Editor's Note:

FACILITATING DATA SHARING IN THE BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES

William Anderson
Data Science Journal Editor

This special section of the Data Science Journal represents an experiment in what might be called "post-hoc open peer review". The DSJ received the paper in this section in 2011. The anonymous reviews of this submission were so constructive and informative that the Editors decided to ask the reviewers and the authors if we could publish the reviews, the authors' responses, and the revised paper as one special section. All parties agreed. The Editors think that the conversation contained in the reviews and the author responses provides context for the paper as well as contributing to the world-wide conversations on sharing research data that are going on among researchers, policy makers, educators, and the general public (Arzberger, et al., 2004; Schofield, et al., 2009). The structure of this special section is based on a process used by The Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics (ACP).

The practice of open peer review is part of a larger discussion of how the established research publication process can adapt to the affordances of the emerging e-Science cyber-infrastructure (Smith, 2010; Cohen, 2010; NMAT, 2011). A number of online research publications now publish papers with solicited reviews and public comments (ACP, BB, PLoS ONE). In addition, in January 2012 the Faculty of 1000 announced a new open access publishing project (F1000). Publishing papers plus reviews has several merits. First, making these scientific discussions public can help make the research understandable to the general public. It also makes the review process itself open to scrutiny and improvement. Second, reviewing papers in the open, and collecting comments from a more general audience, can help promote discussions of different positions. Third, the scientific record is expanded to include discussions of the content of published works. This is a benefit to those who study the practices and history of science.

The Data Science Journal supports these goals and the publication of this section is our way to gain some experience with open review publishing.

REFERENCES

ACP, Retrieved 7 February 2012 from the World Wide Web:
http://www.atmospheric-chemistry-and-physics.net/review/review_process_and_interactive_public_discussion.html

Arzberger P., et al. (2004) Promoting Access to Public Research Data for Scientific, Economic, and Social Development, *CODATA Data Science Journal* 3, 135-152.

BBS, Retrieved 9 February 2012 from the World Wide Web:
http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=BBS

Cohen P. (2010) For Scholars, Web Changes Sacred Rite of Peer Review, Retrieved 16 February 2012 from the World Wide Web: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/24/arts/24peer.html

F1000, Retrieved 7 February 2012 from the World Wide Web:
http://f1000research.com/2012/01/30/f1000-research-join-us-and-shape-the-future-of-scholarly-communication-2/

NMAT (2011) Transparency in peer review, *Nature Materials*, 10, 81, Retrieved 16 February 2012 from the World Wide Web: http://www.nature.com/nmat/journal/v10/n2/full/nmat2952.html (Access with free user registration).

PLoS ONE, Retrieved 7 February 2012 from the World Wide Web:
http://www.plosone.org/static/guidelines.action#postpublication

Schofield, P.N., et al. (2009) Post-publication sharing of data and tools, *Nature* 461, 171-173.

Smith R. (2010) Classical peer review: an empty gun, *Breast Cancer Research* 12(Suppl 4):S13, Retrieved 16 February 2012 from the World Wide Web: http://breast-cancer-research.com/content/12/S4/S13