

# Data management procedures for reproducible research pipelines

---

## Abstract

This unpublished working paper was written to accompany the material included in the PhD thesis ‘Using Reproducible Research Pipelines to Help Disentangle Health Effects of Environmental Changes from Social Factors’ by Ivan Hanigan (2016). It sets out the key data management and analysis principles that were found to be most effective for the reproducible synthesis and integration of heterogeneous datasets for analysis and reporting. The draft was last updated January 30, 2016. The version submitted with the thesis is available as part of a Github repository at [https://github.com/swish-climate-impact-assessment/swish\\_data\\_management\\_procedures/blob/master/swish-dmp-report.pdf](https://github.com/swish-climate-impact-assessment/swish_data_management_procedures/blob/master/swish-dmp-report.pdf).

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Configuration versus convention: The case for standardised approaches</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	The core components of a pipeline . . . . .	3
2.2	Hypothesis and design . . . . .	4
2.3	Data . . . . .	4
2.4	Methods . . . . .	4
2.5	Documentation . . . . .	4
2.6	Distribution . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Procedures when conducting a reproducible research analysis</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Data management plan and data inventory . . . . .	5
3.2	Case study 1: Ecological Metadata Language (EML) and folder structure . . . . .	6
3.3	Data storage and access . . . . .	8
3.4	Reports . . . . .	8
<b>4</b>	<b>Planning and implementing a pipeline</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1	A standardised data analysis pipeline framework . . . . .	9
4.2	Case study 2: Simple pipeline using the makeProject package . . . . .	10
4.3	File organization and naming . . . . .	11
<b>5</b>	<b>Visualisation techniques</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1	Make a list of steps, inputs and outputs . . . . .	13
5.2	Case study 3: Visualisation of methods steps using bespoke software . . . . .	16
<b>6</b>	<b>References for appendix 2</b>	<b>18</b>

# 1 Introduction

There is a need for developing an evidence based set of best practice guidelines for data management procedures in implementing reproducible research pipelines in epidemiology (Peng 2015). The examples drawn together in this report come from experiences and use-cases found in an eco-social epidemiologic research context. The emerging paradigm of eco-social epidemiology is inherently concerned with complex systems and integrating heterogeneous data sources to aid recognition of patterns in the environmental and social determinants of population health (McMichael 2013). This document outlines a suite of data management procedures that have been found to effectively assist the development of reproducible research pipelines.

## 2 Configuration versus convention: The case for standardised approaches

Reproducibility is the ability to recompute the results of a data analysis with the original data. It is possible to have analyses that are reproducible with varying degrees of difficulty. A data analysis might be reproducible but require thousands of hours of work. A primary challenge for reproducible data analysis is to make analyses that are *easy* to reproduce.

In essence this requires attention to be turned to the issue of how the data and analytical steps amassed – toward a reality where this is archived and there is a good understanding all round as to how the study were set up and conducted. Different assumptions or different treatment of the data could conceivably lead to different inferences and conclusions being drawn, such as in the example shown by Silberzahn & Uhlmann (2015) in which 29 research teams were given the same dataset but reached a wide variety of conclusions using different methods on the same dataset to answer the same question.

This is partly because of an underlying complexity in the information drawn from complex systems involving multi-causality, and partly because of different assumptions and different backgrounds and viewpoints. A finding that a variable does or does not cause a disease, might be drawn honestly from the same set of data.

The techniques of pipelines described here are targeting the integrity of the process of data selection, the robustness and suitability of the methods used, a commonsense and well-argued selection of health outcomes and environmental or social exposures, and the clarity and transparency of the methods used.

To achieve this, a guiding principle is that analysts should effectively implement ‘pipelines’ of method steps and tools. Standardised and evidence-based methods based on conventions developed from many data analysts approaching the problems in a similar way should be used, rather than each analyst configuring a pipeline to suit particular individual or domain-specific preferences (Borer *et al.* 2009; White *et al.* 2013).

