

OPEN PRACTICES REVIEW (RT)

Satisfied Requirements

The authors provide clear citations to trusted repositories (such as OSF) in abstract and in a separate Related Materials section. Additionally, the code and Github repositories are properly archived.

Unsatisfied Requirements Personally Identifiable Information

Authors mention that “complete submissions to the feedback survey (see subsection 5.1) cannot be provided, as the data entered by some survey respondents contains personally identifiable information.”

Please add a clarification of what kind of personally identifiable information (PII) is contained in the data.

Based on the survey questions provided in the paper, it does not seem like the survey or the logs actively collected any PII. Consequently, if the PII is not of analytical value and is not difficult to remove, we would recommend you simply describe such information and remove it from the data. Otherwise, you may upload any supplemental materials with personally identifiable information to a protected repository such as Databrary (<https://nyu.databrary.org/>) or any other repository approved by OSF (see <https://osf.io/tvyxz/wiki/8.%20Approved%20Protected%20Access%20Repositories/>) .

Accessing Paper Materials

The OSF repository includes the archived source code and template, however it looks like the Evaluation Materials component is unreachable and marked as “currently archiving”. I imagine this must be an error. It could be an error that occurs when attempting to archive through Google Docs, if that is the case try to directly upload the files.

Please verify that Evaluation Materials are accessible and if not please reach out to OSF to resolve any issues related to archiving. Alternatively, feel free to use any other FAIR-compliant repository if issues persist.

Although we can't evaluate the completeness of the inaccessible materials, just as a reminder make sure it contains any available survey data, log data, as well as analysis code.

Missing License Statement

The OSF repository for the case study Github code mentions that the license statement is contained in a license.txt file, however this file is missing from the code. We note that the flowchart template repository does contain the license statement. Make sure to add a license statement to the case study code as well.

Minor suggestions

It may be helpful to add direct links to the Github repositories in the paper (not just to the archived ones).

Summary

- Clarify what kind of personally identifiable information had been collected and removed.
 - If personally identifiable information is not relevant for the analysis, we suggest simply removing it.
- Fix access to the OSF repository stuck in archiving.
- Add a license statement to the case study code.
- Add URLs to Github repositories.