Transparency and Reproducibility: A Norm, Not an Option

Nematullah Shomoossi[1], PhD; Mohammadreza Shegarf Nakhaie[1,2], MD; Nasrin Shokrpour[3], PhD

Dear Editor

We are writing to emphasize the critical importance of transparency in describing the methodology of scientific studies, particularly regarding the reproducibility of methods and procedures in medical research. The ability to reproduce similar research findings—if not identical results—is a cornerstone of scientific integrity.[1] However, recent observations reveal a concerning trend in which many publications report methods with insufficient detail, resulting in reduced reproducibility.[2] This trend not only undermines the credibility of research efforts but also contributes substantially to research waste. For instance, a report by the UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee (2018) estimated that approximately 85% of biomedical research is wasted due to irreproducibility.

Providing a transparent account of methodology is not merely a best practice; it is essential for fostering trust and collaboration within the scientific community.[3] Therefore, there is an urgent need for a paradigm shift in how researchers disseminate their work. Addressing this challenge requires clearly identifying the problem and bringing it to the forefront of discussions within the publishing industry.

Transparent methodologies are a critical asset in human studies. Transparency in methodology enables other researchers to fully understand how a study was conducted, allowing for accurate replication of the work. It entails comprehensive and clear reporting of all information necessary for another researcher to repeat relevant protocols and methods.[4] Without detailed descriptions of experimental design, data collection, and analysis procedures, subsequent researchers may struggle to reproduce findings, potentially leading to erroneous conclusions and wasted resources. Transparency also encompasses the accessibility and visibility of methodological details to readers of a published manuscript, including study design, data collection procedures, coding schemes, analytical methods, and the instruments used for data collection.[5]

In 2016, reports highlighted that numerous high-profile psychology experiments had failed to be replicated due to insufficient methodological details.[6] This not only calls into question the validity of these studies but also undermines public trust in scientific research as a whole. Transparent methodologies also facilitate the conduct of meta-analyses and systematic reviews, which are essential for synthesizing evidence across multiple studies. When researchers fail to provide adequate methodological detail, it becomes challenging for others to evaluate the quality and applicability of their findings. A systematic review by Ioannidis (2016) demonstrated that a lack of transparency frequently leads to biased results, further complicating evidence-based practice.[7] By ensuring that methodologies are reported transparently, researchers contribute to a more robust and reliable body of knowledge that can inform policy and practice. The importance of transparency was particularly evident during the COVID-19 pandemic, when rapid dissemination and application of research findings were critical. Paltiel et al. (2020), for example, emphasized that transparent reporting in pandemic-related research enhances trust among stakeholders and improves decision-making processes.[8]

To mitigate research waste and promote reproducibility, several

[1]Sabzevar University of Medical Sciences, Sabzevar, Iran
[2]Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Sabzevar, Iran
[3]English Department, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran

Correspondence:
Nasrin Shokrpour, PhD;
English Department, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran
Tel: +98 9173162815
Email: shokrpourn@gmail.com
Received: 30 July 2025
Revised: 16 August 2025
Accepted: 20 September 2025

initiatives have emerged in recent years. The Open Science movement advocates for open access to research data and methodologies, allowing greater scrutiny and fostering collaboration within the scientific community.[9] Additionally, many journals now require authors to provide detailed methodological information as part of their submission process. While these measures are commendable, a broader cultural shift is needed within academia to prioritize transparency and reproducibility as fundamental values. The importance of transparent accounts of methodology cannot be overstated.[10] Although variability in results is inevitable across diverse settings and protocols, it is essential to clearly delineate study aspects to minimize potential sources of error during experimentation and to enhance transparency in research.[5] As researchers strive to address pressing global issues, they must ensure that their findings are both reliable and reproducible. By committing to methodological transparency, the scientific community can reduce research waste, strengthen collaboration, and ultimately achieve higher reproducibility. We propose that irreproducibility should serve as a rejection or major revision criterion during initial screening and peer review, and that it should also become a core component of training effective researchers. Researchers, institutions, and funding bodies should be urged to bring this issue to the forefront and work collectively toward a future in which transparency and reproducibility are established as norms rather than optional practices.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest related to the content of this article.

Please cite this article as: Shomoossi N, Shegarf Nakhaie MR, Shokrpour N. Transparency and Reproducibility: A Norm, Not an Option. J Health Sci Surveillance Sys. 2025;13(4):418-418. doi: 10.30476/jhsss.2024.103735.1959.

Keywords: Transparency, reproducibility, scientific studies, medical research

References

1 Quiroga Gutierrez AC, Lindegger DJ, Taji Heravi A, Stojanov T, Sykora M, Elayan S, et al. Reproducibility and scientific integrity of big data research in urban public health and digital epidemiology: A call to action. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2023; 20(2):1473. doi: 10.3390/ijerph20021473. PubMed PMID: 36674225; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9861515.

2 Hensel PG. Reproducibility and replicability crisis: How management compares to psychology and economics: A systematic review of literature. European Management Journal 2021, 39(5):577-594. doi: 10.1016/j.emj.2021.01.002.

3 UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee. Research integrity: Seventh report of session 2017–19. 2018.

4 Goodman SN, Fanelli D, Ioannidis JP. What does research reproducibility mean? Science Translational Medicine. 2016;8(341):341ps312. doi: 10.1126/scitranslmed.aaf5027.

5 Prager EM, Chambers KE, Plotkin JL, McArthur DL, Bandrowski AE, Bansal N, et al. Improving transparency and scientific rigor in academic publishing. Brain Behav. 2019; 9(1): e01141. doi: 10.1002/brb3.1141. PubMed PMID: 30506879; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6346653.

6 Baker M. Is there a reproducibility crisis? Nature. 2016;533(7604):392-394.

7 Ioannidis JPA. Why most published research findings are false. PLoS Medicine, 2016;2(8): e124.

8 Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Zheng A. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 screening strategies to permit the safe reopening of college campuses in the United States. JAMA Network Open. 2020;3(7):e2016818.

9 Nosek BA, Alter G, Banks G, et al. Promoting an open research culture. Science. 2015;348(6242):1422-1425.

10 Grant S, Wendt KE, Leadbeater B.J. et al. Transparent, open, and reproducible prevention science. Prev Sci 23, 701–722 (2022). doi: 10.1007/s11121-022-01336-w.