Noble (2009) points out that ‘the principles behind organizing and documenting computational experiments are often learned on the fly, and this learning is strongly influenced by personal predilections’. Leek & Peng (2015) describe this as data analysis being ‘taught through an apprenticeship model, and different disciplines develop their own analysis subcultures’. By codifying what an appropriate pipeline would contain, data analysis will be more robust. According to Peng (2015), there should not be a ‘lonely data analyst’ coming up with their own method. If a researcher conducted an analysis using an evidence-based reproducible research pipeline ‘you could at least have a sense that something reasonable was done’ and be confident that you could easily check what had been done if you needed to.

## **2.1 The core components of a pipeline**

Peng *et al.* (2006) distilled a core set of components for reproducibility from earlier work including that of Schwab *et al.* (2000). These are:

- Hypothesis and design
- Data (measurement, pre-processing, analytic)
- Analysis Methods
- Documentation (of all steps)
- Distribution (of the paper, data and code).

## 2.2 Hypothesis and design

The first stage of the pipeline is hypothesis generation and study design. In this stage documentation should explain the literature base supporting the study, the decisions made in selection of explanatory factors for inclusion, decisions made such as the experimental unit, observational unit, measurement method, as well as spatial or temporal extent. This information will also be needed for ethical review and approval.

## 2.3 Data

The data that were measured should be well managed, however the requirements for accessing the original raw data are less important than for the analytical dataset. Descriptions of how the measured data were transformed into the analytic data should be available. Public data repositories or institutional services such as university libraries should be used to ensure longevity of the data storage.

## 2.4 Methods

The software code underlying the principal results needs to be made available. In addition, the computer environment necessary to execute that code should be described adequately to ‘deploy’ a new computer set-up that can reproduce the computations needed.

## 2.5 Documentation

Adequate documentation of the code and data should be available to enable others to repeat the analyses and to conduct other similar ones. This can take the form of metadata, reports, journal papers or even books (Peng & Dominici 2008). Indeed textbooks on statistical methods can benefit greatly from being accompanied by data and analytical code to enhance their pedagogic functions (Barnett & Dobson 2010; Barnett *et al.* 2014).

An important underpinning to reproducible research is the reproducible report. This is the ultimate form of documentation because the information that represents the outputs of the research is written alongside the code that performs the computations that are being described. There has been many

recent advances made in terms of tools for reproducible reports such as R markdown and knitr (Xie 2014).

Metadata should be created and maintained as a priority task at all stages of the data analysis process. An international standard should be preferred over selectively choosing what information one collects and what fieldnames one uses to describe each item of documentation. Ecological Metadata Language (EML) and the Data Documentation Initiative (DDI) are two such standards that offer useful semantic constructs for describing epidemiological data.

## **2.6 Distribution**

Distribution or dissemination of the material needs to use a standard method if they are to be used by others. It is not enough just to provide access to the software and data, but also adequate documentation is required to explain and potentially assist downstream users to piece these together.

## **3 Procedures when conducting a reproducible research analysis**

Having defined above the principle components for a pipeline there are procedural questions about how to go about compiling those. The key steps include:

- Data Management Plans and Data Inventories
- Tracking method steps
- Developing code
- Maintaining data storage
- Writing reports
- Distributing the materials.

### **3.1 Data management plan and data inventory**

In eco-social epidemiology there is a need for a data management plan and a data inventory that enables individual scientists, or multidisciplinary teams of scientists, to manage large and heterogeneous

collections of disparate data sources efficiently. Keeping track of all the elements of a linked health, social and environmental database is very challenging, despite major improvements in data management software, web-portals and virtual laboratories (Fleming *et al.* 2014).

Effective data management policies and procedures are essential in managing data-related risk. Such risks include data loss or corruption, technological obsolescence, breaches of privacy or copyright, and errors or misuse. Misuse may be due either to unintended user misunderstandings about data attributes (no dataset is perfect and self-explanatory, see Michener *et al.* (1997)) or intentional mis-use for malicious or selfish reasons (for example the misuse of data by Bjorn Lomborg to support the argument that environmental health conditions are actually improving. See Bodnar *et al.* (2004) for a discussion on Lomborg’s misuse of data. There have also been notable examples of mistakes in data analyses used for climate change science. See Cai *et al.* (2010) for a discussion of one such case. The careful storage and curation of datasets is also critical because data from many studies are lost (Pullin & Salafsky 2010; Vines *et al.* 2014).

