

Ten simple rules for digital data storage

Data is the central currency of science, but the nature of scientific data has changed dramatically with the rapid pace of technology. This change has led to the development of a wide variety of data formats, dataset sizes, data complexity, data use cases, and data sharing practices. Improvements in high throughput DNA sequencing, sustained institutional support for large sensor networks, and sky surveys with large-format digital cameras have created massive quantities of data. At the same time, the combination of increasingly diverse research teams and data aggregation in portals (e.g. for biodiversity data, GBIF or iDigBio) necessitates increased coordination among data collectors and institutions. As a consequence, “data” can now mean anything from petabytes of information stored in professionally-maintained databases, through spreadsheets on a single computer, to hand-written tables in lab notebooks on shelves. All remain important, but data curation practices must continue to keep pace with the changes brought about by new forms and practices of data collection and storage.

Ten Simple Rules for Digital Data Storage

Edmund Hart ^{1,*}, Pauline Barmby ², David LeBauer ³, François Michonneau ^{4,5}, Sarah Mount ⁶, Timothée Poisot ⁷, Kara H. Woo ⁸, Naupaka B. Zimmerman ⁹, Jeffrey Hollister ¹⁰

1 University of Vermont, Department of Biology, Burlington

2 University of Western Ontario, Department of Physics and Astronomy

3 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, National Center for Supercomputing Applications and Institute for Genomic Biology

4 University of Florida, iDigBio, Florida Museum of Natural History

5 University of Florida, Whitney Laboratory for Marine Bioscience

6 King's College London, Department of Informatics

7 Université de Montréal, Département de Sciences Biologiques

8 Washington State University, Center for Environmental Research, Education, and Outreach

9 University of Arizona, School of Plant Sciences

10 US Environmental Protection Agency, Atlantic Ecology Division

* E-mail: edmund.m.hart@gmail.com

1 Introduction

2 Data is the central currency of science, but the nature of scientific data has changed dramatically with the
3 rapid pace of technology. This change has led to the development of a wide variety of data formats, dataset
4 sizes, data complexity, data use cases, and data sharing practices. Improvements in high throughput DNA
5 sequencing, sustained institutional support for large sensor networks [1,2], and sky surveys with
6 large-format digital cameras [3] have created massive quantities of data. At the same time, the
7 combination of increasingly diverse research teams [4] and data aggregation in portals (e.g. for biodiversity
8 data, GBIF or iDigBio) necessitates increased coordination among data collectors and institutions [5,6]. As
9 a consequence, “data” can now mean anything from petabytes of information stored in
10 professionally-maintained databases, through spreadsheets on a single computer, to hand-written tables in

lab notebooks on shelves. All remain important, but data curation practices must continue to keep pace with the changes brought about by new forms and practices of data collection and storage. While much has been written about both the virtues of data sharing [7,8] and best practices to do so [9,10], data storage has received comparatively less attention. Proper storage is a prerequisite to sharing, and indeed inadequate storage contributes to the phenomenon of data decay or “data entropy”: data, whether publicly shared or not, becomes less accessible through time [11–14]. Best practices for data storage often begin and end with, “use a community standard repository.” This is a good advice; however, data storage policies are highly variable between repositories [15]. Best practices across all stages of the data life cycle will facilitate transition from local storage to repository. Good storage practices are important even (or especially) in cases where data may not fit with an existing repository, where only derived data products (versus raw data) are suitable for archiving, or in the case where an existing repository may have lax standards.

Therefore, this manuscript describes 10 simple rules for digital data storage that grew out of a long discussion among instructors for the Software and Data Carpentry initiative [16,17]. Software and Data Carpentry instructors are scientists from diverse backgrounds who have encountered a variety of data storage challenges and are active in teaching other scientists best practices for scientific computing and data management. Thus, this paper represents a distillation of collective experience, and hopefully will be useful to scientists facing a variety of data storage challenges.

