Submission #4482: Evaluating an agent-oriented language for Reinforcement Learning

Response to committee questions/comments

Below please find responses to the ERB committee review of my protocol submission #4482: *“Evaluating an agent-oriented language for Reinforcement Learning”*. Below, the committee’s comments are provided as quotes and my response right underneath.

1. A committee member noted that, in these types of studies in which the material is interactive and online, tasks should be clearly defined and explained for participants as they may find navigating tasks to be confusing.

We thank the committee member for the feedback. The instructional videos aim at clarifying the tasks and avoiding confusions.

2. For Part A, Question 9 b) – please provide a response.

Response provided (NO). – 9 b)

3. For Part B, Question 5 c) – we are unable to access the sample instrument via the link provided, however, we note that a separate document containing the survey questions has been provided. a. For our records, please provide a copy of the video to be shown to participants.

The link works fine on my end. Videos are under construction. Samples are referred to from the link (which works).

4. For Part B, Question 11 h) – typically, it would be better to store the final, de-identified or anonymized research data in a data repository, rather than a personal webpage, as data repositories are more aligned with the FAIR principles. Consider the following reasons for storing data in a repository, such as the York U Dataverse: […]

Reference to PIs personal web-page has now been removed from 11 h)

## Additional Update

* Participation time has not increased from 30’ to 45’.
* Inducement has respectively increased from GBD £4.5 to £6.25 (CAD ~$12).

This is reflected in 4 a) and 5 c) as well as the informed consent form.

# Informed Consent Form

a. The inducement stated on the consent form is different from that indicated on the protocol form. Please confirm the correct amount and revise accordingly.

It has not been updated to GBP £6.25 for 45’ involvement.

b. The ‘Confidentiality’ section should be revised to indicate the potential for the data to be deposited to a data repository. For example, consider including and adapting the following language:

i. Please note that at the end of the study, [indicate whether identifiable, or anonymized, or de-identified data] may be deposited into one or more publicly accessible scientific repositories, such as York University Dataverse, so that data may be inspected and analyzed by other researchers. , [If data is not identifiable] the data that will be shared on [insert database/publication] will not contain any information that can identify you. [If initiating a customized data reuse agreement, please describe].

We thank the committee for the template. The text has been added to the consent form and other minor updates have been made to the section.

c. Please revise the contact details for the ORE in the ‘Questions About the Research?’ section to “If you have any questions about this process, or about your rights as a participant in the study, please contact the Manager, Research Ethics in the Office of Research Ethics, York University (e-mail [ore@yorku.ca](mailto:ore@yorku.ca)).

This office oversees the ethical conduct of research studies and is not part of the study team. Everything that you discuss will be kept confidential.”

Updated the contact details.

d. Additional consent should be sought, at the end of the consent form, for data deposit. For example, “Consent to data deposit: I understand that my de-identified data will be placed into an open research data repository. Y / N”.

Consent check-box added as follows:

A screenshot of a survey

AI-generated content may be incorrect.