



TRUSTparenthood

Deliverable 5.5

Policy Brief 1: Preliminary policy advice document based on the initial findings of the project

Author: Panagiotis Kavouras

Reviewers: Daniele Fanelli, Mads P. Sørensen

Project title: Increasing reproducibility through the co-creation of interventions that support a transparent and trustworthy research ecosystem

Project acronym: TRUSTparenthood

Grant Agreement no.: 101188172

Lead contractor for this deliverable: University of Oslo

Deliverable factsheet:

Project Number:	101188172
Project Acronym:	TRUSTparenity
Project Title:	Increasing reproducibility through the co-creation of interventions that support a transparent and trustworthy research ecosystem
Title of Deliverable:	Policy Brief 1
Work Package:	WP5
Due date of deliverable	M18 – 31/7/2026
Actual date of submission	30/7/2026
Author:	Panagiotis Kavouras
Reviewers:	Daniele Fanelli, Mads P. Sørensen

ABSTRACT:	This is the 1 st version of TRUSTparenity's policy recommendations for promoting reproducibility. It is based on the results of the empirical studies conducted in the first half of TRUSTparenity's work programme. These findings are summarised in section 2, while the recommendations can be found in section 3.
Keyword List:	Reproducibility interventions, institutional measures, epistemological justice, inclusivity challenges, institutional policy for reproducibility.

Consortium

	Role	Name	Short Name	Country
1.	Coordinator	University of Oslo	UiO	NO
2.	Partner	Aarhus University	AU	DK
3.	Partner	Science of Science Ltd.	SoS	GB
4.	Partner	Amsterdam UMC	AUMC	NL
5.	Partner	University of Latvia	UoL	LV
6.	Partner	National Technical University of Athens	NTUA	EL
7.	Partner	Finnish National Board on Research Integrity	TENK	FI
8.	Partner	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	AuTh	EL
9.	Partner	University of Santa Catarina	UFSC	BR
10.	Partner	National University	NU	PH
11.	Partner	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology	KNUST	GH
12.	Partner	Lviv Polytechnic National University	LPNU	UA
13.	Associated Partner	Open Science NL	OSNL	NL

Revision history

Version	Date	Revised by	Reason
0.1	12.07.2026	Panagiotis Kavouras	First draft of the Policy Brief 1
0.2	16.07.2026	Mads P. Sørensen	Comments on the first draft of Policy Brief 1
0.3	23.07.2026	Daniele Fanelli	Comments on the first draft of Policy Brief 1
0.4	27.07.2026	Panagiotis Kavouras	Second draft of the Policy Brief 1
0.5	28.07.2026	Daniele Fanelli, Mads P. Sørensen	Comments on the prefinal version
1.0	30.07.2026	Panagiotis Kavouras	Compilation of the final vesion

Table of contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Supporting (empirical) evidence.....	3
2.1 Scoping review	3
2.2 Delphi survey	3
2.3 Quality assessment of interventions	4
2.4 Relevant stakeholders and their roles	4
2.5 A framework to evaluate inequalities and disparities	4
2.6 End-user concerns on the collected interventions	4
3. Policy recommendations	5
4. In lieu of conclusions	5

1. Introduction

This document contains the 1st version of TRUSTparenCy's policy recommendations for promoting reproducibility¹. It is based on the results of the most relevant empirical studies conducted in the first half of TRUSTparenCy's work programme. These findings are summarised in section 2, while the policy recommendations can be found in section 3. At this relatively early stage of TRUSTparenCy we opted for drafting a set of policy recommendations that have cross-cutting character, i.e. they target Research Performing Organisations (RPOs), Research Funding Organisations (RFOs), and publishers at the same time.

2. Supporting (empirical) evidence

This section contains a summary of the project's results that have informed the 1st version of TRUSTparenCy's policy recommendations.

2.1 Scoping review

A scoping review was conducted that was a continuation of the one that was jointly conducted by the TIER2 and OSIRIS projects. It expanded the previous scoping review by 19 months and it collected reproducibility interventions that had been published until March 2025. Currently, 173 reproducibility interventions have been collected, representing the results of the two scoping reviews, the vast majority of which are Open Science practices. Most collected reproducibility interventions are relevant to Medical and Health Sciences and they are implemented during the conduct of research.

Why we did this? To compile the content of the TRUSTparenCy Toolbox, the user-friendly open platform for easy search and retrieval of reproducibility interventions. The Toolbox comprises one of the three main elements² of TRUSTparenCy's institutional practices for promoting reproducibility.

For a quick reference see [Key Insight 1](#); for details see [D1.1](#).

2.2 Delphi survey

A three-round Delphi survey was conducted to create an expert-informed taxonomy of interventions that promote reproducibility. The resulting taxonomy is structured across five categories, four based on different stages of the research cycle plus one focused on infrastructures. These five main categories contain 17 sub-categories and 41 types of interventions.

Why we did this? To provide a structure to the TRUSTparenCy Toolbox of reproducibility interventions, the project's user-friendly open platform for easy search and retrieval of the 173 collected studies on reproducibility interventions.