Rule 1: Know what to expect

One can avoid most of the troubles encountered during the analysis, management, and release of data by having a clear roadmap of what to expect *before* data acquisition starts. For instance:

- How will the raw data be received? Are they delivered by a machine or software, or typed-in?
- What is the format expected by the software used for analysis?
- Is there a community standard format?

The answers to these questions can range from simple cases (e.g., sequencing data stored in the FASTA format, which can be used “as is” throughout the analysis), to experimental designs involving multiple instruments, each with its own output format and conventions. Knowing the state in which the data needs to be at each step of the analysis can help (i) identify software tools to use in converting across data formats, (ii) orient technological choices about how and where the data should be stored, and (iii)

40 rationalize the analysis pipeline, making it more amenable to re-use.

41 Also key is the ability to estimate the storage volume needed to store the data, both during and after the
42 analysis. The required strategy will differ for datasets of varying size. Smaller datasets (e.g. a few
43 megabytes in size) can be managed locally with a simple data management plan, whereas larger datasets
44 (e.g. gigabytes to petabytes) will in almost all cases require careful planning and preparation (Rule 10).

45 Rule 2: Know your use case

46 Well-identified use cases make data storage easier. Ideally prior to beginning data collection, one can
47 answer the following questions:

- 48 • Should the raw data be archived (Rule 3)?
- 49 • Should the data used for analysis be prepared once, or re-generated from the raw data each time (and
50 what difference would this choice make for storage, computing requirements, and reproducibility)?
- 51 • Can manual corrections be avoided in favor of programmatic approaches?
- 52 • How will changes to the data be tracked, and where will these tracked changes be logged?
- 53 • Will the final data be released, and if so, in what format?
- 54 • Are there restrictions or privacy concerns associated with the data (e.g. for survey results with
55 personally identifiable information (PII), threatened species, or confidential business information)?
- 56 • Will institutional validation be required prior to releasing the data?
- 57 • Does the funding agency mandate data deposition in a publicly available archive, and if so, where
58 and under what license?
- 59 • Does the target journal mandate data deposition?

60 None of these questions have universal answers, nor are they the only questions one should ask before
61 starting data acquisition. But knowing the what, when, and how of *your* use of the data will bring you
62 close to a reliable roadmap on how to handle data from acquisition through publication to archive.

63 Rule 3: Keep raw data raw

64 Since analytical and data processing procedures improve or otherwise change over time, having access to
65 the ‘raw’ (unprocessed) data can facilitate future re-analysis and analytical reproducibility. As processing
66 algorithms improve and computational power increases, new analyses will be enabled that were not

possible at the time of the original work. If only derived data are stored, it can be difficult to impossible for other researchers to confirm analytical results, to assess the validity of statistical models, or to directly compare findings across studies.

Therefore, data should always be kept in raw format whenever possible (within the constraints of technical limitations). In addition to being the most appropriate way to ensure transparency in analysis, having the data stored and archived in their original state gives a common point of reference for derivative analyses. What constitutes sufficiently “raw” data is not always clear (e.g., ohms off a temperature sensor or images off an Illumina sequencing flowcell are generally not archived after the initial processing). Yet the spirit of this rule is that data should be as “pure” as possible when they are stored. If derivations occur, they should be documented by also archiving relevant code and intermediate datasets.

Rule 4: Store data in open formats

To maximize accessibility and long-term value, it is preferable to store data in formats whose specifications are freely available. The appropriate file type will depend on the data being stored (e.g. numeric measurements, text, images, video), but the key idea is that accessing data should not require proprietary software, hardware, or purchasing a commercial license. Proprietary formats change, maintaining organizations go out of business, and changes in license fees make access to data in proprietary formats unaffordable to end-users. Examples of open data formats include comma-separated values (CSV) for tabular data, hierarchical data format (HDF) [18] and NetCDF [19] for hierarchically structured scientific data, portable network graphics (PNG) for images, KML (or other Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) format) for spatial data, and extensible markup language (XML) for documents. Examples of closed formats include DWG (for AutoCAD drawings), Photoshop document (PSD, for bitmap images), Windows Media Audio (WMA, for audio recording files), shapefiles for spatial data, and Microsoft Excel (for tabular data). Even if day-to-day processing uses closed formats (e.g., due to software requirements), data being stored for archival purposes should be stored in open formats. This is generally not prohibitive; most closed-source software enables users to export data to an open format.

