



Quality Assurance Group

WP4 REVIEW OF DELIVERABLE:

***C3 - Training of university staff, policy makers,
journal editors, and research benefactors in use of
open science platforms***

DELIVERABLE DETAILS

Title of the deliverable:	Open science: practice and perspectives
Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:	Snežana Smederevac, Dejan Pajić, Sanja Radovanović, Silvia Gilezan, Petar Čolović, Branko Milosavljević
WP leader:	University of Novi Sad
QAG reviewer(s):	Snezana Smederevac, Petros Stefaneas, Marina Lenisa, Caspar Addyman, Thed van Leeuwen
Short description of the deliverable:	
<p>A publication entitled Open Science: Practices and Perspectives was published which is available at the University of Novi Sad (OPEN) repository.</p> <p>The publication aims to make available to all researchers topics that are changing the entire international research space, introducing new rules of academic conduct and new academic skills. The legal and technical infrastructure for open science has been developed as part of the project, and the many important areas of open science that need to involve researchers in current scientific developments form the backbone of this publication.</p> <p>The publication explains in more detail the principles of open science, depositing research results and data in an institutional repository, the possibility of preregistering research, open review, open code, open methodology, and the functionality of the Dspace-CRIS platform, which is the basis of institutional repositories in Serbia.</p>	

QUALITY ASSURANCE DETAILS

Assurance point:	Issues to be addressed:	Assessment:	Comments:	Recommendations:
1. Compliance with the objectives of BE-OPEN	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	Deliverable complies with objective of the project	N/A	N/A
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the work package	Does the deliverable comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	Deliverable complies with WP objective specified in the WP description	N/A	N/A
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	Deliverable corresponds with the activity description as specified in the Application Form	N/A	N/A
4. Compliance with the deliverables format	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format?	Deliverable is presented using the Project's deliverable format	N/A	N/A
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External sources used • Bibliography • List of contacts • Methodology used (i.e. for surveys) 	Deliverable Adequacy of complementary information complies with minimum information required	N/A	N/A
External sources and Bibliography used:				

- American Society for Cell Biology. (2013). San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA). <https://sfdora.org/>
- Baden, T., Chagas, A. M., Gage, G., Marzullo, T., Prieto-Godino, L. L., & Euler, T. (2015). Open Labware: 3-D printing your own lab equipment. *PLoS Biology*, 13(3), e1002086. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002086>
- Banks, G. C., Field, J. G., Oswald, F. L., O'Boyle, E. H., Landis, R. S., Rupp, D. E., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2019). Answers to 18 Questions About Open Science Practices. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(3), 257–270. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9547-8>
- Barbour, V., Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and MetaAnalyses: The PRISMA Statement. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>
- Bartling, S., & Friesike, S. (2014). Towards Another Scientific Revolution. In S. Bartling & S. Friesike (Eds.), *Opening Science: The Evolving Guide on How the Internet is Changing Research, Collaboration and Scholarly Publishing* (pp. 3–15). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00026-8_1
- BE-OPEN. (2017). Survey on open science attitudes and experiences among Serbian scholars (WP1 Report). <http://beopen.uns.ac.rs/surveyoa>
- Björk, B.-C. (2018). Evolution of the scholarly mega-journal, 2006–2017. *PeerJ*, 6, e4357. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4357>
- Bohannon, J. (2013). Who's Afraid of Peer Review? *Science*, 342(6154), 60–65. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.342.6154.60>
- Bojanić, M. (2018). Prediktivna moć latentnih profila i dimenzija ličnosti. Master rad. Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Novm Sadu. Bosman, J., & Kramer, B. (2016). Innovations in scholarly communication—Data of the global 2015-2016 survey [Data set] [Data set]. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.49583>
- Branovački, B. (2016). Primena i validacija SAPA metodologije na srpskom jeziku. Master rad. Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Novm Sadu. Brown, N. (2017, December 18). Nick Brown's blog: A review of the research of Dr. Nicolas Guéguen. Nick Brown's Blog. <http://steamtraen.blogspot.com/2017/12/a-review-of-researchof-dr-nicolas.html>
- Brussel, S. V., & Huyse, H. (2019). Citizen science on speed? Realising the triple objective of scientific rigour, policy influence and deep citizen engagement in a large-scale citizen science project on ambient air quality in Antwerp. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 62(3), 534–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2018.1428183>
- Camerer, C. F., Dreber, A., Holzmeister, F., Ho, T.-H., Huber, J., Johannesson, M., Kirchler, M., Nave, G., Nosek, B. A., Pfeiffer, T., Altmejd, A., Buttrick, N., Chan, T., Chen, Y., Forsell, E., Gampa, A., Heikensten, E., Hummer, L., Imai, T., ... Wu, H. (2018). Evaluating the replicability of social science experiments in Nature and Science between 2010 and 2015. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2(9), 637–644. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0399-z>
- Condon, David M. (2018). The SAPA Personality Inventory: An empirically-derived, hierarchically-organized self-report personality assessment model. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/sc4p9>
- Condon, David M., & Revelle, W. (2019). Selected personality data from the SAPA-Project: 18aug2010 to 08dec2013 [Data set]. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/C40K1U>
- Condon, David Michael, & Revelle, W. R. (2015). Selected personality data from the SAPA-Project: On the structure of phrased selfreport items. *Journal of Open Psychology Data*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.5334/jopd.a1>

