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**Editor first decision—Revise & Resubmit**

Oct 13, 2020

Dear Moin Syed,

I have now received all reviews of your manuscript, “Easing Into Open Science: A Guide for Graduate Students and Their Advisors” from qualified researchers. I also independently read the manuscript before consulting these reviews. I agree with the reviewers that this is overall a very useful paper that can give graduate students guidance on how to get started with open science practices. The reviews are overwhelmingly postive, but also note a few issues that need to be addressed. I therefore encourage you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology.

The reviewers did an outstanding job in their reviews. Reviewer 1 has a number of helpful suggestions for references to add. Reviewer 2 has some concerns with respect to the Reproducible Code section, which currently only focuses on R versus SPSS/JASP. I agree with them that the Sharing Data section should be a little more detailed. Reviewer 3 makes the important point that your paper is especially geared towards graduate student who want to stay in academia, which should be clarified. In your resubmission, please include a document with a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments, outlining each change made in your manuscript or providing a suitable rebuttal.

In summary, I think this is a promising manuscript and, I hope you will revise it for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology. I look forward to receiving your revision. As this is a relatively minor revision, I anticipate that I will not need to send this out for review again, but will be able to make a decision on it myself.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at editorialoffice@collabra.org.

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Sincerely,

Eunike Wetzel

**Reviewer 1**

**Open response questions**

Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

The paper is an introduction to Open Science for graduate students and is an engaging and enjoyable read. It is written in a conversational style, and I think this helps the manuscript seem engaging but might not fit some journals style (but I think it fits Collabra). The OSF page is great and commendable. The only point for improvement is that the manuscript lacks some citations throughout that I would have expected to see. While this is not a literature review of open science, and I did not evaluate it as such, I did feel some more citations would help give the arguments weight. I list some of the citations I would have added as an author of this manuscript below, and invite the authors to disregard any they do not think are appropriate.

1. It would be nice to have a reference about the history of these ideas at the beginning of “Why Do Open Science” Section, e.g. Merton’s Norms
2. On page 11 I would have cited Wilson et al. (2017; good enough computational practices) as it is a great introduction to workflows.
3. At the beginning of page 12 it would have been good to cite some papers discussing data sharing instead of referencing just the GDPR guidelines.
4. Bottom of page 13 I would have referenced Brenton Wiernick’s great preprint templates available for Microsoft word.
5. Middle page 19 I would have referenced the option to create a synthetic dataset if the appropriate ethical consent was not obtained before data collection.
6. Middle of page 21 I would try to find a reference or discussion about the perceived trade off between the need to tell a narrative and the need for transparency (I think Dorothy Bishop has blogged about this), as this is a common supervisor concern in my experience.
7. Beginning of page 22 I would have cited Wagenmakers paper about confirmatory research (2012).
8. Middle page 23 I would cite Wagenmakers paper about the creativity and verification cycle published in AMPPS
9. End of page 24 I would cite Chris Chambers editorial about Registered Reports.

The last two suggestions I have a COI as I am an author or co-author, so the authors should feel free to disregard:

1. Page 4, I would also cite Cruwell et al. 2019 at the beginning of paragraph 1.
2. In the journal club section one could have cited my 2019 commentary (Orben, 2019, Nature) which talks about the power of journal clubs. Also, it would be really nice if the authors could update the number of ReproducibiliTea Journal Clubs available when they revise their manuscript.

Best wishes, Amy Orben

**Rating scale questions**

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |

**Reviewer 2**

**Open response questions**

Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

This is a very helpful manuscript which provides an easy guide for graduate students wanting to integrate Open Science practices in their work. I particularly like that there is an accompanying OSF project page with further links to resources. The diagram visualising how the different practices you suggest flow into each other is also great. I have a couple of comments and suggestions that I will outline below.