Rule 5: Data should be stored in a machine-readable format

Not only data should be stored in an open format (Rule 4), but it should also be stored in a format that computers can easily use. This is especially crucial as datasets become larger. Machine readable data is

best achieved by using standard data formats that have clear specifications (e.g., CSV, XML, JSON, HDF5), or by using databases. Such data formats can be handled by a variety of programming languages, as efficient and well-tested libraries for parsing them are typically available. These standard data formats also ensure interoperability, facilitate re-use, and reduce the chances of data loss or mistakes being introduced during conversion between formats.

When data can be easily imported into familiar software, whether it be a scripting language, a spreadsheet, or any other computer program that can import these common files, data becomes easier to re-use. Computer source code, the human readable software that uses data, provides metadata as well. This makes analysis more transparent, since all assumptions about the structure of the data are implicitly stated in the source code. This also enables extraction of the analyses performed, their reproduction, and their modification.

To take full advantage of data, it can be useful for it to be structured in a way that makes use, interpretation, and analysis easy. One such structure for data stores each variable is a column, each observation as a row, and each type of observational unit is a table (Fig. ??). The technical term for this structure is ‘Codd’s 3rd normal form’, but has been made more accessible as the concept of *tidy* data [20]. When data is organized in this way, the duplication of information is reduced and it is easier to subset or summarize the dataset to include the variables or observations of interest.

Interoperability is facilitated when variable names are mapped to existing data standards. For instance, for biodiversity data, the Darwin Core Standard provides a set of terms that describe observations, specimens, samples, and related information for a taxa. For earth science and ecosystem models and data, the Climate Forecasting Conventions are widely adopted, such that a large ecosystem of software and data products exist to reduce the technical burden of reformatting and reusing large and complex data. Because each term in such standards are clearly defined and documented, each dataset can use the terms consistently, this facilitates data sharing across institutions, applications, and disciplines.

With machine-readable, standards-compliant data, it easier to build an Application Programming Interface (API) to query the dataset and retrieve a subset of interest as outlined in Rule 10

Rule 6: Data should be uniquely identifiable

The data used in a scientific publication should be uniquely identifiable to aid reproducibility. Ideally, datasets should have a unique identifier such as a Digital Object Identifier (DOI), Archival Resource Key (ARK), or a Persistent URL (PURL). An increasing number of online services, such as Figshare, Zenodo,

or DataOne are able to provide these. Institutional initiatives also exist, and are known to your librarians. Datasets evolve over time. In order to distinguish between different versions of the same data, each dataset should have a distinct name, which includes a version identifier. A simple way to do this is to use date stamps as part of the dataset name. Using the ISO 8601 standard avoids regional ambiguities: it mandates the date format YYYY-MM-DD (i.e. from largest time unit to smallest). For example, the date “February 1st, 2015”, while written as 01-02-2015 in the UK and 02-01-2015 in the US, is the unambiguous 2015-02-01 under this standard.

Semantic versioning is a richer approach to solving the same problem [21]. The CellPack datasets are an example of this [22]. A semantic version number takes the form: `Major.Minor.Patch`, e.g. 0.2.7. The *major version* numbers should be incremented (or bumped) when a dataset scheme has been updated, or some other change is made that is not compatible with previous versions of the data with the same major version number. This means that an experiment using version 1.0.0 of the dataset may not run on version 2.0.0 without changes to the data analysis. The *minor version* should be bumped when a change has been made which is compatible with older versions of the data with the same major version. This means that any analysis that can be performed on version 1.0.0 of the data is repeatable with version 1.1.0 of the data. For example, adding a new year in a temporal survey will result in a bump in the minor version. The *patch version* number is bumped when typos or bugs have been fixed. For example version 1.0.1 of a dataset may fix a typo in version 1.0.0.