- Data Citation Sythesis Group. (2014). Joint Declaration of Data Citation Principles (M. Martone, Ed.). FORCE11. <https://www.force11.org/datacitationprinciples>
- DeHaven, A. (2017). Preregistration: A Plan, Not a Prison. <https://cos.io/blog/preregistration-plan-not-prison/>
- Dickinson, J. L., Shirk, J., Bonter, D., Bonney, R., Crain, R. L., Martin, J., Phillips, T., & Purcell, K. (2012). The current state of citizen science as a tool for ecological research and public engagement. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 10(6), 291–297. <https://doi.org/10.1890/110236>
- Dobbs, D. (2012). Is the Open Science Revolution For Real? | WIRED. <https://www.wired.com/2012/02/is-the-open-sciencerevolution-for-real/>
- Dobusch, L., & Heimstädt, M. (2019). Predatory publishing in management research: A call for open peer review. *Management Learning*, 50(5), 607–619. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507619878820>
- Düwell, M. (2019). Editorial: Open Science and Ethics. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 22(5), 1051–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-019-10053-3>
- Eksner, A. (2016). Uvod u objavljivanje naučnih publikacija. Centar za promociju nauke. <http://nauka.cpn.rs/>
- Ellers, J., Crowther, T. W., & Harvey, J. A. (2017). Gold Open Access Publishing in Mega-Journals: Developing Countries Pay the Price of Western Premium Academic Output. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.49.1.89>
- Erdt, M., Nagarajan, A., Sin, S.-C. J., & Theng, Y.-L. (2016). Altmetrics: An analysis of the state-of-the-art in measuring research impact on social media. *Scientometrics*, 109(2), 1117–1166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2077-0>
- Firth, S. K., Cole, G., Kane, T., Fouchal, F., & Hassan, T. M. (2018). An Open Data Science Approach for Building Performance Studies. 2018 Building Performance Analysis Conference and SimBuild, 699–706.
- Ford, E. (2013). Defining and Characterizing Open Peer Review: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.44.4.001>
- Fuggetta, A. (2003). Open source software—an evaluation. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 66(1), 77–90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0164-1212\(02\)00065-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0164-1212(02)00065-1)
- Gacek, C., & Arief, B. (2004). The many meanings of open source. *IEEE Software*, 21(1), 34–40. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2004.1259206>
- García-Peñalvo, F. J., García de Figuerola, C., & Merlo, J. A. (2010). Open knowledge: Challenges and facts. *Online Information Review*, 34(4), 520–539. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14684521011072963>
- Gueguen, N. (2007). Women’s bust size and men’s courtship solicitation. *Body Image*, 4(4), 386–390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2007.06.006>
- Guéguen, N., & Fischer-Lokou, J. (2003). Another Evaluation of Touch and Helping Behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 92(1), 62–64. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2003.92.1.62>
- Haag, A. (2005). A trip of a lifetime. *Nature*, 435(7045), 1018–1020. <https://doi.org/10.1038/4351018a>
- Haklay, M. (2013). Citizen Science and Volunteered Geographic Information: Overview and Typology of Participation. In D. Sui, S. Elwood, & M. Goodchild (Eds.), *Crowdsourcing Geographic Knowledge: Volunteered Geographic Information (VGI) in Theory and Practice* (pp. 105–122). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4587-2_7
- Haustein, S., Bowman, T. D., & Costas, R. (2016). Interpreting “altmetrics”: Viewing acts on social media through the lens of citation and social theories. In C. R. Sugimoto (Ed.), *Theories of informetrics and scholarly communication. A Festschrift in Honor of Blaise Cronin* (pp. 372–405). De Gruyter. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1502.05701>