Major

* Some of the claims made in this manuscript will not apply to all kinds of science and research. I think that it is important to be clear about which area of research you are focussing on and making claims about. For example “Open Science is just good science” may be broadly true, but not all Open Science practices will be applicable to all areas of research. Take for example preregistration — while more templates for more diverse fields are being delivered, it is not clear that preregistration is feasible and possible in all areas of research.
* Reproducible Code section: I think this section needs to be clearer. The issue of reproducible code is at least two-dimensional in that it is both about open-source vs closed source and about programming languages (easily reproducible) vs GUIs (need to find out how to use scripts). Currently, it seems to be R vs JASP/SPSS. This near-dichotomy might apply to some research in psychology, but many researchers may be using e.g. Matlab, which is straightforwardly reproducible as it is a programming language, but only if you own the proprietary software. Researchers may also be using Python, or Ruby, etc instead of R, depending on their area of research. It would be great if this section could be clearer. Similarly, the “Worries” section here focusses entirely on learning R. If you want to focus on R as an example or because you think it is superior to other alternatives, maybe make this clearer and at least briefly refer to some alternatives? Please also add at least a reference to the drawbacks of using GUI based programmes that you allude to.
* Sharing Data: I think this section needs to include more detail on the ethical concerns, rather than entirely referring to another article. It might also be useful to point those students who work in areas of research that have particular ethical concerns around sharing data to the possibility of creating synthetic data (Quintana, 2020).
* Preregistration: Please add some references here, so that interested students can look into this further. Especially your summary of what the primary goal of preregistration is is at least somewhat contentious (is it just about making transparent which decisions were made when? Does it enable more severe testing? Etc). It might be nice to highlight that preregistration helps you not to fool yourself/be lead by your own biases.

Minor

* The title promises a guide for graduate students and their advisors, but the body of the article seems to be geared towards graduate students only, with some mention of their advisors. This seems somewhat confusing.
* P.3: What do you mean by “culture of secrecy and scepticism”? I think a reference would be helpful here, but I truly don’t know what the culture of scepticism is, as surely scepticism was lacking. Similarly, as this is a paper geared towards people with little prior knowledge of Open Science and/or the replication crisis, it would probably be good to further expand on and add references to the claim that “doubt was cast upon foundational empirical work”.
* P.7 “Academic Twitter” might not be an expression that is known to relative newcomers — how can they join this?
* P.9: There are now over 100 ReproducibiliTea journal clubs
* P/12: GDPR only applies to EU researchers, right?

**Rating scale questions**

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |

**Reviewer 3**

**Open response questions**

Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

To the authors:

I had the pleasure of reviewing your manuscript, “Easing into Open Science: A Guide for Graduate Students and their Advisors.” In it, you provide concrete actions that researchers can take to make their research workflow more open. Overall, I think this paper does a really good job summarizing several open science activities. I also really like the modular framing of open science practices – I share the concern that these can all seem overwhelming at once and you do a great job emphasizing that a researcher can take these things one at a time. I have a few suggestions, mainly for additional framing. I don’t think any change or challenge the paper in a major way, they just add more context that I think would be useful for readers.

It seems to me that these suggestions are largely focused on the context of academic research. That makes sense, given that the article is targeted toward grad students, who are by definition in academia. Nevertheless, I think it helps state that this guide is rooted in academic research. Many of the skills and practices in this paper will translate well outside of academia, but probably to different degrees. For instance, learning about preregistration might make you better at inference and that will help in lots of research contexts. Conversely, learning the intricacies of Registered Report publishing might not matter much if a grad student goes on to a field where academic publishing isn’t a priority. I haven’t seen the numbers in a while, but I think it’s still the case that most psych PhDs will not stay in academia. I’d encourage your readers to consider what their long-term career goals are and keep that in mind when picking where to work on openness (not emphasizing this point is one of my main regrets in how I’ve talked to grad students about open science in the past).

Discussing the open science practices by their difficulty is a great idea – it really emphasizes the modular view of adoption. I also appreciate that you acknowledge that the ratings are subjective. I would also mention, though, that there are a range of activities that could fall under most of your behaviors. The way you discuss preregistration is a good example of this. I think it would help to add a general note when describing the rating system that you are rating the difficulty of some version of the behavior (what reads to me as the modal case). Individuals could certainly do less or more intense versions of the practices if they want (and you can encourage them to scale up as they get more practiced in these behaviors!). Overall though, you’re rating the difficulty of what is a common version of each behavior.

I also really liked how you described potential worries and drawbacks to each of these practices. From reading each of those sections, it sounds like there’s a bit of an overarching theme to the worries, which is that engaging in open science is a bit of a collective action problem. A lot of the benefits of being more open go to the state of the literature and the scientists using that literature. A lot of the potential draw backs go to the individual researcher. I don’t think that’s a great reason to not do these things, but it might be worth acknowledging. Admittedly, maybe it’s a bit too negative for the tone of this paper to add a section that says “all of these things will make you easier to criticize than your peers who don’t do them, but at least the literature will be more reliable!” However, this perspective does seem to apply to a lot of things in your Worries section and it might make the paper more persuasive to openly tackle it as an overarching challenge.