Data management plans are needed for developing procedures and processes to keep data safe. There is an issue when ensuring that all relevant data are collected in deciding what is relevant. Keeping an up-to-date data inventory and careful organisation of all folders and files helps mitigate these problems.

Whether data management is the responsibility of the individuals collecting or collating it, or of the lead scientist, clarity on how and where data are stored and who manages it is vital, as is a ‘succession plan’ that sets out the vision of the data collections preservation and re-use into the future.

### **3.2 Case study 1: Ecological Metadata Language (EML) and folder structure**

For data to be reused in the future, metadata and documentation need to be carefully prepared to allow future users (including the original collector) to find and understand the data (Michener *et al.* 1997). Metadata should be associated with the data and adhere to a standard schema. This example shows the use of the Ecological Metadata Language (EML).

Good metadata requires sufficient detail to describe the collection process and to record decisions that were made during the design phase about the use of different sampling methods. Time and effort may be saved by considering metadata requirements at the commencement of a study, rather than trying to

recall all the details later. If metadata adheres to a standard schema, it can be used in catalogues to enable fast searching and retrieval, or in machine-to-machine data queries that assist data access and use.

In EML the elements of any dataset can be seen as a nested hierarchy at three levels:

1. The Project level: this is an overarching grouping of data. It might be indicative of the principal investigator or organisation who provided the data, or a programme of research studies (sub-projects).
2. The Dataset level: this is a distinct grouping of data that might be organised around a particular time period or geographical region.
3. The Entity level: This grouping of data includes data files (such as tables in CSV or Excel, shapefiles and raster images) or documents (such as metadata descriptions or related publications).

This conceptual framework can be very useful for the organisation of the work constituting a single pipeline, as well as when working with multiple pipelines within several projects.




Figure 1: images/EML\_project.png

### 3.3 Data storage and access

Some datasets such as sensitive personal information about suicide or climate change scenarios with restrictions due to privacy and confidentiality rules, or because of protected intellectual property, need to be accessed in a restricted way. This complicates the implementation of the method of pipelines which dictates that all the steps, models and assumptions need to be made transparent and available for scientific debate even though the datasets may require authorisation to access. Restrictions around access to data have increased recently in Australia. As an example the custodians of the national mortality database made it virtually impossible to access these data for several years after the discovery of an incident in which Australian population health researcher Dr Stephen Begg was reported to have hacked into the database in an illegal act (O’Keefe 2007). The subsequent investigation by the data custodians led to a wide ranging modification to the procedures for approval and provision of these data that make the access much more restricted. Appropriate access to data is therefore required to address this issue. In the work reported in the conference presentation in this thesis, a range of available workflow tools for data management and analysis were investigated and developed.

### 3.4 Reports

Reproducible research reports are written using a scripting language for statistical computing and graphics. The report is made up of ordinary text written in a suitable format that enables the computational process to recognise it as text. An example is the Rmarkdown format which is very similar to text used when authoring word processor documents (<http://rmarkdown.rstudio.com>). There are also chunks of pure statistical programming code (such as R codes) that perform data manipulations and analyses when the document is ‘evaluated’. When the processing stage is run a report document is generated that includes both content as well as the output of any embedded computer code ‘chunks’ within the document. An example of this is provided in the Supporting Information document of Paper 1 of this thesis.



## 4 Planning and implementing a pipeline

It can be much easier to conceptualise a complicated data analysis method than to implement this as a reproducible research pipeline. The most effective way to implement a pipeline is by methodically tracking each of the steps taken, the data inputs needed and all the outputs of the step. If done in a disciplined way then the analyst or some other person could ‘audit’ the procedure easily and access the details of the pipeline they need to scrutinise.

### 4.1 A standardised data analysis pipeline framework

One method that was selected for use in the papers of this thesis was the concept of the Load-Clean-Functions-Do (LCFD) framework. This was first proposed by Josh Reich on the open-source software discussion forum called ‘stack overflow’ (<http://stackoverflow.com/a/1434424>), and then encoded into the ‘makeProject’ R package (<http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/makeProject/makeProject.pdf>). The approach is demonstrated in case study 2 below.

