

# BMJ Paediatrics Open

BMJ Paediatrics Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Paediatrics Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjpaedsopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Paediatrics Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjpo@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjpo@bmj.com)

## BMJ Paediatrics Open

### Why sharing data is important for children

Journal:	<i>BMJ Paediatrics Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjpo-2018-000356
Article Type:	Editorial
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Aug-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Choonara, Imti; University of Nottingham School of Medicine,
Keywords:	Evidence Based Medicine, Health services research

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Review Only

## Why data sharing is important for children

Imti Choonara, Editor in Chief, BMJ Paediatrics Open

Evidence-based medicine is recognised as the way of ensuring individual patients receive the correct diagnosis and treatment and that health systems ensure that appropriate treatments are provided to communities. Evidence-based medicine is especially important in children where many medicines are used in an off-label manner. Evidence-based medicine should result in the more rational use of medicines in children [1].

Medical journals provide researchers with a location for their research. Peer review alongside editorial input is utilised in order to ensure that researchers' findings are presented and interpreted objectively. This is essential for the generation of objective evidence. BMJ Paediatrics Open ensures that the peer review process is transparent by publishing the reviewers' names, their comments and previous versions of the articles. All articles alongside the peer review comments are available to both health professionals and the public, free of charge. We recognise that not all individuals have access to the internet and that in many low and lower middle income countries internet availability for health professionals and researchers is often intermittent or difficult to access.

Data sharing – the provision of the original research data for each scientific study is not a new idea, but is increasingly being recognised as being important [2]. Researchers involved in systematic reviews are well aware that many scientific papers do not adequately explain and present all their findings. Systematic reviews are an important step in drawing up evidence-based guidelines. It is well recognised that adverse drug reactions are inadequately reported in clinical trials. This is especially so in paediatric patients [3]. Additionally, clinical trials involving children and adults do not always present the paediatric data separately and this is disadvantageous to the paediatric population. In a systematic review of randomised clinical trials of antiepileptic drugs in children, 29 trials involved children and adults [3]. However, only 10 stated the actual number of children recruited and only three analysed the paediatric patients separately. CONSORT guidelines have helped to improve the reporting of clinical trials. They do not however insist upon the separate presentation and analysis of different population subgroups such as children. Such information should always be included in the paper. The provision of the original data will allow investigators to access this information.

There have also been cases where clinical trial data has been misinterpreted and subsequent reanalysis of the original data finds different findings. An example of this is the reanalysis of trial data for paroxetine in the treatment of major depression in adolescents [4]. The original trial was published in 2001 and suggested that paroxetine was effective in the treatment of adolescent major depression [5]. An independent reanalysis of the data published in 2015 found no evidence of efficacy [4]. Authors often have preconceived ideas about efficacy and safety and will overstate findings to try and ensure both publication and impact. The provision of original data will allow re-analysis to ensure that the interpretation by the authors is correct. A gap of 14 years is unacceptable, both scientifically and ethically. The young people who participated in the original trial did so to help ensure others received the most beneficial treatment.

We are therefore strongly encouraging authors to ensure that the data on which their research paper is based is made available. Details of what data should be stored and how to store it are available in our instructions to authors. In brief data must be anonymised and provided in sufficient detail to

1  
2  
3 allow others to reanalyse the data and confirm the author's findings. There are well established  
4 controlled access repositories where researchers can deposit data.  
5

6 For clinical trials, data must be made available upon reasonable request. Individuals requesting the  
7 relevant data need to provide a detailed protocol for their proposed study and also to consider  
8 inviting the original authors to participate in the reanalysis. Guidance re data from clinical trials has  
9 been previously published and authors should refer to this article [6].  
10

11  
12  
13 For clinical trials that begin enrolling children on or after 1 January 2019, a data sharing plan must be  
14 included alongside trial registration. This will result in compliance with the ICMJE recommendations  
15 [7].  
16

17  
18 We are confident that data sharing will become readily accepted by the research community and  
19 hopefully also result in greater collaboration between researchers. It should also ensure that all  
20 research becomes publicly available and that children of all ages receive the best possible  
21 management and treatment.  
22  
23