One final minor note - In your section on preprints, I’d encourage readers to reach out to the editors they’re working with on when pre-prints can/should be shared. Journals may have policies about preprints, but at the end of the day, your handling editor makes the call on acceptance. I’ve seen some handling editors that are much more hostile to pre-prints than others, so it might help to check (I’ve gotten the “well this is no longer novel” response to a paper with a preprint).

Overall, I think this is a great overview of getting started in open science. I look forward to sharing this paper with people who ask me how they can get started so that I don’t have to explain anything myself.

Warm Regards, Charlie Ebersole University of Virginia

**Rating scale questions**

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |

**Author response**

Dec 3, 2020

December 3, 2020

Dr. Eunike Wetzel

*Collabra: Psychology*

Re: “Easing Into Open Science: A Guide for Graduate Students and Their Advisors”

Dear Dr. Wetzel,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript for further consideration. We appreciate the helpful comments provided by you and the reviewers, and believe that the manuscript is much improved. We hope you agree and will find the manuscript suitable for publication.

We address each comment provided by you and the reviewers below. Please do not hesitate to reach out if you require clarification or additional information.

Respectfully,

AUTHORS

**Editor**

**I have now received all reviews of your manuscript, “Easing Into Open Science: A Guide for Graduate Students and Their Advisors” from qualified researchers. I also independently read the manuscript before consulting these reviews. I agree with the reviewers that this is overall a very useful paper that can give graduate students guidance on how to get started with open science practices. The reviews are overwhelmingly postive, but also note a few issues that need to be addressed. I therefore encourage you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology.**

Thank you to you and the reviewers for the positive response and constructive comments!

**The reviewers did an outstanding job in their reviews. Reviewer 1 has a number of helpful suggestions for references to add. Reviewer 2 has some concerns with respect to the Reproducible Code section, which currently only focuses on R versus SPSS/JASP. I agree with them that the Sharing Data section should be a little more detailed. Reviewer 3 makes the important point that your paper is especially geared towards graduate student who want to stay in academia, which should be clarified. In your resubmission, please include a document with a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments, outlining each change made in your manuscript or providing a suitable rebuttal.**

Thank you for highlighting these important issues. We addressed each of these concerns below in response to the reviewer’s specific comments.

**Reviewer 1 (Amy Orben)**

**The paper is an introduction to Open Science for graduate students and is an engaging and enjoyable read. It is written in a conversational style, and I think this helps the manuscript seem engaging but might not fit some journals style (but I think it fits Collabra). The OSF page is great and commendable. The only point for improvement is that the manuscript lacks some citations throughout that I would have expected to see. While this is not a literature review of open science, and I did not evaluate it as such, I did feel some more citations would help give the arguments weight. I list some of the citations I would have added as an author of this manuscript below, and invite the authors to disregard any they do not think are appropriate.**

We thank Amy for the kind review and for the great suggestions of additions to our paper.

1. **It would be nice to have a reference about the history of these ideas at the beginning of “Why Do Open Science” Section, e.g. Merton’s Norms**

We have added brief reference to Merton’s Norms

1. **On page 11 I would have cited Wilson et al. (2017; good enough computational practices) as it is a great introduction to workflows.**

We have added reference to Wilson et al. as well as a couple of other useful resources.

1. **At the beginning of page 12 it would have been good to cite some papers discussing data sharing instead of referencing just the GDPR guidelines.**

We have removed reference to GDPR in this section, and have a clearer discussion of it in the Data Sharing section.

1. **Bottom of page 13 I would have referenced Brenton Wiernick’s great preprint templates available for Microsoft word**.

We have added this reference.

1. **Middle page 19 I would have referenced the option to create a synthetic dataset if the appropriate ethical consent was not obtained before data collection.**

This has been added:

“Where you are unable to share your data due to the dataset including sensitive details of participants, or if you have not obtained ethical consent before data collection, it is possible to instead create a synthetic dataset that preserves the statistical properties and the relationships between variables (Quintana, 2020).”