## 4.2 Case study 2: Simple pipeline using the makeProject package

```
# in an interactive R session at the command line choose your project directory
setwd("~/projects")

# load the required functions from the makeProject package
library(makeProject)

# use the makeProject function to
makeProject("my_first_pipelines_project")

### gives
/my_first_pipelines_project/
  /code/**/*.R
  /data/
  /DESCRIPTION
  /main.R

# in main.R you put these lines into the script and run them as the steps of the pipeline evolution
source("code/load.R")
source("code/clean.R")
source("code/func.R")
source("code/do.R")

# Reporting is then a matter of choice
## If using the rmarkdown approach there would be an Rmd file that contained the prose
## and turned into a PDF, HTML or Word document with a line such as
rmarkdown::render("My-Pipeline-Report.Rmd", "pdf_document")
```

### 4.3 File organization and naming

In many stages of a pipeline, an analyst will want to include details of the settings or what dataset they started out with. Rather than saving a folder or file name that is long and uninformative there are many different ways to organizing folders and files.

Key techniques for this are available and known in the data analysis community as ‘Tidy Data’ guidelines. In the words of Wickham (2014) the order that data should be arranged in follows some generic principles:

‘A good ordering makes it easier to scan the raw values. One way of organizing variables is by their role in the analysis: are values fixed by the design of the data collection, or are they measured during the course of the experiment? Fixed variables describe the experimental design and are known in advance. Computer scientists often call fixed variables dimensions, and statisticians usually denote them with subscripts on random variables. Measured variables are what we actually measure in the study. Fixed variables should come first, followed by measured variables, each ordered so that related variables are contiguous. Rows can then be ordered by the first variable, breaking ties with the second and subsequent (fixed) variables.’

#### 4.3.1 An exemplar

The following protocol was developed for an ecology and biodiversity database that the author of this PhD thesis was involved with. The naming convention relied heavily on a sequence of information being used to order the names of folders, subfolders and files. This is:

1. The project name (and optional sub-project name)
2. Data type (such as experimental unit, observational unit, and/or measurement methods)
3. Geographic location (State, Country)
4. Temporal frequency and coverage (such as annual or seasonal tranches).

### 4.3.2 The concepts of slow moving dimensions and fast moving variables

The concept of dimensions and variables can be useful here, and especially for deciding on filenames. Dimensions are fixed or change slowly while variables change more quickly. By ‘change’, this means that there are more of them. For example the project name is ‘fixed’, that is it does not change across the files, but the sub-project name does change, just more slowly (say there may be 2-3 different sub-projects within a project). Then there may be a set of data types, and these ‘change’ more quickly than the sub-project name. Then the geographic and temporal variables might change quickest of all.

So a general rule for the order of things can be stated. The fixed and slowly changing variables should come first (those things that don’t change, or don’t change much), followed by the more fluid variables (or things that change more across the project). List elements can then be ordered so that the groups of things that are similar will always be contiguous, and vary sequentially within clusters.

An example is shown in Table 1 to describe this and make it easier to understand. Here is a set of file names that were constructed for an ecological field sites project that the I worked on (<http://www.supersites.net.au/>). That project involved ecological data sampled at plot-based measurement locations. At the begining of the procedure a controlled vocabulary of data types and their acronyms was created.

Table 1: An example of standardised filename conventions to simplify tracking complicated datasets