#### 24 25 References

- 26 1. Bonati M, Jacqz-Aigrain E, Choonara I. Licensed medicines, off-label use or evidence-based.  
27 Which is most important? Arch Dis Child 2016. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2016-311527.  
28
- 29 2. Loder E, Groves T. The BMJ requires data sharing on request for all trials. BMJ 2015;350:h2373  
30 doi:10.1136/bmj.h2373  
31
- 32 3. Anderson M, Choonara I. A systematic review of safety monitoring and drug toxicity in published  
33 randomised controlled trials of antiepileptic drugs in children over a 10-year period. Arch Dis  
34 Child 2010; 95: 731-738.  
35
- 36 4. Keller MB, Ryan ND, Strober M, et al. Efficacy of paroxetine in the treatment of adolescent major  
37 depression: a randomised, controlled trial. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 2001; 40:7.  
38
- 39 5. Le Noury J, Nardo JM, Healy D, et al. Restoring study 329: efficacy and harms of paroxetine and  
40 imipramine in treatment of major depression in adolescence. BMJ 2015; 351:h4320. doi:  
41 10.1136/bmj.h4320.  
42
- 43 6. Ohmann C, Banzi R, Canham S, et al. Sharing and reuse of individual participant data from clinical  
44 trials: principles and recommendations. BMJ Open 2017; 7:e018647. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-  
45 2017-018647.  
46
- 47 7. Taichmann DB, Sahni P, Pinborg A, et al. Data sharing statement for clinical trials. BMJ 2017;  
48 357:j2372. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j2372.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## BMJ Paediatrics Open

### Why data sharing is important for children

Journal:	<i>BMJ Paediatrics Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjpo-2018-000356.R1
Article Type:	Editorial
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Aug-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Choonara, Imti; University of Nottingham School of Medicine,
Keywords:	Health services research, Evidence Based Medicine

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Review Only

## Why data sharing is important for children

Imti Choonara, Editor in Chief, BMJ Paediatrics Open

Evidence-based medicine is recognised as the way of ensuring individual patients receive the correct diagnosis and treatment and that health systems ensure that appropriate treatments are provided to communities. Evidence-based medicine is especially important in children where many medicines are used in an off-label manner. Evidence-based medicine should result in the more rational use of medicines in children [1].

Medical journals provide researchers with a location for their research. Peer review alongside editorial input is utilised in order to ensure that researchers' findings are presented and interpreted objectively. This is essential for the generation of objective evidence. BMJ Paediatrics Open ensures that the peer review process is transparent by publishing the reviewers' names, their comments and previous versions of the articles. All articles alongside the peer review comments are available to both health professionals and the public, free of charge. We recognise that not all individuals have access to the internet and that in many low and lower middle income countries internet availability for health professionals and researchers is often intermittent or difficult to access.

Data sharing – the provision of the original research data for each scientific study is not a new idea, but is increasingly being recognised as being important [2]. Researchers involved in systematic reviews are well aware that many scientific papers do not adequately explain and present all their findings. Systematic reviews are an important step in drawing up evidence-based guidelines. It is well recognised that adverse drug reactions are inadequately reported in clinical trials. This is especially so in paediatric patients [3]. Additionally, clinical trials involving children and adults do not always present the paediatric data separately and this is disadvantageous to the paediatric population. In a systematic review of randomised clinical trials of antiepileptic drugs in children, 29 trials involved children and adults [3]. However, only 10 stated the actual number of children recruited and only three analysed the paediatric patients separately. CONSORT guidelines have helped to improve the reporting of clinical trials. They do not however insist upon the separate presentation and analysis of different population subgroups such as children. Such information should always be included in the paper. The provision of the original data will allow investigators to access this information.

There have also been cases where clinical trial data has been misinterpreted and subsequent reanalysis of the original data finds different findings. An example of this is the reanalysis of trial data for paroxetine in the treatment of major depression in adolescents [4]. The original trial was published in 2001 and suggested that paroxetine was effective in the treatment of adolescent major depression [5]. An independent reanalysis of the data published in 2015 found no evidence of efficacy [4]. Authors often have preconceived ideas about efficacy and safety and will overstate findings to try and ensure both publication and impact. The provision of original data will allow re-analysis to ensure that the interpretation by the authors is correct. A gap of 14 years is unacceptable, both scientifically and ethically. The young people who participated in the original trial did so to help ensure others received the most beneficial treatment.