Rule 7: Link relevant metadata

Metadata is the contextual information required to interpret data (Figure 1) and should be clearly defined and tightly integrated with data. The importance of metadata for context, reusability, and discovery has been written about at length in guides for data management best practices [9,13,23].

Metadata should be as comprehensive as possible, using standards and conventions of a discipline, and should be machine-readable. Metadata should always accompany a dataset, wherever it is stored, but the best way to do this depends on the format of the data. Text files can contain meta-data in in well defined text files such as XML or JSON). Some file formats are self-documenting, for example NetCDF, HDF5, and many image files allow for embedded metadata [18,19]. In a relational database, metadata tables should be clearly labeled and linked to the data. Ideally a schema will be provided that also shows the linkages between data tables and metadata tables. Another scenario is a set of flat text files—in this case a semantically versioned, compressed archive should be created that includes metadata.

155 Whatever format is used for archiving, the goal should be to make the link between metadata and data as
156 clear as possible. The best approach is dependent on the archiving plan used, but even if the dataset is
157 archived solely for personal use, metadata will provide crucial context for future reuse.

158 **Rule 8: Adopt the proper privacy protocols**

159 In datasets where privacy is important, be sure to have a plan in place to protect data confidentiality. You
160 should consider the different data stakeholders when developing privacy protocols for your data storage.
161 These stakeholders include funding agencies, human subjects or entities, collaborators, and yourself. Both
162 the NSF and NIH have data sharing policies in their grant guidelines to prevent sharing personally
163 identifiable information, and to anonymize data on human subjects.

164 In small datasets, a hashing scheme (anonymizing PII by converting it into a numeric key of a fixed length
165 with a standard algorithm) is enough to anonymize minimal personal information. Make sure to not store
166 the hashing scheme with the data to prevent inadvertent sharing and to not use a commonplace hashing
167 technique. Famously, New York City officials shared what they thought was anonymized data on cab
168 drivers and over 173 million cab rides. However, it was quickly recognized that the city anonymized the
169 data with a simple MD5 hashing scheme and all 20 GB of data were de-anonymized in a matter of hours
170 [24]. This type of error can be prevented by asking a trusted colleague to try to “crack” anonymised data
171 before releasing it publicly. Often the person who has produced the data is least well placed to check the
172 fine details of their security procedures.

173 In more problematic cases, the data itself allows identifiability: this is the case with human genomic data
174 that map directly onto a subject’s identity [25]. Methods for dealing with these complex issues at the
175 intersection of data storage and privacy are rapidly evolving, and include storing changes against a
176 reference genome to help with privacy and data volume [26,27], or bringing computation to data storage
177 facilities instead of vice versa [28]. Having a plan for privacy before data acquisition is important, because
178 it can determine or limit how data will be stored.

179 **Rule 9: Have a systematic backup scheme**

180 Every storage medium can fail, and every failure can result in loss of data. Researchers should therefore
181 back data up at all stages of the research process. Data stored on local computers or institutional servers
182 during the collection and analysis phases should be backed up to other locations and formats to protect

183 against data loss. No backup system is failsafe (see the stories of the Dedoose crash and the
184 near deletion of Toy Story 2), so more than one backup system should be used. Kristin Briney advocates
185 the “Rule of 3” for backing up data: two onsite copies (such as on a computer, an external hard drive, or a
186 tape) and one offsite copy (e.g. in cloud storage). For example, keeping backups in multiple locations
187 protects against data loss due to theft or natural disasters.
188 Researchers should also test their backups regularly to ensure that they are functioning properly. Common
189 reasons for backup failure include:

- 190 • faulty backup software
- 191 • incorrect configuration (e.g., not backing up sub-directories)
- 192 • encryption (e.g., someone has encrypted the backups but lost the password)
- 193 • media errors

194 Consider the backup plan of your selected data repository before publishing your data. Many repositories
195 mirror the data they host on multiple machines. If possible, find out about the long-term storage plans of
196 the repository. Are there plans in place to keep data available if the organization that manages the
197 repository dissolves?

