

Fecher, Benedikt; Wagner, Gert G.

Article — Accepted Manuscript (Postprint)

A Research Symbiont

Science

Provided in Cooperation with:

German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin)

Suggested Citation: Fecher, Benedikt; Wagner, Gert G. (2016) : A Research Symbiont, Science, ISSN 0036-8075, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C., Vol. 351, Iss. 6280, pp. 1405-1406,
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.351.6280.1405-b> ,
<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/351/6280/1405.2>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/145091>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Credit for data sharing

M. McNutt (“#IAMAREsearchParasite,” Editorial, 4 March, p. 1005) can be proud to be a “research parasite.” The creators of this term, Longo and Drazen (1), miss the very point of scientific research when they write that researchers may “even use the [open] data to try to disprove what the original investigators had posited.” It is at the core of the scientific paradigm that researchers take nothing as final truth. In fact, using research data to try to disprove a result is good scientific practice, especially in the light of the replication crisis (2–4).

However, Longo and Drazen are right that scientific data sharing deserves recognition. They suggest that credit for data sharing should take the form of co-authorship. Although this is true in particular cases, co-authorship as the sole instrument of credit will unnecessarily restrict the potential of data sharing and could be a detriment to the original researcher (for instance, if the resulting publications lack quality) (5). In the case of replication studies and meta-analyses, co-authorship makes no scientific sense.

A more suitable instrument for giving credit where credit is due would be a much higher appraisal of data sharing by research communities through citations of data sets, awards, and the consideration of data “production” in career prospects, funding applications, and evaluations. With this end in mind, research parasites are beneficial for the organism as a whole.

Benedikt Fecher^{1, 2, 4} and Gert G. Wagner^{1, 3*}

1. German Institute for Economic Research, Mohrenstraße 58, 10117 Berlin, Germany

2 Alexander von Humboldt Institute for Internet und Society, Französische Straße 9, 10117 Berlin, Germany

3 Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Lentzeallee 94, 14195 Berlin, Germany

4 Leibniz Association, Chausseestraße 111, 10115 Berlin, Germany

*Corresponding author. E-mail: benedikt.fecher@hiig.de

References

1. D. L. Longo, J. M. Drazen, *N. Engl. J. Med.* **374**, 276 (2016).

2. Open Science Collaboration, *Science* **349**, aac4716 (2015).
3. C. F. Camerer *et al.*, *Science* 10.1126/science.aaf0918 (2016).
4. C. J. Anderson *et al.*, Response to Comment on “Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science.” *Science*. **351**, 1037–1037 (2016).
5. T. Rohlfing, J.-B. Poline, *NeuroImage* **59**, 4189 (2012).