

Standardizing Survey Data Collection to Enhance Reproducibility: An Evaluation of ReproSchema

Yibei Chen, Dorota Jarecka, Sanu Ann Abraham, Remi Gau, Evan Ng, Daniel M. Low, Isaac Bevers, Alistair Johnson, Anisha Keshavan, Arno Klein, Jon Clucas, Zaliqa Rosli, Steven M. Hodge, Janosch Linkersdörfer, Hauke Bartsch, Samir Das, Damien Fair, David Kennedy, Satrajit S. Ghosh

Submitted to: Journal of Medical Internet Research
on: June 21, 2024

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript.....	5
Supplementary Files.....	35
Figures	36
Figure 1.....	37
Figure 2.....	38
Figure 3.....	39
Multimedia Appendixes	40
Multimedia Appendix 1.....	41
Multimedia Appendix 2.....	41
Related publication(s) - for reviewers eyes onlies	42
Related publication(s) - for reviewers eyes only 0.....	43

Standardizing Survey Data Collection to Enhance Reproducibility: An Evaluation of ReproSchema

Yibei Chen¹ PhD; Dorota Jarecka¹ PhD; Sanu Ann Abraham² MS; Remi Gau³ PhD; Evan Ng⁴ BS; Daniel M. Low¹ PhD; Isaac Bevers¹ BS; Alistair Johnson¹ PhD; Anisha Keshavan⁵ PhD; Arno Klein⁶ PhD; Jon Clucas⁶ MIS; Zaliqa Rosli⁷ BS; Steven M. Hodge⁸ MA; Janosch Linkersdörfer⁹ PhD; Hauke Bartsch¹⁰ PhD; Samir Das¹¹ PhD; Damien Fair^{12, 13, 14} PhD; David Kennedy⁸ PhD; Satrajit S. Ghosh^{1, 15} PhD

¹ McGovern Institute for Brain Research Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge US

² Flexxbotics Inc Boston US

³ Neuro Data Science ORIGAMI Laboratory McConnell Brain Imaging Centre, Faculty of Medicine McGill University Montréal CA

⁴ The Hospital for Sick Children Toronto CA

⁵ BigHat Biosciences San Mateo US

⁶ Child Mind Institute New York US

⁷ McGill Centre for Integrative Neuroscience Montréal Neurological Institute-Hospital Montréal CA

⁸ Department of Psychiatry University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School Worcester US

⁹ Center for Human Development University of California, San Diego San Diego US

¹⁰ Department of Informatics University of Bergen Bergen NO

¹¹ McConnell Brain Imaging Center McGill Centre for Integrative Neuroscience Montréal Neurological Institute, McGill University Montréal CA

¹² Institute of Child Development University of Minnesota Minneapolis US

¹³ Department of Pediatrics University of Minnesota Minneapolis US

¹⁴ Masonic Institute for the Developing Brain University of Minnesota Minneapolis US

¹⁵ Department of Otolaryngology Harvard Medical School Boston US

Corresponding Author:

Satrajit S. Ghosh PhD

McGovern Institute for Brain Research
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
43 Vassar St
Cambridge
US

Abstract

Background: Inconsistencies in survey-type assessments (e.g., questionnaires) data collection across biomedical, clinical, behavioral, and social sciences pose challenges to research reproducibility. ReproSchema offers a schema-centric framework and comprehensive tools to standardize survey (e.g., assessment) design and facilitate reproducible data collection in multiple scenarios.

Objective: This study illustrates ReproSchema's impact on enhancing research reproducibility and reliability. We first introduce ReproSchema's conceptual and practical foundations, then compare it against twelve platforms, assessing its contributions in resolving inconsistencies in data collection. Three use cases detail ReproSchema's application in standardizing required mental health common data elements, tracking changes in longitudinal data collection, and creating interactive checklists for neuroimaging research.

Methods: We describe ReproSchema's foundation and practical implementation before selecting twelve platforms for comparison, including CEDAR, former, Kobo Toolbox, LORIS, MindLogger, OpenClinica, Pavlovio.org, PsyToolkit, Qualtrics, REDCap, SurveyCTO, SurveyMonkey. Our comparison focuses on adapted FAIR principles (i.e., Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability) and survey-platform-generic functions (i.e., shared assessment, multilingual, multimedia, validation, branch logic, scoring logic, adaptability, and non-code). We then present three use cases of survey design—NIMH-Minimal, the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) and HEALTHY Brain and Child Development Study (HBCD), and the Committee on Best Practices in Data Analysis and Sharing Checklist (eCOBIDAS)—to demonstrate ReproSchema's versatile applications.