- Head, M. L., Holman, L., Lanfear, R., Kahn, A. T., & Jennions, M. D. (2015). The Extent and Consequences of P-Hacking in Science. *PLoS Biology*, 13(3).
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002106>
- Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., de Rijcke, S., & Rafols, I. (2015). The Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics. *Nature*, 520, 429–431. Jakšić, S., Pantović, J., & Ghilezan, S. (2017). Linked data privacy. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 27(1), 33–53.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S096012951500002X>
- Literatura 167 Jochum, V., & Paylor, J. (2013). New ways of giving time: Opportunities and challenges in micro-volunteering. A literature review. Institute for Volunteering Research, NCVO.
http://www.ivr.org.uk/images/stories/NESTA_literature_review_final_0502131.pdf
- Kerr, N. L. (1998). HARKing: Hypothesizing after the results are known. *Personality and Social Psychology Review: An Official Journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.*, 2(3), 196–217. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0203_4
- Knöchelmann, M. (2019). Open Science in the Humanities, or: Open Humanities? *Publications*, 7(4), 65. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7040065>
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press. Laine, H. (2018). Open science and codes of conduct on research integrity. *Informaatiotutkimus*, 37(4).
<https://doi.org/10.23978/inf.77414>
- Larivière, V., & Gingras, Y. (2010). The impact factor's Matthew Effect: A natural experiment in bibliometrics. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61(2), 424–427. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21232>
- Leistner, M. (2014). Structural aspects of secondary (provider) liability in Europe. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 9(1), 75–90. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpt213>
- Lotfian, M., Ingensand, J., Ertz, O., Composto, S., Oberson, M., Oulevay, S., Campisi, D., & Joerin, F. (2018). Participants' motivations to contribute to biodiversity citizen science projects (e27198v1). *PeerJ Inc.* <https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27198v1>
- Literatura 168 Munafò, M. R., Nosek, B. A., Bishop, D. V. M., Button, K. S., Chambers, C. D., Percie du Sert, N., Simonsohn, U., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Ware, J. J., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2017). A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-016-0021-0021>
- Newman, G., Crall, A., Laituri, M., Graham, J., Stohlgren, T., Moore, J. C., Kodrich, K., & Holfelder, K. A. (2010). Teaching Citizen Science Skills Online: Implications for Invasive Species Training Programs. *Applied Environmental Education & Communication*, 9(4), 276–286.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1533015X.2010.530896>
- Neylon, C., & Wu, S. (2009). Article-Level Metrics and the Evolution of Scientific Impact. *PLoS Biol*, 7(11), e1000242. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000242>
- Nuijten, M. B. (2019). Practical tools and strategies for researchers to increase replicability. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 61(5), 535–539. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.14054>
- Open Source Initiative. (2007). The Open Source Definition. <https://opensource.org/osd>
- Pajić, D. (2015a). On the stability of citation-based journal rankings. *Journal of Informetrics*, 9(4), 990–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2015.08.005>
- Pajić, D. (2015b). Globalization of the social sciences in Eastern Europe: Genuine breakthrough or a slippery slope of the research evaluation practice? *Scientometrics*, 102(3), 2131–2150.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1510-5>
- Pajić, D., & Jevremov, T. (2015). Promotions, Tenures, and Publication Behaviours: Serbian Example. *Proceedings of ISSI 2015 - 15th International Conference of the Society for Scientometrics and*

