**Data sharing extraction form proposed changes (From meeting 19/01)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Form heading | Issue | Proposed change |
| Data sharing policy | ISSUE 1: Journals might mention the presence of a ‘data sharing plan’, however this does not indicate that an explicit policy requiring data sharing is in place  ISSUE 2: The extraction form gives an example of mandating a data availability statement as a ‘recommendation’ for its data sharing policy  ISSUE 3:  Some journals defer to ICMJE policy, as well as a custom policy above it – how should we capture this? | CHANGE 1/2: Create separate field of extraction for ‘Does the journal require a data sharing plan’ with available options as:   1. Absent 2. Mention 3. Recommendation 4. Requirement   CHANGE 3:  Add a separate field of extraction for ‘Type of data sharing policy’ with options as:   1. ICMJE ONLY 2. ICMJE with additional policies 3. Completely custom policy |
| Studies | ISSUE 1:  Some journals have a general data sharing policy across the board, with a specific data sharing policy for clinical trials only (e.g. specification for interventions, but not observational trials) – how do we record both/choose one? | CHANGE 1:  Add an ‘additional notes’ section using free-text to explain any differences specified in data policy applicability |
| Data | NA | NA |
| Documents |  | PROPOSED CHANGE: We should use a coded method (E.g. 1, 2, 3, …) in reference to the available items (Study protocol, statistical analysis plan, informed consent plan, … etc) |
| Exceptions | ISSUE 1: Unclear on how to reliably judge ‘justified’ and ‘unjustified’  Journals may note for example: “If your data is unavailable to access or unsuitable to post, you will have the opportunity to indicate why during the submission process, for example by stating that the research data is confidential” | CHANGE 1: Use exception categories of:   1. Exceptions are explicitly allowed with specified parameters 2. Mentions that exceptions are allowed 3. No mention of exceptions |
| Start | NA | NA |
| Stop | NA | NA |
| People | NA | NA |
| Purpose | NA | NA |
| Distribution | ISSUE 1:  ‘Third party website’s suggested by the studies can include data repositories such as Mendeley, where the author does not need to share their data publicly (i.e. not unrestricted access) – however the only option for third party website is “Unrestricted access through a third party website” | CHANGE 1:  We need to target every aspect of data storage, so it should be separated into 4 questions as follows   1. Where is the data stored? (i.e. what platform is used)  * “Not specified” * Recommended: Free text * Required: Free text  1. Who ~~can~~ is permitted to access the data (i.e. the public, researchers only?) 2. What ~~purposes~~ are acceptable purposes for data access?  * As before we could use a coded method (E.g. 1, 2, 3) to account for instances where multiple purposes apply  1. ~~Who decides if the requested purposes meets the criteria for access (i.e. public data, author request, journal request, etc.)~~ 2. How may the data be accessed?  * Unrestricted access through a link ~~third party website~~ * Access through a university data warehouse * Access through the publishing journal website (e.g., supplementary material to a journal article) * Access subject to approval by the principal investigator * Access subject to approval by the primary sponsor * Access subject to approval by either the principal investigator or primary sponsor * Access subject to approval by both the principal investigator and primary sponsor |
|  |  |  |