Filename	Title
asn_fnqr_soil_charact_robson_2011.csv	Soil Data, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, Robson Creek, 2011
asn_fnqr_soil_pit_robson_2012.csv	Soil Pit Data, Water Content and Temperature, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, Robson Creek, 2012
asn_fnqr_veg_seedling_robson_2010-2012.csv	Seedling Survey, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, Robson Creek, 2010-2012
asn_fnqr_veg_seedling_transect_coord_robson_2010-2012.csv	Seedling Survey, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, Robson Creek, 2010-2012
asn_fnqr_core_1ha_robson_2014.csv	Soil Pit Data, Soil Characterisation, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, Robson Creek, Core 1 ha plot, 2014
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_ctbcc_2012.csv	Vertebrate Fauna Biodiversity Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, CTBCC, 2012
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_ctbcc_2013.csv	Vertebrate Fauna Biodiversity Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, CTBCC, 2013
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_ctbcc_capetrib_2014.csv	Avifauna Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, Cape Tribulation, 2014
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_ctbcc_lu11a_2014.csv	Vertebrate Fauna Biodiversity Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, CTBCC, LU11A, 2014
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_ctbcc_lu7a_2014.csv	Vertebrate Fauna Biodiversity Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, CTBCC, LU7A, 2014
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_ctbcc_lu7b_2014.csv	Vertebrate Fauna Biodiversity Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, CTBCC, LU7B, 2014
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_ctbcc_lu9a_2014.csv	Vertebrate Fauna Biodiversity Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, CTBCC, LU9A, 2014
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_ctbcc-lu11a_2009-2011.csv	Vertebrate Fauna Biodiversity Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, CTBCC, LU11A, 2009-2011
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_ctbcc-lu7a_2009-2011.csv	Vertebrate Fauna Biodiversity Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, CTBCC, LU7A, 2009-2011
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_ctbcc-lu9a_2009-2011.csv	Vertebrate Fauna Biodiversity Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, CTBCC, LU9A, 2009-2011
asn_fnqr_fauna_biodiversity_habitat_codes_ctbcc-lu11a_2009-2011.pdf	Vertebrate Fauna Biodiversity Monitoring, Far North Queensland Rainforest SuperSite, CTBCC, LU11A, 2009-2011

# 5 Visualisation techniques

## 5.1 Make a list of steps, inputs and outputs

A very simple example of a pipeline is shown in Table 2. The steps and data listed in Table 2 can be visualised using the `newnode` function described below in case study 3. This creates the graph of this pipeline shown in Figure 2. As the analysis progresses through the phases of testing, refinement and final versions. The linked table and graphical depiction can be very helpful for reference by the analyst. The optional setting to define a status of each step (TODO, DONE, WONTDO) can be used to add colour, and show steps that remain to be done. The addition of short summary descriptions are also very useful for orienting oneself to the required tasks and their priorities. Such flow chart diagrams can be printed up on large sheets of paper and stuck on the wall beside a computer workstation for use in day-to-day work.

Table 2: A table with the steps of a simple data analysis pipeline

STEP	INPUTS	OUTPUTS	DESCRIPTION	STATUS
Step1	Source 1, Source 2	Derived 1, QC	This might be latitude and longitude of sites	DONE
Step2	Source 3	Derived 2	This might be weather data	DONE
Step3	Derived 1, Derived 2	Derived 3	Merging these data means they can be analysed	TODO
Step4	Derived 3	Model selection		TODO
Step5	Model selection	Sensitivity analysis		TODO




Figure 2: A visualisation of a data analysis pipeline showing the use of colour

As an example of the kinds of tangible steps such a workflow might entail a schematic diagram has been created and is shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: A schematic flow chart showing the steps required to prepare and conduct an analysis of health, environmental and social data.

A high resolution version of this image is available online at [https://github.com/swish-climate-impact-assessment/swish\\_data\\_management\\_procedures/blob/phd\\_appendix/images/envepi\\_data\\_pipeline.pdf](https://github.com/swish-climate-impact-assessment/swish_data_management_procedures/blob/phd_appendix/images/envepi_data_pipeline.pdf)

## 5.2 Case study 3: Visualisation of methods steps using bespoke software

The method step is the key atomic unit of a scientific pipeline. It consists of inputs, outputs and a rationale for why the step is taken.

A simple way to keep track of the steps, inputs and outputs is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: A simple table to track method steps, data inputs and outputs

STEP	INPUTS	OUTPUTS
Step1	Input 1, Input 2	Output 1
Step2	Input 3	Output 2
Step3	Output 1, Output 2	Output 3

The steps and data listed in Table 3 can be visualised. To achieve this an R function was written as part of this PhD project and is distributed in the author's own R package available on Github (<https://github.com/ivanhanigan/disentangle>). This is the `newnode` function. The function returns a string of text written in the `dot` language which can be rendered in R using the `DiagrammeR` package, or the standalone `graphviz` package. This creates the graph view shown in Figure 4. Note that a new field was added for Descriptions as these are highly recommended.

```
library(disentangle); library(stringr); library(readxl)
steps <- read_excel("steps_basic_workflow.xlsx")
nodes <- newnode(indat = steps, names_col = "STEP",
                 in_col = "INPUTS", out_col = "OUTPUTS")
DiagrammeR::grViz(nodes)
```