- Informetrics, Istanbul, Turkey, Jun 29 - Jul 4, 2015, 602–603. Literatura 169 Paunović, N. (2014). Upitnik UOP-39: Psihometrijska svojstva na osnovu podataka prikupljenih papir-olovka metodom i SAPA tehnologijom. Master rad. Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Novm Sadu. Piwowar, H., Priem, J., Larivière, V., Alperin, J. P., Matthias, L., Norlander, B., Farley, A., West, J., & Haustein, S. (2018). The state of OA: A large-scale analysis of the prevalence and impact of Open Access articles. *PeerJ*, 6, e4375. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4375>
- Powell, A. (2012). Democratizing production through open source knowledge: From open software to open hardware. *Media, Culture & Society*, 34(6), 691–708. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443712449497>
 - Quinlivan, L., Chapman, D. V., & Sullivan, T. (2020). Validating citizen science monitoring of ambient water quality for the United Nations sustainable development goals. *Science of The Total Environment*, 699, 134255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.134255>
 - Quintana, D. S. (2015). From pre-registration to publication: A nontechnical primer for conducting a meta-analysis to synthesize correlational data. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01549>
 - R Core Team. (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>
 - Radovanović, S. (2012). Ugovor o licenci softvera. Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.
 - Radovanović, S. (2015). Građanskopravna odgovornost internet posrednika za povredu autorskog prava – uporednopravni Literatura 170 aspekt. In D. V. Popović, *Intelektualna svojina i internet* (pp. 83– 112). Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu. Radovanović, S. (2018). Otvorena nauka i autorsko pravo, s posebnim osvrtom na Predlog direktive EU o autorskom pravu na jedinstvenom digitalnom tržištu. In D. V. Popović, *Intelektualna svojina i internet 2018* (pp. 21–36). Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.
 - Ravn, T., Nielsen, M. W., & Mejlgaard, N. (2015). Metrics and indicators of responsible research and innovation (Progress report D3.2). European Commission. <https://www.rri-tools.eu/documents/10184/47609/MORRI-D3.2/>
 - Resnik, D. B. (2019). Citizen Scientists as Human Subjects: Ethical Issues. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*, 4(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.150>
 - Revelle, W., Elleman, L., & Hall, A. (n.d.). Statistical analyses and computer programming in personality. In P. J. Corr, *The Cambridge Handbook of Personality Psychology* (p. In press). Cambridge University Press. <https://personalityproject.org/revelle/publications/cup.18.final.pdf>
 - Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling and more. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1–36. Ross-Hellauer, T. (2017). What is open peer review? A systematic review. *F1000Research*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.11369.2>
 - Ross-Hellauer, T., Deppe, A., & Schmidt, B. (2017). Survey on open peer review: Attitudes and experience amongst editors, authors and reviewers. *PLoS ONE*, 12(12). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189311>
 - Literatura 171 Sadeghi, A., Capadisli, S., Wilm, J., Lange, C., & Mayr, P. (2019). Opening and Reusing Transparent Peer Reviews with Automatic Article Annotation. *Publications*, 7(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7010013>
 - Salamon, L. M., & Sokolowski, W. (2001). Volunteering in cross-national perspective: Evidence from 24 countries. Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies Baltimore. http://www.cca.org.mx/lideres/cursos/dls/html/m4/pdf/volunteer_ring.pdf
 - Schmidt, B. (2016). OpenAIRE eInfrastructure for Open Science. <https://www.openstarts.units.it/bitstream/10077/14021/1/Schmidt.pdf>

