

Page 1: Introduction

Welcome to a survey on AI-assisted Data Management Plans (DMPs). This survey aims to evaluate the potential of large language models (LLMs) in drafting high-quality, compliant Data Management Plans to assist researchers submitting proposals to federal funders.

As part of your participation, you will review and provide feedback on sample NIH (National Institutes of Health) DMPs, some human and some LLM-generated. You will be guided through the following pages:

- **Background Information**

You will be asked to provide information about your professional role, experience with DMPs, and attitudes toward the use of AI in research. All questions are optional and serve to contextualize your feedback.

- **Evaluation of DMPs**

You will successively review **three randomly assigned NIH DMPs** and assess the quality of each of their 6 sections based on standardized criteria, including technical accuracy, completeness, and clarity. You may also provide qualitative feedback and point out any issues you observe. Each one may have been written by a human or an LLM, and you will be asked to make a guess which it is.

Your participation plays a vital role in shaping the future of LLM-assisted research infrastructure. This study was determined not to meet the definition of human subjects research by the UC Davis IRB (FWA No: 00004557, IORG: 0000251). No identifiable information will be collected. All responses will be anonymous and used solely for product development research, in accordance with ethical and regulatory standards.

Your answers will be saved as you go to a new page. You can go back and change answers at any time. Once you submit on the final page, your answers cannot be changed anymore.

This survey is conducted jointly by teams from the California Medical Innovations Institute and the California Digital Library. If you have any questions, feedback, or suggestions, please reach out to Nahid Zeinali at nzeinali@calmi2.org.

Important: This survey must be completed in one sitting.

Page 2: Background Information

Let's start with some information about you

Section 1: About You

1.1 What is your primary field or discipline?

E.g., Biology, Psychology, Computer Science, Library Science, etc.

[_____]

1.2. What is your current role? (*Select all that apply*)

☐ Researcher (e.g., student, faculty, post-doctoral)

☐ Research administrator / Program officer

☐ Data manager / Data steward

☐ Librarian / Data librarian / Research support staff

☐ Other: [_____]

1.3. How long have you been in your current or a similar role?

☐ Less than 1 year

☐ 1–3 years

☐ 4–6 years

☐ 7–10 years

☐ More than 10 years

Section 2: Experience with Data Management Plans (DMPs)

2.1. How many data management plans (DMPs) have you authored or co-authored?

☐ None

☐ 1

☐ 2–3

☐ 4–5

☐ More than 5

2.2. How often do you review DMPs?

☐ Never

☐ Once or twice a year

☐ Every few months

☐ About once a month

☐ Weekly or more often

2.3. How familiar are you with the NIH Data Management and Sharing Plan (DMSP)?

☐ Not at all familiar

☐ Slightly familiar

☐ Somewhat familiar

☐ Moderately familiar

☐ Extremely familiar

Section 3: Attitudes Toward AI

3.1. How often have you used AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Copilot) to help write any part of a DMP?

- ☐ Never
- ☐ Almost never
- ☐ Occasionally/Sometimes
- ☐ Often
- ☐ Always or almost always

3.2. How comfortable are you using AI to assist in DMP writing?

- ☐ Not at all comfortable
- ☐ Slightly comfortable
- ☐ Somewhat comfortable
- ☐ Moderately comfortable
- ☐ Extremely comfortable

3.3. What best describes your general attitude toward using AI in research workflows (e.g., grant writing, literature review, data analysis)?

- ☐ Very against it
- ☐ Somewhat against it
- ☐ Neutral toward it
- ☐ Somewhat in favor of it
- ☐ Very in favor of it

3.4. Any additional comments about using generative AI for drafting or reviewing DMPs?

[_____]
[_____]

Page 3: DMP #1 - Review

You will now evaluate 3 DMPs assigned to you. Click below to download the first DMP and read it fully before continuing to the evaluation. You will also see the text of each section again as you rate them.

 PDF Available: [Download Now](#)

Page 4: DMP #1 - Section-wise Evaluation (1/3)

Evaluate each of the sections of the DMP below. The text from each section is provided again to facilitate your evaluation.

Element 1: Data Type

1-A Types and amount of scientific data expected to be generated in the project:

(Summarize the types and estimated amount of scientific data expected to be generated in the project)

1-B Scientific data that will be preserved and shared, and the rationale for doing so:

(Describe which scientific data from the project will be preserved and shared, and provide the rationale for this decision.)

1-C: Metadata, other relevant data, and associated documentation:

(Briefly list the metadata, other relevant data, and any associated documentation (e.g., study protocols and data collection instruments) that will be made accessible to facilitate interpretation of the scientific data)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None -- No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Element 2: Related Tools, Software, and/or Code

(State whether specialized tools, software, and/or code are needed to access or manipulate shared scientific data, and if so, provide the name(s) of the needed tool(s) and software and specify how they can be accessed.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Element 3: Standards

(State what common data standards will be applied to the scientific data and associated metadata to enable interoperability of datasets and resources, and provide the name(s) of the data standards that will be applied and describe how these data standards will be applied to the scientific data generated by the research proposed in this project. If applicable, indicate that no consensus standards exist.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Page 5: DMP #1 - Section-wise Evaluation (2/3)

Evaluate each of the sections of the DMP below. The text from each section is provided again to facilitate your evaluation.