¹ By reproducibility we mean the extent to which design, implementation, analysis, and reporting of a study enable a third party to repeat the study and assess its findings.

² The other two main elements are the training material and the Reproducibility Promotion Plans.

For a quick reference see [Key Insight 2](#); for details see [D1.1](#).

2.3 Quality assessment of interventions

A quality assessment framework for the collected interventions was developed that includes the following elements: (a) the strength, consistency, and heterogeneity of the evidence that support their *effectiveness* to promote reproducibility and (b) the resources needed for their implementation, i.e. financial costs, required infrastructure, effort, and time needed, that define their *efficiency* to promote reproducibility.

Why we did this? To provide information about the reliability and feasibility of the collected reproducibility interventions. Such information will be part of the descriptors that will feature, for each type of intervention, in the TRUSTparenity Toolbox.

For a quick reference see [Key Insight 6](#); for details see [D3.2](#).

2.4 Relevant stakeholders and their roles

An initial map of the central stakeholders relevant to reproducibility, their differences in the interest they have in reproducibility, and their influence on and power to change reproducibility practices was created, with input by representatives of national RNs. A detailed exposition of their roles in enhancing reproducibility was compiled, as well as their limitations in doing so.

Why we did this? To enrich our understanding of the stakeholder landscape and to provide additional evidence to inform the implementation of TRUSTparenity's institutional practices that promote reproducibility. The mapping exercise will be repeated in workshops with representatives from RPOs, RFOs, and Publishers/Journals to get a fuller picture of the stakeholder landscape.

For a quick reference see [Key Insight 3](#); for details see [D1.2](#).

2.5 A framework to evaluate inequalities and disparities

A 9-dimensional framework was developed, by reviewing the outcomes of iRISE, OSIRIS and TIER2 projects, that allows to map the risk a reproducibility intervention may cause to disparities, by excluding researchers in particular fields, countries, demographics.

Why we did this? To help decision makers examine the relevance, costs and benefits when planning to implement reproducibility interventions in a specific context, as well as to provide them with a rating tool that can help them quantify the risk of inequity brought about by the implementation of a particular reproducibility intervention.

For a quick reference see [Key Insight 4](#); for details see [D1.3](#).

2.6 End-user concerns on the collected interventions

Concerns about the cost-effectiveness of implementation of the 41 reproducibility intervention types were compiled, by inviting members of national reproducibility networks and other stakeholders to anonymously share their opinions.

Why we did this? To document actual downsides, challenges or unintended consequences of reproducibility policies and interventions.

For a quick reference see [Key Insight 8](#); for details see [D3.1](#).

3. Policy recommendations

Each policy recommendation is followed, in square brackets, by the (empirical) study and deliverable upon which it is based, were applicable.

1. There is a need to utilize a commonly agreed terminology on reproducibility. TRUSTparenacy has opted to use the relevant terminology developed by the iRISE project (<https://osf.io/br9sp/files/ewybt>). [*Internal consortium discussions on how to draft the 1st version of the training material and the Reproducibility Promotion Plans that will be pilot tested*]
2. There is a need to expand the evidence base on the effectiveness of existing reproducibility interventions, e.g. by incentivising relevant studies. [*Scoping review, D1.1*]
3. There is a need to create a commonly agreed quality assessment framework for reproducibility interventions. [*Assessment of all collected interventions, D3.2*]
4. There is a need to examine relevance, costs and benefits when planning to implement reproducibility interventions. [*Development of a mapping framework of inclusivity challenges and epistemological disparities, D3.1*]
5. There is a need to quantify the risks of inequity brought about by the implementation of a particular reproducibility intervention in a particular context. [*A mapping framework of inclusivity challenges and epistemological disparities, D1.3*]
6. There is a need to provide open and safe spaces for researchers to discuss challenges in terms of resources, receptivity, and relevance coming from the implementation of reproducibility interventions and policies. [*Launch of online dialogues with comCensus platform, where participants participated anonymously, D3.1*]
7. There is a need to formalise training on reproducibility that will be adaptable to different disciplines. [*Development of the project's training material, D3.3*]
8. There is a need to support existing communities of interest and communities of practice on reproducibility. [*Acknowledgement of the benefits coming from the interaction with the Global Federation of Reproducibility Networks (GFRN)*]

4. In lieu of conclusions

The 2nd – and final – version of TRUSTparenacy's policy brief will be drafted to target RPOs, RFOs, and publishers with three sets of policy recommendations, by keeping a cross-cutting set of recommendations that will be – most plausibly – comprised of an updated version of the existing recommendations. The final version of TRUSTparenacy's policy recommendations is going to be informed by the lessons learned from the pilot testing and by interacting with members of the project's Stakeholder Advisory Board (SAB) and Reproducibility Community, with the GFNR, as well as with the wider professional networks of TRUSTparenacy beneficiaries and SAB, via the comCensus platform.

Author: Panagiotis Kavouras

Reviewers: Daniele Fanelli, Mads P. Sørensen