- Schmidt, B., Ross-Hellauer, T., van Edig, X., & Moylan, E. C. (2018). Ten considerations for open peer review. *F1000Research*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.15334.1>
- Šipka, P. (2012). Legitimacy of citations in predatory publishing: The case of proliferation of papers by Serbian authors in two Bosnian WoSindexed journals (No. 2012-12-2.; CEES Occasional Paper Series). <http://www.ceon.rs/ops/12122>
- Smederevac, S., & Čolović, P. (2019). Quantitative Behavioral Genetic and Molecular Genetic Foundations of the Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory Dimensions [Mendeley Data]. <https://doi.org/10.17632/bbxb7yxkzj.1>
- Smith, E. (2011). Lord of the Files: International Secondary liability for Internet Service Providers. *Washington and Lee Law Review*, 68, 1555. Sokal, A. D. (1996). Transgressing the Boundaries: Toward a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity. *Social Text*, 46/47, 217–252. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/466856>
- Literatura 172 Spezi, V., Wakeling, S., Pinfield, S., Creaser, C., Fry, J., & Willett, P. (2017). Open-access mega-journals: The future of scholarly communication or academic dumping ground? A review. *Journal of Documentation*, 73(2), 263–283. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JD06-2016-0082>
- Sroufe, L. A., Coffino, B., & Carlson, E. A. (2010). Conceptualizing the role of early experience: Lessons from the Minnesota longitudinal study. *Developmental Review*, 30(1), 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2009.12.002>
- Suber, P. (2012). *Open Access*. MIT Press. <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/10752204>
- Sullivan, I. (2019). Preregistration. *OSF Guides*. <http://help.osf.io/hc/enus/articles/360021390833->
- Preregistration Switters, J., & Osimo, D. (2019). Citizen Science in the Surveillance and Monitoring of Mosquito-Borne Diseases—Open Science Monitor Case Study. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/research_and_innovation/ki0319822enn_0.pdf
- Teif, V. B. (2014). On the Sociology of Science 2.0. In S. Bartling & S. Friesike (Eds.), *Opening Science: The Evolving Guide on How the Internet is Changing Research, Collaboration and Scholarly Publishing* (pp. 309–311). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00026-8_23
- Tennant, J. P., Dugan, J. M., Graziotin, D., Jacques, D. C., Waldner, F., Mietchen, D., Elkhatib, Y., B. Collister, L., Pikas, C. K., Crick, T., Masuzzo, P., Caravaggi, A., Berg, D. R., Niemeyer, K. E., Ross-Hellauer, T., Mannheimer, S., Rigling, L., Katz, D. S., Greshake Tzovaras, B., ... Colomb, J. (2017). A multi-disciplinary perspective on emergent and future innovations in peer review. *Literatura 173 F1000Research*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.12037.3>
- Tyson, E., Bowser, A., Palmer, J., Kapan, D., Bartumeus, F., Brocklehurst, M., & Pauwels, E. (2018). *Global Mosquito Alert: Building Citizen Science Capacity for Surveillance and Control of Disease-Vector Mosquitoes*. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/publication/global-mosquitoalert-building-citizen-science-capacity-for-surveillance-andcontrol>
- Van Noorden, R. (2014). Online collaboration: Scientists and the social network. *Nature News*, 512(7513), 126. <https://doi.org/10.1038/512126a>
- Wang, P., Hoyt, J., Pöschl, U., Wolfram, D., Ingwersen, P., Smith, R., & Bates, M. (2016). The last frontier in open science: Will open peer review transform scientific and scholarly publishing? *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 53(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa2.2016.14505301001>
- Ware, J. J., & Munafò, M. R. (2015). Significance chasing in research practice: Causes, consequences and possible solutions. *Addiction*, 110(1), 4–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.12673>

- Warren, M. (2018). First analysis of ‘pre-registered’ studies shows sharp rise in null findings. Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-07118-1>
- Wiley, D., & Hilton III, J. L. (2018). Defining OER-Enabled Pedagogy. International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v19i4.3601>
- Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, Ij. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L. B., & Literatura 174 Bourne, P. E. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. Scientific Data, 3. <https://www.nature.com/articles/sdata201618.pdf>
- Wilsdon, J., Bar-Ilan, J., Frodeman, R., Lex, E., Peters, I., & Wouters, P. F. (2017). Next-Generation Metrics: Responsible Metrics and Evaluation for Open Science. Report of the European Commission Expert Group on Altmetrics. European Commission. <https://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/pdf/report.pdf>
- Wilson, E. O. (1999). Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge (Reprint edition). Vintage. Wilt, J., Condon, D., & Revelle, W. (2012). Telemetry and online data collection. In B. Laursen, T. D. Little, & N. Card, Handbook of developmental research methods (pp. 163–179). <https://personalityproject.org/revelle/publications/Telemetry.10.pdf>
- WMA - The World Medical Association. (2018). WMA Declaration of Helsinki – Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects. <https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wmadeclaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-researchinvolving-human-subjects/>
- Yamada, Y. (2018). How to Crack Pre-registration: Toward Transparent and Open Science. Frontiers in Psychology, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01831>

6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written Serbian	C2	N/A	N/A
Quality assurance:				
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement		Overall assessment is that deliverable is completely in line with adequate quality expectations for the Report on the existing open science legislative and incentives		
Date of Quality Assurance performed by QAG reviewers:		01.04.2020.		
Deadline for submission of amended version of the Deliverable:		N/A		

BE-OPEN TEAM

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.