**Response to editor letter**

Dear Matt,

Thank you for the opportunity to expand on some content. I have addressed each of these and updated the manuscript accordingly. See below for point-by-point responses and changes. All data and code to reproduce the results reported here continue to be available at [osf.io/8sp7e](https://osf.io/8sp7e/).

[Editor comment 1]

*Could you please include some discussion of the ethics of this study itself? Some readers might argue that the authors you corresponded with are essentially human participants in your study, and that you collected "data" from them (i.e., emailed responses) without them consenting to being participants in this study or knowing that their responses would be used for this specific research purpose. I don't necessarily see it that way myself but I think it would be useful to pre-empt such concerns. I would guess that your stance is either that this study isn't itself research with human participants, or that it is, but not of a type that requires informed consent or ethics/IRB approval(?) In discussing this, you could draw on whatever codes of ethics are salient in your context (e.g., your university's ethics code).*

Author response:

Thank you for the discussion around this point in the journal’s Review Discussion’s portal. The ethical approval section on page 2 now reads:

## “Ethical approval

Whether or not this study required ethical approval was discussed extensively with peers and with consultation of ethical guidelines (i.e., those by the American APA: American Psychological Association, 2016; the German DPGs: Deutschen Gesellschaft für Psychologie, 2022; and the British BPS: Oates et al., 2021) prior to its conduction. The consensus among these guidelines was that this work did not constitute “human subjects research” and therefore did not require approval. Previous studies assessing data sharing upon request have adopted a similar position (e.g., Vines et al., 2014). Meta-science research such as this is very similar to the conduction of a meta-analysis. In most jurisdictions, including that in which this work was conducted, meta-analyses do not require ethical approval because they have no human subjects. To draw a closer comparison that provides an intuition pump: individual participant data meta-analyses (IPD-MA) involve contacting authors of original studies for access to the participant level data, but also do not require ethical approval. The human subjects in an IPD-MA are the participants in the original studies, not the researchers being asked to share that data. The act of contacting researchers to ask them to share data, and reporting the rate of data availability, involves no human subjects and therefore does not require ethical approval for human subjects research. Requiring ethical approval to request data from authors, or quantify the rate of availability, is not in line with any common set of ethical guidelines (e.g., American Psychological Association, 2016; Deutschen Gesellschaft für Psychologie, 2022; Oates et al., 2021).  This manuscript does lightly summarise some of the types of reasons that people gave for not being able to share, but this is brief, anonymous, and descriptive, and is in line with the norms of our field: we would not require ethical approval to quote or paraphrase from another researcher’s correspondence with us (e.g., a tweet, email, or letter).

Separately, it is useful to recognise that all but one of the journals represented in the dataset have explicit data-sharing policies that the authors agreed to prior to publication. That is, by publishing in these journals, the authors agree to the policy that they will share data upon request. This encouragement or requirement to share data wherever possible is echoed by professional bodies (e.g., APA, BPS, DGPs) and funding bodies (USA NIH, EU Horizon). Lastly, it is also reflected in the Research Data Management policies of many universities, including those with which many researchers contacted as part of this study were affiliated.”

[Editor comment 2]

*In the "Impediments to data sharing" section, there are several cases where you describe events that occurred without saying how many times. (E.g., "multiple authors stated to that they were on maternity leave or were retired"... "In multiple other cases, authors agreed"...."researchers were observed violating"... "there were instances"... etc.). Could you please either indicate how many cases of each you observed, or, if you would rather not, briefly explain why? My own gut feel is that the frequencies would give some indication of the prevalence of each given problem, but perhaps you see things differently.*

Author response:

This vagueness was intentional in the previous version of the manuscript. The imperfect overlap between occurrences, articles, and authors – and that none of them likely provide a good estimate of prevalence, as I discuss below – is why I kept the previous version of the manuscript less quantitative and more reflective. However, adding both the number and the below qualifier hopefully gives the best of both worlds. All such cases have now been clarified to describe the actual number of occurrences, albeit with the qualification (p.4):

“In the below, I sometimes refer to the number of authors or cases of a given situation. It is important to note that these do not perfectly map onto the number of articles, because (a) some researchers were co-authors of many articles and conversely (b) sometimes more than one author replied to my emails regarding a given publication, and sometimes authors even contradicted one another regarding the existence of data or its shareability. As such, these cases should be interpreted as examples of situations that can arise and what can be learned from those situations, rather than any attempt to estimate the prevalence of such situations.”

[Editor comment 3]

*Could you please include some discussion about the limitations of your study/audit?*

Author response

Thank you – this was an oversight on my behalf. The limitations section on p.6 now reads:

## “Limitations

**Generalisability.** The top-line conclusions of all previous studies covered in Hamilton et al.'s (2023) review, and indeed the results of this study, are in close agreement: data sharing upon request occurs in the minority of cases. However, precise estimates of the rate of data sharing as yet unknown. The generalisability of the current estimate of data sharing upon request to other areas of psychology, or indeed other areas of science, is unknown at this time. The recent systematic review of the rate of data sharing upon request by Hamilton et al. (2023) noted that no meta-analysis of the rate of sharing across studies was possible due to methodological differences between the component studies, such as differences in journal policies between fields and differences in how old the publications were. The estimate provided by this study is perhaps more likely to correspond with (a) fields of similarly small size, (b) fields with comparable journal policies (e.g., requiring Data Availability Statements but not mandatory sharing at the time of publication), and (c) studies considering a similar timeframe (e.g., publications within the last 5 years).

**The impact of personal acquaintance on sharing.** The fact that I was personally acquainted with many of the researchers contacted may have influenced the rate of data sharing in some way. I have written critiques of IRAP research in the past, and it is possible this could have made some researchers more reticent to share. On the other hand, the fact that I was acquainted with many of the authors prior to contacting them for their data may have lent a degree of ecological validity to the request: within many small-to-medium-sized fields data requests are likely to come from another researcher who is already known to you. To the best of my knowledge, only one previous study has examined this question: Tedersoo (2021) examined data sharing upon request and quantified whether they were acquainted with the authors prior to the data requests they sent. An analysis of their open data suggests that data sharing upon request in their sample was slightly higher among researchers already known to the authors (50% of 12 articles) than those who were not (40% of 272 studies).

**Data usability and computational reproducibility.** Of course, not all shared data is useful, and data sharing is not an end in itself. Data sharing merely (a) enables verifiability of published analyses, and (b) enables reuse for novel purposes. Even when data is technically complete and shared, poor documentation (e.g., the absence of high-quality codebooks) can limit the degree to which it can be used for verification or novel purposes (Horstmann et al., 2020). Separately, recent research has demonstrated that even when data and code are openly shared at the time of publication, the results of relatively few publications can be precisely reproduced (e.g., only 1 of 12 articles: Crüwell et al., 2022). Additional research would be required to estimate the computational reproducibility of results reported in IRAP publications based on shared data.”

Best wishes

Ian