Figure 4: A graphical view of the steps that comprise a simple data analysis pipeline

## 6 References for appendix 2

- Barnett, A.G. & Dobson, A.J. (2010). *Analysing Seasonal Health Data*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany.
- Barnett, A.G., Baker, P. & Dobson, A.J. (2014). Package ‘season’: Analysing seasonal data R functions. R package version 0.3-5.
- Bodnar, A., Castorina, R., Desai, M., Duramad, P., Fischer, S., Klepeis, N., Liang, S., Mehta, S., Naumoff, K., Noth, E.M., Schei, M., Tian, L., Vork, K.L. & Smith, K.R. (2004). Lessons learned from ‘the skeptical environmentalist’: an environmental health perspective. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*, 207(1), 57–67.
- Borer, E.T., Seabloom, E.W., Jones, M.B. & Schildhauer, M. (2009). Some simple guidelines for effective data management. *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, (April), 205–214.
- Cai, W., Cowan, T., Braganza, K., Jones, D. & Risbey, J. (2010). Comment on ‘On the recent warming in the Murray Darling Basin: Land surface interactions misunderstood’ by Lockart et al. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 37(10), 1–3.
- Fleming, L., Haines, A., Golding, B., Kessel, A., Cichowska, A., Sabel, C., Depledge, M., Sarrao, C., Osborne, N., Whitmore, C., Cockledge, N. & Bloomfield, D. (2014). Data mashups: Potential contribution to decision support on climate change and health. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(2), 1725–1746.
- Leek, J.T. & Peng, R.D. (2015). Statistics: P values are just the tip of the iceberg. *Nature*, 520(7549), 612–612.
- McMichael, A.J. (2013). Impediments to comprehensive research on climate change and health. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 10(11), 6096–6105.
- Michener, W.K., Brunt, J.W., Helly, J.J., Kirchner, T.B. & Stafford, S.G. (1997). Nongeospatial metadata for the ecological sciences. *Ecological Applications*, 7(1), 330–342.
- Noble, W.S. (2009). A quick guide to organizing computational biology projects. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 5(7), 1–5.

- O’Keefe, B. (2007). Hackers pick up UQ cash prize. *The Australian*. <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/higher-education/hackers-pick-up-uq-cash-prize/story-e6frgcjx-1111113191659> [Accessed 14 Oct. 2015]
- Peng, R.D. (2015). *Report Writing for Data Science in R*. Leanpub. Unpublished Draft (Accessed 22 Dec. 2015). <https://leanpub.com/reportwriting>
- Peng, R.D. & Dominici, F. (2008). *Statistical Methods for Environmental Epidemiology with R. A Case Study in Air Pollution and Health*. Springer Science & Business Media, New York, USA.
- Peng, R.D., Dominici, F. & Zeger, S.L. (2006). Reproducible epidemiologic research. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 163(9), 783–789.
- Pullin, A.S. & Salafsky, N. (2010). Save the whales? Save the rainforest? Save the data! *Conservation Biology*, 24(4), 915–917.
- Schwab, M., Karrenbach, M. & Claerbout, J. (2000). Making scientific computations reproducible. *Computing in Science and Engineering*, 2(6), 61–67.
- Silberzahn, R. & Uhlmann, E.L. (2015). Crowdsourced research: Many hands make tight work. *Nature*, 526(7572), 189–191.
- Vines, T.H., Albert, A.Y.K., Andrew, R.L., Débarre, F., Bock, D.G., Franklin, M.T., Gilbert, K.J., Moore, J.-S., Renaut, S. & Rennison, D.J. (2014). The availability of research data declines rapidly with article age. *Current Biology*, 24(1), 94–97.
- White, E., Baldridge, E., Brym, Z., Locey, K., McGlinn, D. & Supp, S. (2013). Nine simple ways to make it easier to (re)use your data. *Ideas in Ecology and Evolution*, 6(2), 1–10.
- Wickham, H. (2014). Tidy data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 59(10), 1–23.
- Xie, Y. (2014). Chapter 1. Knitr: A comprehensive tool for reproducible research in R. *Implementing Reproducible Research* (eds V. Stodden, F. Leisch & R. Peng). CRC Press, Boca Raton, USA.