198 **Rule 10: The location and method of data storage depends on** 199 **how much you have**

200 The storage method you should choose depends on the size and nature of your data, the cost of storage,
201 the time it takes to transfer the data, how the data will be used and any privacy concerns. Data is
202 increasingly generated in the range of many terabytes by environmental sensors, satellites, automated
203 analytical tools, simulation models, and genomic sequencers. Even larger data generating machines like the
204 Large Hadron Collider (LHC) and the Large Scale Synoptic Survey Telescope (LSST) generate many
205 terabytes (TB) per day, rapidly accumulating to petabyte (PB) scale over the course of any particular
206 study. While the cost of storage continues to decrease, the volume of data to be stored impacts the choice
207 of storage methods and locations: for large datasets it is necessary to balance the cost of storage with the
208 time of access and costs of re-generating the data.

209 When data takes too long to transfer or is costly to store, it can become more efficient to use a computer
210 that can directly access and use the data in place. Inactive data can be put in longer-term storage; this is
211 less expensive, but can take longer to retrieve. Some storage systems automatically migrate ‘stale’ files to

longer term storage. Alternatively, some computing can be done ‘in the database’ or ‘on disk’ via database query languages (e.g. SQL, MapReduce) that perform basic arithmetic, or via the use of procedural languages (e.g. R, Python, C) embedded in the database server. Modern database technologies such as HDFS and Spark allow these computations to be done on data of almost any size. When data is larger than RAM, it can be handled by a ‘big memory’ node, which most high-performance computing have deployed – relying on tight software/hardware integration, these are currently around 1-4 TB. This allows the user to read in and use a large dataset without special tools.

If you regularly only need access to a small subset of your data or need to share it with many collaborators, a web-based API (Application Programming Interface) might be a good solution. Using this method, many users can send requests to a web service which can subset the data, perform in-database computation, and return smaller volumes of data as specific slices. Tools based on web services make it easier to find and download data, and facilitate analysis via reproducible scripts, however they can lead to excessive and careless abuse of resources. The time required to re-download and recompute results can be reduced by ‘caching’. Caching stores copies of downloads and generated files that are recognized when the same script is run multiple times.

Glossary and abbreviations used in the manuscript

Projects

- **GBIF** (Global Biodiversity Information Facility, <http://www.gbif.org>) provides an international open data infrastructure to publish and disseminate biodiversity information.
- **iDigBio** (Integrated Digitized Biocollections, <https://www.idigbio.org>) is a project funded by the National Science Foundation that facilitates the digitization of natural history collections, and provides data and images for biological specimens.
- **ITIS** (Integrated Taxonomic Information System, <http://www.itis.gov>) is an international partnership of governmental organizations that aims at providing authoritative taxonomic information for plants, animals, fungi and microbes.

File formats

- **CSV** (Comma-Separated Values) and **TSV** (Tab-Separated Values) are plain text file formats used to store tabular data where each row is represented by a line in the file, and each field (column) is

separated by a comma for CSV or by the Tab character for TSV.

- **FASTA** is a simple file format used to represent sequences of nucleotides or amino-acids in plain text making it easy to manipulate programmatically.
- **HDF5** (Hierarchical Data Format) is an open-source binary file format designed to store large amounts of data (and their associated metadata) by providing a hierarchical structure that could be compared to how a hard drive is organized with directories and files. It is maintained by the non-profit HDF Group, a spin off of the National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA).
- **NetCDF** (Network Common Data Form) is an open-source binary file format designed to store large datasets in array-oriented scientific data as typically used in geosciences. It is maintained by Unidata, a non-profit member of the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research (UCAR) which is funded by the National Science Foundation.

