Investigation of Data-Sharing Attitudes in the Context of a Meta-Analysis: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Principal Investigator: Joshua R. Polanin, Ph.D.

Co-Principal Investigator: Mary Terzian

Development Services Group, Inc.

Sponsored by a grant from the University of California-Berkeley's Berkeley Initiative for Transparency in Social Sciences (BITSS) Social Science Meta-Analysis and Research Transparency (SSMART) Grant Award No. 20153030 & 20161821

AERA 2017

Overview

- Individual participant data (IPD) from primary studies can provide meta-analysts with a windfall of information
 - Complete datasets
 - Additional moderators or program characteristics
 - Conduct an IPD meta-analysis
- Obtaining IPD from primary researchers is challenging
 - Difficult to find authors
 - Once contacted, recent IPD MAs have indicated an unwillingness to share primary study dataset

Research Questions

- 1) Does the willingness to share IPD increase when authors receive a data-sharing agreement that addresses potential concerns, compared with authors who do not receive a data-sharing agreement?
- 2) What are the reasons researchers adopt non-transparent research practices (i.e., concerns about sharing IPD)?
- 3) What are researchers' attitudes toward and experiences with data sharing in general?

Methods Overview

- Searched for meta-analyses published on or after 2012
 - Social science subject matter
 - Included at least 20 primary studies
 - Identified the primary study authors (citations)
- Extracted 2,239 primary authors from articles published on or after 2004
 - Obtained 1,694 emails (after duplicates)
 - 1,207 active emails, after bounce-backs (71.2%)
- 247 individuals responded and completed demographics (17.55% response rate)

Methods Overview

- Randomly assigned participants to receive the data sharing agreement or the standard data request
- Participants completed an online survey
 - Demographics
 - Transparent research practices
 - General data sharing concerns
 - Willing to share data
 - Meta-analysis data sharing concerns
- Conducted exploratory factor analyses and impact analyses, as well as subgroup analyses

Data Sharing Agreement

Participant Characteristics

Variable	Intervention	Control	Group Difference
v arrable	intervention	Control	Group Difference
Gender			$\chi^2 = 1.11, p = .57$
Female	71 (58)	69 (56)	χ , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Male	52 (42)	55 (44)	
Age	(/		$\chi^2 = 2.25, p = .81$
25-34	12 (10)	11 (9)	
35-44	31 (25)	29 (24)	
45-55	30 (25)	38 (31)	
56-64	29 (24)	31 (25)	
65-74	18 (15)	13 (11)	
75+	2 (2)	1(1)	
Race			$\chi^2 = 0.01, p = .99$
Non-White	12 (10)	12 (10)	
White	106 (90)	104 (90)	
Degree			$\chi^2 = 0.01, p = .99$
Ph.D. or Equivalent	112 (89)	114 (92)	
Other	14 (11)	10 (8)	
Institution			$\chi^2 = 2.02, p = .73$
Primarily Research University	62 (50)	67 (54)	
Primarily Teaching University	22 (18)	24 (19)	
Medical Institution	18 (15)	17 (14)	
Research Firm	10 (8)	5 (4)	
Other	12 (10)	11 (9)	
Primary Area of Research			$\chi^2 = 11.03, p = .20$
Education	9 (7)	12 (10)	
Criminology	6 (5)	5 (4)	
Medicine	1 (1)	9 (7)	
Psychology	52 (42)	47 (38)	
Public Health	41 (33)	32 (26)	
Social Work	3 (2)	1 (1)	
Sociology	1 (1)	1 (1)	
Statistics/Methodology	5 (4)	10 (8)	
0.1	(()	7.6	

Transparent Research Practices

I have	Overall (%)	IN (%)	CO (%)	Group Difference
Registered a research study on a site such as clinicaltrials.gov or another publicly available website.	29.84	29.03	30.65	$\chi^2 = .02, p = .89$
Published a research protocol/plan in a journal or publicly available website before implementing a study.	52.02	50.00	54.03	$\chi^2 = .26, p = .61$
Uploaded a research dataset to a publicly-available repository.	18.15	14.52	21.77	$\chi^2 = 1.74, p = .19$
Provided additional study information to a researcher for a systematic review or meta-analysis.	71.78	67.74	75.81	$\chi^2 = 1.61, p = .20$
Provided a research dataset to be included in a meta- analysis.	29.03	24.19	33.87	$\chi^2 = 2.37, p = .12$
Shared a research dataset with a colleague.	75.00	77.42	72.58	$\chi^2 = .54, p = .46$
Shared a research dataset with a researcher who I do not know.	21.78	17.74	25.81	$\chi^2 = 1.92, p = .17$

EFA of Posttest

Factor	Variable	Loa	ding	Reliability	Descriptive Statistics		
		F1	F2		IN	CO	d
Sharing my	I would be interested in sharing my dataset for inclusion in this	.83		.79	16.99 (5.88)	12.18 (6.57)	.77
dataset.	meta-analysis.						
	I would not be willing to share my dataset for inclusion in this	.76					
	meta-analysis.*						
	Now that an email has been sent to me asking for the dataset, I	.66					
	would share my dataset for inclusion in this meta-analysis.						
Sharing my	I would be willing to share my dataset as long as I am a co-		.99	.47	4.26 (3.91)	4.21 (3.85)	.01
dataset with	author of the meta-analysis.						
conditions.							
	I would be willing to share my dataset as long as I receive		.46				
	financial compensation.						

Impact Analysis of Posttest

Variable	Coding	Coefficient	p-value
		(SE)	
Intercept	-	15.91 (2.75)	0.001
Intervention	0 = CO, 1 = IN	4.64 (.78)	0.001
Gender	0 = Female, 1 = Male	16 (.83)	0.848
Race	0 = White, $1 = $ Non-White	.18 (1.29)	0.887
Age	Continuous variable	.3 (.38)	0.433
Degree Type	0 = Non-PhD, 1 = PhD	91 (1.4)	0.519
Date of Original Study Publication	Continuous variable	.04 (.14)	0.799
Experience providing data for a meta-analysis	0 = No, 1 = Yes	.15 (.98)	0.877
Experience providing data to a research you don't know	0 = No, 1 = Yes	1.65 (1.08)	0.128
Concerns about the condition of the dataset. (Pretest Factor 1)	Continuous variable	.08 (.06)	0.210
Concerns about dataset accessibility. (Pretest Factor 2)	Continuous variable	43 (.11)	0.001

Exploratory Analysis of Secondary Outcome

Changes to the Data Sharing Agreement

- Clarified language on storage and future use
- Added statements about "rights"
 - Right to Results
 - Right to Consultation
 - Right to Collaboration
- Added statement on financial compensation

Conclusions

- Cautiously optimistic that the data sharing agreement "works"
- Need to address initial data sharing concerns in order for this system to work effectively for all
- Bold statement: Meta-analysts should always consider asking primary authors for IPD, regardless of whether we are doing an IPD metaanalysis

Thanks!

• Technical Working Group: Terri Pigott, Jessaca Spybrook, Mark Lipsey

• Research Assistants: Susanne Miller, Meghan Baragho

 Funder: University of California, Berkeley's Berkeley Initiative for Transparency in Social Science (BITSS)