1. **Middle of page 21 I would try to find a reference or discussion about the perceived trade off between the need to tell a narrative and the need for transparency (I think Dorothy Bishop has blogged about this), as this is a common supervisor concern in my experience.**

We were not able to find a suitable reference for this point (even after searching Bishop’s blog) and so decided to not include it.

1. **Beginning of page 22 I would have cited Wagenmakers paper about confirmatory research (2012).**

We have now added this reference

1. **Middle page 23 I would cite Wagenmakers paper about the creativity and verification cycle published in AMPPS**

We have now added this reference

1. **End of page 24 I would cite Chris Chambers editorial about Registered Reports.**

This has been added.

**The last two suggestions I have a COI as I am an author or co-author, so the authors should feel free to disregard:**

1. **Page 4, I would also cite Cruwell et al. 2019 at the beginning of paragraph 1.**
2. **In the journal club section one could have cited my 2019 commentary (Orben, 2019, Nature) which talks about the power of journal clubs. Also, it would be really nice if the authors could update the number of ReproducibiliTea Journal Clubs available when they revise their manuscript.**

These have been added.

**Reviewer 2 (unsigned)**

**This is a very helpful manuscript which provides an easy guide for graduate students wanting to integrate Open Science practices in their work. I particularly like that there is an accompanying OSF project page with further links to resources. The diagram visualising how the different practices you suggest flow into each other is also great. I have a couple of comments and suggestions that I will outline below**.

Thank you, we appreciate the kind words and are pleased that you found value in the approach and the resources provided.

**Major**

**Some of the claims made in this manuscript will not apply to all kinds of science and research. I think that it is important to be clear about which area of research you are focussing on and making claims about. For example “Open Science is just good science” may be broadly true, but not all Open Science practices will be applicable to all areas of research. Take for example preregistration — while more templates for more diverse fields are being delivered, it is not clear that preregistration is feasible and possible in all areas of research.**

We fully agree that not all claims and practices will apply completely to all aspects of psychology, let alone all of science. Indeed, that is one reason why we are very clear about the “selective approach” to open science, and what we emphasize the range of specific manifestations of the different practices. To address the reviewer’s concerns, we have included more text throughout highlighting the point that open science is relevant to all, but some aspects might be more relevant than others and that readers should take this into consideration.

* **Reproducible Code section: I think this section needs to be clearer. The issue of reproducible code is at least two-dimensional in that it is both about open-source vs closed source and about programming languages (easily reproducible) vs GUIs (need to find out how to use scripts). Currently, it seems to be R vs JASP/SPSS. This near-dichotomy might apply to some research in psychology, but many researchers may be using e.g. Matlab, which is straightforwardly reproducible as it is a programming language, but only if you own the proprietary software. Researchers may also be using Python, or Ruby, etc instead of R, depending on their area of research. It would be great if this section could be clearer. Similarly, the “Worries” section here focusses entirely on learning R. If you want to focus on R as an example or because you think it is superior to other alternatives, maybe make this clearer and at least briefly refer to some alternatives? Please also add at least a reference to the drawbacks of using GUI based programmes that you allude to.**

We appreciate these comments and have made extensive edits in this section to address them. Please see pp. 17-20 in the manuscript for revisions.

* **Sharing Data: I think this section needs to include more detail on the ethical concerns, rather than entirely referring to another article. It might also be useful to point those students who work in areas of research that have particular ethical concerns around sharing data to the possibility of creating synthetic data (Quintana, 2020).**

We have now added more detail about some of the ethical concerns and how to handle them. We have also added additional resources to the OSF page on this subject.

**Preregistration: Please add some references here, so that interested students can look into this further. Especially your summary of what the primary goal of preregistration is is at least somewhat contentious (is it just about making transparent which decisions were made when? Does it enable more severe testing? Etc). It might be nice to highlight that preregistration helps you not to fool yourself/be lead by your own biases.**

We appreciate the reviewer bringing up this issue. We do not feel like this is the appropriate paper to weigh the merits of the different perspectives on preregistration, but we do think it is important for readers to be aware of the different views. Thus, we have briefly referenced the debates at the beginning and referred readers to relevant sources.

