

Article details: 2020-0303	
Title	Examining data sharing practices in publications funded by the Canadian Institutes
Authors	Kevin B. Read MLIS, Heather Ganshorn MLIS, Sarah Rutley MLIS, David R. Scott
Reviewer 1	Dr. Lorie Kloda
Institution	Concordia University, Montréal, Que.
General comments (author response in bold)	<p>[...] However, I think it might be helpful to explain to the reader why the authors chose to limit the study to identify ONLY publications that "indicated they shared research data" (p. 2 line 51) and not retrieve all CIHR-funded publications. This is likely for logistical/practical reasons, but nevertheless needs to be stated so that the reader understands that the results reflect the proportion of papers with shared data out of those claiming (or "indicating") shared data.</p> <p><b>We included a discussion of the limitation of only including publications that "indicated they shared research data", and not all CIHR-funded publications (Page 19, 20)</b></p> <p>The results are very clearly presented, included the tables and figures. There is, however, one small point: on p. 12, lines 32-33, the statement "the authors of this study agreed that in many cases authors may have incorrectly considered tables and figures to be research data." seems like an interpretation of the results. Although I believe the statement to be plausible, it might be better placed in the Interpretation section of the manuscript.</p> <p><b>We have moved this statement to the Interpretation section. (Page 18)</b></p> <p>The Interpretation is very clear, and make important points. Upon reading it, further questions arose for me that I think could expand this section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How do the results of this study compare to similar studies on data sharing practices?</li> </ul> <p><b>We have added a paragraph comparing similar studies in the Interpretation (Page 18)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What are the possible reasons for the low number of data sharing/availability given that these were all retrieved based on having data sharing statements (is there any chance of false hits?)</li> </ul> <p><b>We address the most likely reason for low number of data sharing/availability in the Interpretation. (Page 18)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are there suggestions for further research on this topic? for instance, is there a correlation between journal policies and data sharing (as suggested by the finding of PLOS One)? Are there other factors associated with data sharing (discipline, institutional support, etc)?</li> </ul> <p><b>We have discussed the possible relation between the journals identified in our study and their corresponding data sharing policies in the Interpretation. We have cited current research that explores this topic at a journal level, and made recommendations for future study across CIHR funded publications. (Pages 18, 19)</b></p>
Reviewer 2	Dr. Joel Lexchin
Institution	York University, Toronto, Ont.
General comments (author response in	When it comes to published articles isn't a statement about data sharing subject to individual journal policy? The authors should analyze data sharing by authors in

bold)	<p>relation to the policy of the journals where the article is published. [Editorial note: The reviewer addresses an excellent point. We think the analysis suggested is optional; however, this issue should be fully discussed.]</p> <p><b>We have discussed the possible relation between the journals identified in our study and their corresponding data sharing policies in the Interpretation. We have cited current research that explores this topic at a journal level, and made recommendations for future study across CIHR funded publications. (Page 18)</b></p> <p>The authors acknowledge the upcoming Tri-Agency data management policy but I would like to see specific recommendations about what that policy should contain and how it can be enforced.</p> <p><b>We have included specific recommendations for extending the Tri-agency data management policy in the context of our results. (Page 19)</b></p> <p><b>We did not include recommendations on enforcement as there is already language written within the existing Tri-agency data management policy.</b></p> <p>There is a large number of tables and figures and some of them should be appendices. I'd suggest moving Table 5 and Figures 4, 7A&amp;B and 8A&amp;B. In addition, tables 3 and 4 could be combined.</p> <p><b>Tables 1 and 2, and Figure 7AB have been moved to the Appendix (Pages 24, 25, 26)</b></p> <p><b>We strongly believe that Figure 4 (now Figure 5 with the updated order) should remain within the manuscript, as the breadth/long tail of data repositories where CIHR researchers share highlights one of the key challenges of CIHR data discovery.</b></p> <p><b>We have kept Figure 8AB at the request of the editors. (Page 17)</b></p> <p>Why did the authors just use PubMed and PubMed Central and not other databases such as Embase?</p> <p><b>Our Limitations were expanded to include a discussion of our choice of databases (Pages 19, 20)</b></p> <p>Page 5, line 26: The authors should give an example of "documentation to support data reuse".</p> <p><b>We included examples of different types of documentation to address reviewer's concern. (Pages 6, 8)</b></p> <p>Page 5, line 35: How many people did the grouping and how were differences resolved?</p> <p><b>Added information about the data collection process under the heading "Examination of CIHR funded data sharing practices", to distinguish between metadata extraction and the data collection process. (Page 6)</b></p> <p><b>A sentence was added to describe how conflicts were resolved (Page 6)</b></p>
-------	---