Element 4: Data Preservation, Access, and Associated Timelines

4-A: Repository where scientific data and metadata will be archived:

(Provide the name of the repository(ies) where scientific data and metadata arising from the project will be archived; see [Selecting a Data Repository](#))

4-B: How scientific data will be findable and identifiable:

(Describe how the scientific data will be findable and identifiable, i.e., via a persistent unique identifier or other standard indexing tools.)

4-C: When and how long the scientific data will be made available:

(Describe when the scientific data will be made available to other users (i.e., no later than the time of an associated publication or the end of the performance period, whichever comes first) and for how long data will be available.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None -- No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Element 5: Access, Distribution, or Reuse Considerations

5-A: Factors affecting subsequent access, distribution, or reuse of scientific data:

(Describe and justify any applicable factors or data use limitations affecting subsequent access, distribution, or reuse of scientific data related to informed consent, privacy and confidentiality protections, and any other considerations that may limit the extent of data sharing.)

 **5-B: Whether access to scientific data will be controlled:**

(State whether access to the scientific data will be controlled (i.e., made available by a data repository only after approval.)

 **5-C: Protections for privacy, rights, and confidentiality of human research participants:**

(If generating scientific data derived from humans, describe how the privacy, rights, and confidentiality of human research participants will be protected (e.g., through de-identification, Certificates of Confidentiality, and other protective measures.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

 **Page 6: DMP #1 - Section-wise Evaluation (3/3)**

 **Element 6: Oversight of Data Management and Sharing**

(Describe how compliance with this Plan will be monitored and managed, frequency of oversight, and by whom at your institution (e.g., titles, roles).

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details

- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None -- No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Overall Evaluation

Provide an overall evaluation of this DMP below.

1-How satisfied were you with this DMP as a whole?*

- ☐ Very Dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Very Satisfied

2-If you had to guess, would you think this DMP was more likely to have been written by a human or by an LLM?*

- ☐ Human
- ☐ LLM

Page 7: DMP #2 - Review

Click below to download the first DMP and read it fully before continuing to the evaluation. You will also see the text of each section again as you rate them.

 PDF Available: [Download Now](#)

Page 8: DMP #2 - Section-wise Evaluation (1/3)

Evaluate each of the sections of the DMP below. The text from each section is provided again to facilitate your evaluation.

Element 1: Data Type

 **1-A Types and amount of scientific data expected to be generated in the project:**

(Summarize the types and estimated amount of scientific data expected to be generated in the project)

 **1-B Scientific data that will be preserved and shared, and the rationale for doing so:**

(Describe which scientific data from the project will be preserved and shared and provide the rationale for this decision.)

 **1-C: Metadata, other relevant data, and associated documentation:**

(Briefly list the metadata, other relevant data, and any associated documentation (e.g., study protocols and data collection instruments) that will be made accessible to facilitate interpretation of the scientific data)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

 **Element 2: Related Tools, Software, and/or Code**

(State whether specialized tools, software, and/or code are needed to access or manipulate shared scientific data, and if so, provide the name(s) of the needed tool(s) and software and specify how they can be accessed.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Element 3: Standards

(State what common data standards will be applied to the scientific data and associated metadata to enable interoperability of datasets and resources, and provide the name(s) of the data standards that will be applied and describe how these data standards will be applied to the scientific data generated by the research proposed in this project. If applicable, indicate that no consensus standards exist.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Page 9: DMP #2 - Section-wise Evaluation (2/3)

Evaluate each of the sections of the DMP below. The text from each section is provided again to facilitate your evaluation.

Element 4: Data Preservation, Access, and Associated Timelines

4-A: Repository where scientific data and metadata will be archived:

(Provide the name of the repository(ies) where scientific data and metadata arising from the project will be archived; see Selecting a Data Repository)

4-B: How scientific data will be findable and identifiable:

(Describe how the scientific data will be findable and identifiable, i.e., via a persistent unique identifier or other standard indexing tools.)

4-C: When and how long the scientific data will be made available:

(Describe when the scientific data will be made available to other users (i.e., no later than the time of an associated publication or the end of the performance period, whichever comes first) and for how long data will be available.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3- Provide additional comments (optional)



Element 5: Access, Distribution, or Reuse Considerations



5-A: Factors affecting subsequent access, distribution, or reuse of scientific data:

(Describe and justify any applicable factors or data use limitations affecting subsequent access, distribution, or reuse of scientific data related to informed consent, privacy and confidentiality protections, and any other considerations that may limit the extent of data sharing.)



5-B: Whether access to scientific data will be controlled:

(State whether access to the scientific data will be controlled (i.e., made available by a data repository only after approval.)