Programming and algorithms

- **Web APIs** (Application Programming Interface) provide ways to query programmatically databases through the internet. They notably allow users to retrieve and work with a small slice of a large dataset.
- **HDFS** (Hadoop Distributed File System) is a Java based file system where data is stored in small chunks across multiple redundant nodes.
- **MapReduce** is a style of programming designed to work with large datasets in parallel computing environments. Such programs are composed of a **map** procedure where the dataset is sliced into several pieces, and a **reduce** procedure where summary operations are applied to each of the slices.
- **SHA-2** is a family of Secure Hashing Algorithms used in cryptographic analysis, often to verify the integrity of a file. A cryptographic hash function converts a “message” (e.g., passwords, file content) into an encrypted value. Cryptographic hash functions are easy to compute from the message, but it should be impossible to recover the message from the output, and any modifications to the message should also modify the output. The SHA algorithms are often used in preference to similar tools such as MD5 (mentioned in Rule 8), which are no longer secure.
- Apache **Spark** is an open source computing platform for querying large data sets in memory, in contrast to on disk based methods like MapReduce.

- **SQL** (Structure Query Language) is a programming language used to interact with relational database management systems.

Hardware

- **mega-, giga-, tera-, peta-bytes** are units of digital information and are used to measure the size of datasets or the storage media. Originally a byte was the minimum amount of memory needed to store a single character of text in a computer. The prefixes mega-, giga-, tera- and peta- refer to the international system of units for the multiple of the unit, and correspond to 10^6 , 10^9 , 10^{12} , and 10^{15} abbreviated M, G, T and P respectively.

Persistent identifiers

- **ARK** (Archival Resource Key) identifiers are URLs designed to support long-term access to information online.
- **DOI** (Digital Object Identifier) provides unique and persistent identifiers for electronic documents (in particular journal articles and datasets) on the internet. The uniqueness of the identifiers is guaranteed by a central registry. By dissociating the identifier and the location of the document (i.e., the URL), the DOI can remain fixed even if its location changes.
- **PURL** (Persistent Uniform Resource Locator) is an URL used to redirect to the location of an electronic object on the internet. DOI and ARK are examples of implementations of PURL.
- **URL** (Uniform Resource Locator) gives the location of an object on the World Wide Web; the most familiar type of URL is a website address.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank G. Wilson and the Software Carpentry instructor community for providing the initial inspiration for this paper and the discussion held at <https://github.com/swcarpentry/site/issues/797>. DL was funded by the Energy Biosciences institute and the National Center for Supercomputing Applications. FM was funded by iDigBio (Integrated Digitized Biocollections), and therefore this material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation's Advancing Digitization of Biodiversity Collections Program (Cooperative

294 Agreement EF-1115210). Contributions from JWH, an employee of the U.S. Environmental Protection
 295 Agency (EPA) have not been subjected to the Agency's peer and administrative review. Therefore, the
 296 conclusions and opinions drawn are solely those of the author(s) and are not necessarily the views of the
 297 Agency. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or
 298 recommendation for use. KW was funded by Washington State University. NBZ was funded by the Gordon
 299 and Betty Moore Foundation through Grant GBMF 2550.03 to the Life Sciences Research Foundation. PB
 300 was funded by the Natural Sciences & Engineering Research Council of Canada and the Academic
 301 Development Fund of the University of Western Ontario. SM would like to thank Dr. Laurence Tratt for
 302 reviewing an early draft of this paper. TP was funded by an NSERC Discovery Grant, and a Start-Up
 303 grant from the Université de Montréal. PB was funded by an NSERC Discovery Grant and the Academic
 304 Development Fund of the University of Western Ontario.