There are also other examples where the interpretation of data varies. This results in guidelines which differ in their recommendations. There are significant differences in the recommendations for the diagnosis and management of asthma between the National Institute for Health and Care

1  
2  
3 Excellence (NICE) guideline and the collaborative guideline from the British Thoracic Society (BTS)  
4 and the Scottish Intercollegiate Guideline Network (SIGN) [6]. Similarly, different countries have  
5 different guidelines for eating disorders [7]. Recently a Cochrane review on human papillomavirus  
6 vaccine [8], was criticised for its interpretation of the data [9]. These examples show that the  
7 interpretation of data is complex and researchers and health professionals need access to original  
8 data to ensure patients receive optimal treatment.  
9

10  
11 We are therefore strongly encouraging authors to ensure that the data on which their research paper  
12 is based is made available. Details of what data should be stored and how to store it are available in  
13 our instructions to authors. In brief data must be anonymised and provided in sufficient detail to  
14 allow others to reanalyse the data and confirm the author's findings. There are well established  
15 controlled access repositories where researchers can deposit data.  
16

17  
18 For clinical trials, data must be made available upon reasonable request. Individuals requesting the  
19 relevant data need to provide a detailed protocol for their proposed study and also to consider  
20 inviting the original authors to participate in the reanalysis. Guidance re data from clinical trials has  
21 been previously published and authors should refer to this article [10].  
22

23  
24 For clinical trials that begin enrolling children on or after 1 January 2019, a data sharing plan must be  
25 included alongside trial registration. This will result in compliance with the ICMJE recommendations  
26 [11].  
27

28  
29 We are confident that data sharing will become readily accepted by the research community and  
30 hopefully also result in greater collaboration between researchers. It should also ensure that all  
31 research becomes publicly available and that children of all ages receive the best possible  
32 management and treatment.  
33  
34  
35

## 36 References

- 37  
38 1. Bonati M, Jacqz-Aigrain E, Choonara I. Licensed medicines, off-label use or evidence-based.  
39 Which is most important? Arch Dis Child 2016. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2016-311527.
- 40  
41 2. Loder E, Groves T. The BMJ requires data sharing on request for all trials. BMJ 2015;350:h2373  
42 doi:10.1136/bmj.h2373
- 43  
44 3. Anderson M, Choonara I. A systematic review of safety monitoring and drug toxicity in published  
45 randomised controlled trials of antiepileptic drugs in children over a 10-year period. Arch Dis  
46 Child 2010; 95: 731-738.
- 47  
48 4. Keller MB, Ryan ND, Strober M, et al. Efficacy of paroxetine in the treatment of adolescent major  
49 depression: a randomised, controlled trial. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 2001; 40:7.
- 50  
51 5. Le Noury J, Nardo JM, Healy D, et al. Restoring study 329: efficacy and harms of paroxetine and  
52 imipramine in treatment of major depression in adolescence. BMJ 2015; 351:h4320. doi:  
53 10.1136/bmj.h4320.
- 54  
55 6. White J, Paton JY, Niven R, et al. Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of asthma: a look  
56 at the key differences between BTS/SIGN and NICE. Thorax 2018; 73: 293-297.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9
  - 10
  - 11
  - 12
  - 13
  - 14
  - 15
  - 16
  - 17
  - 18
  - 19
  - 20
  - 21
  - 22
  - 23
  - 24
  - 25
  - 26
  - 27
  - 28
  - 29
  - 30
  - 31
  - 32
  - 33
  - 34
  - 35
  - 36
  - 37
  - 38
  - 39
  - 40
  - 41
  - 42
  - 43
  - 44
  - 45
  - 46
  - 47
  - 48
  - 49
  - 50
  - 51
  - 52
  - 53
  - 54
  - 55
  - 56
  - 57
  - 58
  - 59
  - 60
7. Hibert A, Hoek HW, Schmidt R. Evidence-based guidelines for eating disorders: international comparison. *Curr Opin Psychiatry* 2017; 30: 423-437.
8. Arbyn M, Xu L, Simoens C, Martin-Hirsch PPL. Prophylactic vaccination against human papillomaviruses to prevent cervical cancer and its precursors. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2018, Issue 5. Art. No.: CD009069. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD009069.pub3.
9. Jørgensen L, Gøtzsche P, Jefferson T. The Cochrane HPV vaccine review was incomplete and ignored important evidence of bias. *BMJ Evid Based Med*. 2018 doi:10.1136/bmjebm-2018-111012
10. Ohmann C, Banzi R, Canham S, et al. Sharing and reuse of individual participant data from clinical trials: principles and recommendations. *BMJ Open* 2017; 7:e018647. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018647.
11. Taichmann DB, Sahni P, Pinborg A, et al. Data sharing statement for clinical trials. *BMJ* 2017; 357:j2372. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j2372.