**Minor**

* **The title promises a guide for graduate students and their advisors, but the body of the article seems to be geared towards graduate students only, with some mention of their advisors. This seems somewhat confusing.**

After great deliberation, we decided to retain the title as it. In presenting these ideas to people we have found some advisors said they came to find out how to supervise their students better with respect to open science after reading the paper. We have now made it clear in the opening that we have a student-focus in the paper, even when it comes to the relevance for advisors.

* **P.3: What do you mean by “culture of secrecy and scepticism”? I think a reference would be helpful here, but I truly don’t know what the culture of scepticism is, as surely scepticism was lacking. Similarly, as this is a paper geared towards people with little prior knowledge of Open Science and/or the replication crisis, it would probably be good to further expand on and add references to the claim that “doubt was cast upon foundational empirical work”.**

We agree that this phrasing was opaque, and have removed this phrase in favor or a clearer explanation. Regarding the claim that “doubt was cast,” that sentence includes a citation to Vazire (2017) who very nicely covers the issue. As this is the first paragraph in which we are laying out the broad issues (that we unpack later), we feel this is sufficient.

* **P.7 “Academic Twitter” might not be an expression that is known to relative newcomers — how can they join this?**

We have explained what this means and added a reference.

* **P.9: There are now over 100 ReproducibiliTea journal clubs**

This has been changed.

* **P/12: GDPR only applies to EU researchers, right?**

As noted, we have removed reference to GDPR in this section, and have a clearer discussion of it in the Data Sharing section.

**Reviewer 3 (Charlie Ebersole)**

**I had the pleasure of reviewing your manuscript, “Easing into Open Science: A Guide for Graduate Students and their Advisors.” In it, you provide concrete actions that researchers can take to make their research workflow more open. Overall, I think this paper does a really good job summarizing several open science activities. I also really like the modular framing of open science practices – I share the concern that these can all seem overwhelming at once and you do a great job emphasizing that a researcher can take these things one at a time. I have a few suggestions, mainly for additional framing. I don’t think any change or challenge the paper in a major way, they just add more context that I think would be useful for readers.**

We thank Charlie for the kind comments and helpful review!

**It seems to me that these suggestions are largely focused on the context of academic research. That makes sense, given that the article is targeted toward grad students, who are by definition in academia. Nevertheless, I think it helps state that this guide is rooted in academic research. Many of the skills and practices in this paper will translate well outside of academia, but probably to different degrees. For instance, learning about preregistration might make you better at inference and that will help in lots of research contexts. Conversely, learning the intricacies of Registered Report publishing might not matter much if a grad student goes on to a field where academic publishing isn’t a priority. I haven’t seen the numbers in a while, but I think it’s still the case that most psych PhDs will not stay in academia. I’d encourage your readers to consider what their long-term career goals are and keep that in mind when picking where to work on openness (not emphasizing this point is one of my main regrets in how I’ve talked to grad students about open science in the past).**

This is an important point. We have edited the “Why Do Open Science” section to introduce this idea, and have also come back to it when talking about individual practices.

“It is important to note that different practices will make sense to prioritise depending on your planned career, and so it is important to think critically about which practices you’d like to engage with. Many of the practices we outline help with project organization (project workflow, data sharing, reproducible code), and therefore efficiency in the long term, which is beneficial to careers inside and outside of academia.”

Journal club section:

“More generally, organising a journal club and presenting are both transferable skills for most jobs.”

Project organization section:

“Having an organised workflow is beneficial in most jobs, as well as in your everyday life - no more scribbled shopping lists on scrap pieces of paper!”

Preprints section:

“Using preprints in this way can be useful if you choose not to stay in academia and do not get a chance to publish your research, but would still like to get it out there.”

Reproducible code section:

“Also, if you ever need to code for a non-academic job (e.g. in data science), it is likely this will be a lot more collaborative, and so it is good to practice annotating your code well from the beginning so that you can get used to it.”

Data sharing section:

“When applying for non-academic jobs involving data (e.g. data science), it can be useful to have an example of data that you have shared along with a codebook, to show that you are organised with your data.”

Transparent writing section:

“Writing transparently is a good skill to learn for other jobs that require communicating science truthfully - for example, science communication or journalism.”

Preregistration section:

“Going through this process can also make you better at inference, which would help in any research context (not just in academia).”

Registered Report section:

“For these reasons, Registered Reports may make the most sense for those who wish to stay in academia, as they lead to a guaranteed publication.”