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Example of an untidy dataset (A) and its tidy equivalent (B). Dataset A is untidy because it mixes observational units (species, location of observations, measurements about individuals), the units are mixed and listed with the observations, more than one variable is listed (both latitude and longitude for the coordinates, and genus and species for the species names), and several formats are used in the same column for dates and geographic coordinates. Dataset B is an example of a tidy version of dataset A that reduces the amount of information that is duplicated in each row, limiting chances of introducing mistakes in the data. By having species in a separate table, they can be identified uniquely using the Taxonomic Serial Number (TSN) from the Integrated Taxonomic Information System (ITIS), and it makes it easy to add information about the classification of these species. It also allows researchers to edit the taxonomic information independently from the table that holds the measurements about the individuals. Unique values for each observational unit facilitate the programmatic combination of information using “join” operations. With this example, if the focus of the study for which these data were collected is based upon the size measurements of the individuals (weight and length), information about “where”, “when”, and “what” animals were measured can be considered meta-data. Using the tidy format makes this distinction clearer.

Figures

Figure 1

A

Untidy Data

species	habitat	weight	length	latitude/longitude	date
Alligator mississippiensis	swamp	431 lb	4 ft 2	29.531,-82.184	Sept 15, 2015
Puma concolor	forest	125 lb	2.2m	29.125,-81.682	08/10/2015
Ursus americanus	forest	88 kg	133 cm	N29°7'30"/W81°40'55.2"	07-13-2015

B

Tidy Data

meta-data

data

species_code	date	station_code	weight_kg	length_cm
TSN 551771	2015-09-15	1	196	127
TSN 55247	2015-08-10	2	57	220
TSN 180544	2015-07-13	2	88	133

station_code	habitat	latitude	longitude
1	swamp	29.531	-82.184
2	forest	29.125	-81.682

species_code	class	genus	species
TSN 551771	Reptilia	Alligator	mississippiensis
TSN 55247	Mammalia	Puma	concolor
TSN 180544	Mammalia	Ursus	americanus

References

1. Reid JG, Carroll A, Veeraraghavan N, Dahdouli M, Sundquist A, English A, et al. Launching genomics into the cloud: deployment of Mercury, a next generation sequence analysis pipeline. *BMC bioinformatics*. 2014;15: 30. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-15-30
2. Hampton SE, Strasser C a, Tewksbury JJ, Gram WK, Budden AE, Batcheller AL, et al. Big data and the future of ecology. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*. 2013; 130312142848005. doi:10.1890/120103
3. Eisenstein DJ, others. SDSS-III: Massive Spectroscopic Surveys of the Distant Universe, the Milky Way, and Extra-Solar Planetary Systems. *The Astronomical Journal*. 2011;142: 72.
4. Adams J. Collaborations: The rise of research networks. *Nature*. Nature Publishing Group, a division of Macmillan Publishers Limited. All Rights Reserved. 2012;490: 335–6. doi:10.1038/490335a
5. Fraser LH, Henry HA, Carlyle CN, White SR, Beierkuhnlein C, Cahill JF, et al. Coordinated distributed experiments: an emerging tool for testing global hypotheses in ecology and environmental science. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*. Ecological Society of America; 2013;11: 147–155. doi:10.1890/110279
6. Robertson MAG Tim AND Döring. The gBIF integrated publishing toolkit: Facilitating the efficient publishing of biodiversity data on the internet. *PLoS ONE*. Public Library of Science; 2014;9: e102623. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0102623
7. Wolkovich EM, Regetz J, O'Connor MI. Advances in global change research require open science by individual researchers. *Global Change Biology*. 2012;18: 2102–2110. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2012.02693.x
8. Roche DG, Lanfear R, Binning SA, Haff TM, Schwanz LE, Cain KE, et al. Troubleshooting public data archiving: suggestions to increase participation. *PLoS biology*. 2014;12: e1001779. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1001779
9. White E, Baldrige E, Brym Z, Locey K, McGlinn D, Supp S. Nine simple ways to make it easier to (re)use your data. *Ideas in Ecology and Evolution*. 2013;6: 1–10. doi:10.4033/iee.2013.6b.6.f
10. Goodman A, Pepe A, Blocker AW, Borgman CL, Cranmer K, Crosas M, et al. Ten simple rules for the care and feeding of scientific data. *PLoS computational biology*. 2014;10: e1003542. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003542
11. Pepe A, Goodman A, Muench A, Crosas M, Erdmann C. How Do Astronomers Share Data? Reliability and Persistence of Datasets Linked in AAS Publications and a Qualitative Study of Data Practices among US Astronomers. Golden AA-J, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9: e104798. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0104798
12. Vines TH, Albert AYK, Andrew RL, Débarre F, Bock DG, Franklin MT, et al. The availability of