5-C: Protections for privacy, rights, and confidentiality of human research participants:

(If generating scientific data derived from humans, describe how the privacy, rights, and confidentiality of human research participants will be protected (e.g., through de-identification, Certificates of Confidentiality, and other protective measures.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Page 10: DMP #2 - Section-wise Evaluation (3/3)

Element 6: Oversight of Data Management and Sharing

(Describe how compliance with this Plan will be monitored and managed, frequency of oversight, and by whom at your institution (e.g., titles, roles)).

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Overall Evaluation

Provide an overall evaluation of this DMP below.

- 1-How satisfied were you with this DMP as a whole?*
- ☐ Very Dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Very Satisfied

- 2-If you had to guess, would you think this DMP was more likely to have been written by a human or by an LLM?*
- ☐ Human
- ☐ LLM

Page 11: DMP #3 - Review

Click below to download the third DMP and read it fully before continuing to the evaluation. You will also see the text of each section again as you rate them.

 PDF Available: [Download Now](#)

Page 12: DMP #3 - Section-wise Evaluation (1/3)

Evaluate each of the sections of the DMP below. The text from each section is provided again to facilitate your evaluation.

Element 1: Data Type

1-A Types and amount of scientific data expected to be generated in the project:

(Summarize the types and estimated amount of scientific data expected to be generated in the project)

1-B Scientific data that will be preserved and shared, and the rationale for doing so:

(Describe which scientific data from the project will be preserved and shared, and provide the rationale for this decision.)

1-C: Metadata, other relevant data, and associated documentation:

(Briefly list the metadata, other relevant data, and any associated documentation (e.g., study protocols and data collection instruments) that will be made accessible to facilitate interpretation of the scientific data)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Element 2: Related Tools, Software, and/or Code

(State whether specialized tools, software, and/or code are needed to access or manipulate shared scientific data, and if so, provide the name(s) of the needed tool(s) and software and specify how they can be accessed.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Element 3: Standards

(State what common data standards will be applied to the scientific data and associated metadata to enable interoperability of datasets and resources, and provide the name(s) of the data standards that will be applied and describe how these data standards will be applied to the scientific data generated by the research proposed in this project. If applicable, indicate that no consensus standards exist.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Page 13: DMP #3 - Section-wise Evaluation (2/3)

Evaluate each of the sections of the DMP below. The text from each section is provided again to

facilitate your evaluation.

Element 4: Data Preservation, Access, and Associated Timelines

4-A: Repository where scientific data and metadata will be archived:

(Provide the name of the repository(ies) where scientific data and metadata arising from the project will be archived; see Selecting a Data Repository)

4-B: How scientific data will be findable and identifiable:

(Describe how the scientific data will be findable and identifiable, i.e., via a persistent unique identifier or other standard indexing tools.)

4-C: When and how long the scientific data will be made available:

(Describe when the scientific data will be made available to other users (i.e., no later than the time of an associated publication or the end of the performance period, whichever comes first) and for how long data will be available.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Element 5: Access, Distribution, or Reuse Considerations

5-A: Factors affecting subsequent access, distribution, or reuse of scientific data:

(Describe and justify any applicable factors or data use limitations affecting subsequent access, distribution, or reuse of scientific data related to informed consent, privacy and confidentiality protections, and any other considerations that may limit the extent of data sharing.)

5-B: Whether access to scientific data will be controlled:

(State whether access to the scientific data will be controlled (i.e., made available by a data repository only after approval.)

5-C: Protections for privacy, rights, and confidentiality of human research participants:

(If generating scientific data derived from humans, describe how the privacy, rights, and confidentiality of human research participants will be protected (e.g., through de-identification, Certificates of Confidentiality, and other protective measures.)

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Page 14: DMP #3 - Section-wise Evaluation (3/3)

Element 6: Oversight of Data Management and Sharing

(Describe how compliance with this Plan will be monitored and managed, frequency of oversight, and by whom at your institution (e.g., titles, roles).

- 1- How satisfied are you with the response to this Element?*
- 2- What type of errors did you find, if any (select all that apply)?*

- 1- Accuracy--Contains incorrect or misleading information, such as mentioning a repository that does not exist
- 2- Completeness--Missing something that is required for the Element
- 3- Clarity--Uses vague language, such as saying data will be shared but not providing details
- 4- Coherence--Information not presented in a logical, organized, and well-connected way
- 5- Compliance--Plan would not be in compliance with Funder Policy
- 6- Fluency--Contains spelling, punctuation, or grammar issues
- 7- Best Practice--Contains plan choices that aren't recommended
- 8- Other--Please mention in comments
- 9- None – No errors seen

3-Provide additional comments(optional)

Overall Evaluation

Provide an overall evaluation of this DMP below.

1- How satisfied were you with this DMP as a whole?*

- ☐ Very Dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Very Satisfied

2- If you had to guess, would you think this DMP was more likely to have been written by a human or by an LLM?*

- ☐ Human
- ☐ LLM

Final Page-15

"Thank you for participating and evaluating DMPs."