QAC meeting minutes, 18 feb 2025

Present: all QAC members, of whom DS and MS online.

LW opens meeting

QAC discusses the use of its own vocabulary, mainly the term 'Syntax'. It is tied to certain analysis methods, mostly computational quantitative methods. However, the term has been, and can be extended to include the analysis protocol in all approaches. If at all unclear in the context of reviews or communication, 'analysis protocol' will be offered as a synonym.

Current Open Science proposal text refers to equator for qualitative methods. This is mainly because qual researchers are sometimes unaware that such reporting guidelines also exist for them. MP: This would also apply observational quantitative studies. BP: we can change this to "contains guidelines", including qual, observational, etc. DS: if we hide the links behind the text, it does not get any longer. **Action: BP**

MP: Do we need to discuss predatory journals in our quality proposals? BP: PSI is working on predatory journal guidelines, mainly to display responsibilities around publication choices.

LW: There is some duplication in this text, compared with a few other sections on the website. We can choose to have the OS text refer to the syntax section on the QAC website, for clarity. **Action: BP**

BW: Should we add a statement on a requirement of a data analysis plan for RCTs? LW & CD: Yes, good to plan well beforehand and contact stats early on. LW: BW can write three sentences on this. **Action: BW**

LW: we will mention on the registration page that registration is recommended. BP: we also need to update the vocabulary on the website, plus the minutes submitted have not been posted and links to departments are broken. **Action** Website update: **BP**

DS: Issues of Knowledge security will start with awareness raising and education at some point in 2025. QAC will have to wait until that happens before any form of integration can be pursued.

MS: We don't need to be more specific than the research code and can add a heading "Knowledge Security". Any info on infrastructure and policy can then be added later.

Annual report draft by BP and DS needs a few updates: S Zwakhalen (outgoing), M Paric needs to be removed (not a member). The 37 audited projects can be described in slightly more detail, for instance: 2024 only had 4 audits.

MT meeting April. BP offered to present the annual report, but has received no confirmation.

How satisfied are users of our website and services? We do not know a lot. MP: as a past reviewee, I was very positive. We can ask Caphri about website visit stats and include an evaluation after the quality reviews. MS proposal to establish a link with PhD track.

CD: are there any common issues that arise from the audits/review? DS: reports collect issues also to report back to committee. BP: the only recurring issue from those reports was data storage on surfdrive. BP/DS: option to offer feedback via webinar. MS: Do we need to put this on the website in the form of a FAQ? **Action: BP**

DS/MP: if we also want to assess whether people live up to their data management promises, we'd need to audit projects post-completion. This might be made easier through an integration with TRACK.

BP has moved QAC data to UM server. Caphri offered to host it, and could facilitate access to all QAC members, where review reports and data would only be accessible to the QAC chair and QO. QAC members agree. **Action: BP**

BP to what extent do we reviewing unfunded research? MS does that also include student projects, do we review them too? DS: could be really interesting but the timeline is extremely tight. Also, most student projects are actually reviewed more tightly because of existing agreements with FHML-REC. MS: students have limited access to data infrastructure, which could pose a risk. DS: review via supervisor might be more prudent. This will be taken to next meeting. **Action: LW**

BP: Caphri asked whether external PhD student reviews are the same as internal PhD students? MP reports that she did this on behalf of her external PhD students. CD: sometimes they have their own data. It simply isn't always our data. It can be in their system. Is that our responsibility to review that – or their other institution's or country's regulations. Some elements of the review script might not apply. DS: it might be harder for them to live up to UM criteria because of limited access, etc. BP: Proposal: Review joint review with supervisor and external PhD student in which the applicability of all QAC review elements can be discussed.

It was decided the next meeting takes place in September. Meeting months of the QAC are September and January. **Action: LW** (arrange a meeting in September).

The consultancy link on the website does not work. **Action: BW** (provide new consultancy link to BP).

The audit terminology is still on the website (replaced by review). **Action: BP** (correct the terminology on the website, via Caphri communications).