research data declines rapidly with article age. *Current biology : CB*. Elsevier; 2014;24: 94–7.

doi:10.1016/j.cub.2013.11.014

13. Michener WK, Jones MB. Ecoinformatics: supporting ecology as a data-intensive science. *Trends in ecology & evolution*. 2012;27: 85–93. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.11.016

14. Michener WK, Brunt JW, Helly JJ, Kirchner TB, Stafford SG. Nongeospatial metadata for the ecological sciences. *Ecological Applications*. Eco Soc America; 1997;7: 330–342.

15. Marcial LH, Hemminger BM. Scientific data repositories on the Web: An initial survey. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*. 2010;61: 2029–2048. doi:10.1002/asi.21339

16. Wilson G. Software Carpentry: lessons learned. *F1000Research*. 2014;3: 62.

doi:10.12688/f1000research.3-62.v1

17. Teal TK, Cranston Ka, Lapp H, White E, Wilson G, Ram K, et al. Data Carpentry: Workshops to Increase Data Literacy for Researchers. *International Journal of Digital Curation*. 2015;10: 135–143.

doi:10.2218/ijdc.v10i1.351

18. Koziol Q, Matzke R. Hdf5—a new generation of hdf: Reference manual and user guide. National Center for Supercomputing Applications, Champaign, Illinois, USA, <http://hdf.ncsa.uiuc.edu/nra/HDF5>. 1998;

19. Rew R, Davis G. NetCDF: An interface for scientific data access. *Computer Graphics and Applications, IEEE*. IEEE; 1990;10: 76–82.

20. Wickham H. Tidy Data. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2014;59: 1–23. Available:

<http://www.jstatsoft.org/v59/i10>

21. Preston-Werner T. Semantic Versioning 2.0.0. <http://semver.org>; 2014.

22. Johnson GT, Goodsell DS, Autin L, Forli S, Sanner MF, Olson AJ. 3D molecular models of whole HIV-1 virions generated with cellPACK. *Faraday Discuss. The Royal Society of Chemistry*; 2014;169: 23–44. doi:10.1039/C4FD00017J

23. Strasser C, Cook R, Michener W, Budden A. Primer on Data Management : What you always wanted to know [Internet]. California Digital Libraries; 2012. doi:10.5060/D2251G48

24. Goodin D. Poorly anonymized logs reveal NYC cab drivers’ detailed whereabouts [Internet]. *Ars technica*. 2015. Available:

<http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2014/06/poorly-anonymized-logs-reveal-nyc-cab-drivers-detailed-w>

25. Homer N, Szelling S, Redman M, Duggan D, Tembe W, Muehling J, et al. Resolving individuals contributing trace amounts of DNA to highly complex mixtures using high-density SNP genotyping microarrays. *PLoS genetics*. Public Library of Science; 2008;4: e1000167. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1000167

26. Kahn SD. On the future of genomic data. *Science (New York, NY)*. 2011;331: 728–9.

doi:10.1126/science.1197891

27. Wandelt S, Bux M, Leser U. Trends in genome compression. *Current Bioinformatics*. Bentham Science Publishers; 2014;9: 315–326.

28. Gaye A, Marcon Y, Isaeva J, LaFlamme P, Turner A, Jones EM, et al. DataSHIELD: taking the analysis to the data, not the data to the analysis. *International journal of epidemiology*. 2014;43: 1929–44.
doi:10.1093/ije/dyu188