**Discussing the open science practices by their difficulty is a great idea – it really emphasizes the modular view of adoption. I also appreciate that you acknowledge that the ratings are subjective. I would also mention, though, that there are a range of activities that could fall under most of your behaviors. The way you discuss preregistration is a good example of this. I think it would help to add a general note when describing the rating system that you are rating the difficulty of some version of the behavior (what reads to me as the modal case). Individuals could certainly do less or more intense versions of the practices if they want (and you can encourage them to scale up as they get more practiced in these behaviors!). Overall though, you’re rating the difficulty of what is a common version of each behavior.**

We have now clarified this in the introduction.

Introduction:

“A lot of the time, you can engage with any of the practices at a variety of difficulty levels (see section on pre-registration for an example), and so here we have rated practices as “medium” difficulty - but effectively this means this practice can be anywhere from easy to difficult depending on how you enact it. We encourage you to start as easy as you need to within a practice, and work your way up!”

**I also really liked how you described potential worries and drawbacks to each of these practices. From reading each of those sections, it sounds like there’s a bit of an overarching theme to the worries, which is that engaging in open science is a bit of a collective action problem. A lot of the benefits of being more open go to the state of the literature and the scientists using that literature. A lot of the potential draw backs go to the individual researcher. I don’t think that’s a great reason to not do these things, but it might be worth acknowledging. Admittedly, maybe it’s a bit too negative for the tone of this paper to add a section that says “all of these things will make you easier to criticize than your peers who don’t do them, but at least the literature will be more reliable!” However, this perspective does seem to apply to a lot of things in your Worries section and it might make the paper more persuasive to openly tackle it as an overarching challenge.**

We have now clarified this in the introduction and conclusion.

Introduction:

“All in all, there are many benefits—and few drawbacks—to engaging in open science practices. However, in a constantly changing research culture it is difficult to say for certain what these benefits and drawbacks are. We have attempted to cautiously make an assessment of the research culture as it is now, but we cannot predict which direction this will go in. It seems that open science practices are becoming increasingly widely adopted, and that (for those who wish to stay in academia) it can make sense to invest in these practices now, as they are increasingly becoming a part of decisions with regards to publication and hiring, etc. However, engaging in open science practices (e.g. transparent manuscript writing, sharing data) *can* make you easier to criticise than your peers who do not engage with them. For this reason, it is a very personal choice which practices you engage with and when. For some, the “moral” reasons to practice open science outweigh any possible risks, others do not perceive there to be risks, and for others the perceived risks outweigh the benefits or moral reasons. What we hope to be able to do is to at least make clear where worries are unfounded (e.g. worries that are just myths or that are easily remedied), so that you can make an informed decision.”

Conclusion:

“But remember, engaging in any of these practices is a personal decision that only you can make in a constantly changing research culture.”

**One final minor note - In your section on preprints, I’d encourage readers to reach out to the editors they’re working with on when pre-prints can/should be shared. Journals may have policies about preprints, but at the end of the day, your handling editor makes the call on acceptance. I’ve seen some handling editors that are much more hostile to pre-prints than others, so it might help to check (I’ve gotten the “well this is no longer novel” response to a paper with a preprint).**

We have now included this:

“To alleviate any remaining anxieties, if you know the journal that you wish to submit to you can contact the editor directly in order to get in writing whether preprints of the work are allowed before submission to the journal.”

**Overall, I think this is a great overview of getting started in open science. I look forward to sharing this paper with people who ask me how they can get started so that I don’t have to explain anything myself.**

Thank you, we look forward to you sharing it, too, and are happy to save you some work!

**Editor final decision**

**Dec 8, 2020**

Dear Moin Syed,

I have now had a chance to read over your manuscript “Easing Into Open Science: A Guide for Graduate Students and Their Advisors”, along with the letter describing the changes you made. Thank you for your responsiveness to the concerns that the reviewers and I raised. I am happy to say that your paper is now officially accepted for publication in Collabra: Psychology. Congratulations on this excellent work, I think it will make an important contribution to the literature and I look forward to seeing it published! I hope your experiences with Collabra: Psychology have been positive and that you will continue to consider it as an outlet for your work.

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point. Our managing editor will contact you in case there are any pre-prodution file related questions. You will have an opportunity to check the page proofs before we publish your article. Thank you again for publishing in Collabra: Psychology.

Sincerely, Eunike Wetzel