of the resources in the broad categories have been made public, not all, but there is no option to specify this." (2018)*

*"Just a thought: the survey does not explicitly ask for executable software, but it may be different to ask whether researchers have open sourced their code or whether they have made an executable publicly available.  Other than that: a great survey!" (2018)*

*"I found the initial questions difficult to understand, as it's not always clear whether you refer to open \*datasets\* or \*source code / software\*, so I hope my responses match the paper. Also, might be a good idea to include examples of mechanical turk, crowd flower, etc. and not just focus on fitt's law type experiements. [sic]" (2018)*

*"Questionnaire seems overly repetitive. I had a hard time distinguishing the difference between types of data. I just answered the questions the same way in the most part." (2019)*

*"All data is subjective if you follow an interpretive/ post-positivist approach to science. I disagree with the idea that researchers can either 'objectively' or 'subjectively' collect data. All data collected is subjective and informed by the research questions and biases and the involvement of the researcher. This isn't a bad thing - it just recognizes that there is no 'hard' data or science - we are always all involved in the making of data and research." (2019)*