

BISA Journals' Approach to Data Access and Research Transparency

The editors of the *Review of International Studies* and the *European Journal of International Security* recognise that the discipline of Politics and International Studies is characterised by fundamentally different understandings of what it means to undertake political inquiry. For some, this involves the analysis of empirical evidence extracted from the social world. For others, it is a relational and intersubjective activity in which observation and interpretation are inseparable. This necessarily means that while it is possible to have general principles of data access and research transparency, there must be flexibility regarding the degree to which they are implemented and the means by which it occurs. The editors of both journals share a commitment to the following goals, recognising that authors will need flexibility in how these goals are met:

Production Transparency:

Where authors have collected and/or generated their own data, they provide a full account of the manner in which the data was collected and/or generated, and the context in which this took place. This should be provided in accordance with the norms for rigour of your selected methodological approach and in adherence to ethical standards for the type of research undertaken. References should be made to any research instruments used, i.e. interview protocols, coding protocols, procedures for identifying appropriate informants, and so on. Where authors are basing claims on analysis of a dataset they have created themselves, they should clearly describe how the dataset was compiled.

Analytic Transparency:

That authors making evidence-based claims provide a clear account of how they have drawn their conclusions from the available data. This should be provided in accordance with the norms for rigour of your selected methodological approach and in adherence to ethical standards for the type of research undertaken. Such accounts would normally appear in the main text and footnotes, and with direct reference to the methodology employed. Authors may wish to supply additional information in appendices.

Data Access:

Authors may wish to make their data openly and permanently available, and where that is the case, the editors of both journals and CUP are committed to helping authors identify ways to publish their data. The editors do not, however, expect that all authors will wish to make their data available for various reasons, including that it may be inappropriate to do so; for example, where confidentiality agreements prohibit disclosure or where data are under legal constraint (i.e. they are classified, proprietary, or copyright), or where publishing the data would put research participants and the researchers themselves at risk. This is particularly true of research undertaken among vulnerable populations, in contexts of political violence and authoritarianism, or on sensitive topics. The editors also recognise that the costs and logistical burdens of making empirical evidence available may be extremely high. We will therefore support authors to make the most appropriate decisions on data access.

The editors share the view that authors are in the best possible position to make judgements on where the potential risks outweigh the benefits of making empirical evidence publically available, and these should be communicated clearly to both editors and readers at the point of submission.

Regardless of whether or not data is made openly available, authors making evidence-based claims based either on data that they have collected and/or generated themselves or on other datasets should provide clear citations to those datasets in the reference section of the article.

The quality of data, evidence and argumentation are central to our peer-reviewing processes, and we select reviewers who will challenge authors to engage seriously on the manner in which they have generated data and evidence, and the conclusions they derive from it. On occasion reviewers may request access to the underlying data, and we would expect authors to provide access, or to explain any restrictions on data access. We share the view that peer review remains a robust mechanism for ensuring publication of high quality work that is theoretically informed, methodologically rigorous, analytically robust, and ethically sound.