Results: ReproSchema standardizes survey-based data collection through a central schema and other synergistic components (e.g., a library of assessments, a toolkit for format conversion and schema validation, a user interface for data collection, and a template for multi-assessment research protocol creation). In the platform comparisons, ReproSchema is one of the few platforms that meet all criteria related to the adapted FAIR principles and six out of eight functionalities. Additionally, three use cases highlight ReproSchema's effectiveness in streamlining data collection, enforcing version control, and facilitating data harmonization post-collection.

Conclusions: ReproSchema contributes to reproducible data collection through the standardized creation and usage of assessments in diverse research settings while being equipped with the general functions of other survey platforms. ReproSchema's existing limitations and plan enhancements, including ontology mappings and semantic search capabilities, demonstrate ongoing refinement in utility for the research community.

(JMIR Preprints 21/06/2024:63343)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.63343>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in [JMIR Publications](#)

No. Please do not make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone. I understand that if I later pay to participate in [JMIR Publications](#)

Original Manuscript

Standardizing Survey Data Collection to Enhance Reproducibility: An Evaluation of ReproSchema

Yibei Chen¹, Dorota Jarecka¹, Sanu Ann Abraham², Remi Gau³, Evan Ng⁴, Daniel M. Low¹, Isaac Bevers¹, Alistair Johnson¹, Anisha Keshavan⁵, Arno Klein⁶, Jon Clucas⁶, Zaliqa Rosli⁷, Steven M. Hodge⁸, Janosch Linkersdörfer⁹, Hauke Bartsch¹⁰, Samir Das¹¹, Damien Fair^{12,13,14}, David Kennedy⁸, Satrajit S. Ghosh^{1,15}

¹McGovern Institute for Brain Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

²Flexxbotics Inc, Boston, MA, USA

³Neuro Data Science ORIGAMI Laboratory, McConnell Brain Imaging Centre, Faculty of Medicine, McGill University, Montréal, QC, Canada

⁴The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada

⁵BigHat Biosciences, San Mateo, CA, USA

⁶Child Mind Institute, New York, NY, USA

⁷McGill Centre for Integrative Neuroscience, Montréal Neurological Institute-Hospital, Montéreal, QC, Canada

⁸Department of Psychiatry, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School, Worcester, MA, USA

⁹Center for Human Development, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA

¹⁰Department of Informatics, University of Bergen, Norway

¹¹McConnell Brain Imaging Center, McGill Centre for Integrative Neuroscience, Montréal Neurological Institute, McGill University, Montréal, QC, Canada

¹²Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

¹³Department of Pediatrics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

¹⁴Masonic Institute for the Developing Brain, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

¹⁵Department of Otolaryngology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

Please direct correspondence to:

Satrajit S. Ghosh, Ph.D.

McGovern Institute for Brain Research, MIT

43 Vassar St, 46-4033 F

Cambridge, MA 02139

Phone: (617) 324-3544

Email: satra@mit.edu

Original Paper

Standardizing Survey Data Collection to Enhance Reproducibility: An Evaluation of ReproSchema

Abstract

Background: Inconsistencies in survey-based (e.g., questionnaires) data collection across biomedical, clinical, behavioral, and social sciences pose challenges to research reproducibility. ReproSchema is an ecosystem that standardizes survey design and facilitates reproducible data collection through a schema-centric framework, a library of reusable assessments, and computational tools for validation and conversion. Unlike conventional survey platforms that primarily offer GUI-based survey creation, ReproSchema provides a structured, modular approach for defining and managing survey components, enabling interoperability and adaptability across diverse research settings.

Objectives: This study examines ReproSchema's role in enhancing research reproducibility and reliability. We introduce its conceptual and practical foundations, compare it against twelve platforms to assess its effectiveness in addressing inconsistencies in data collection, and demonstrate its application through three use cases: standardizing required mental health survey common data elements, tracking changes in longitudinal data collection, and creating interactive checklists for neuroimaging research.

Methods: We describe ReproSchema's core components, including its schema-based design, reusable assessment library with over 90 assessments, and tools to validate data, convert survey formats (e.g., REDCap, FHIR), and build protocols. We compared twelve platforms—CEDAR, former, Kobo Toolbox, LORIS, MindLogger, OpenClinica, Pavlov.org, PsyToolkit, Qualtrics, REDCap, SurveyCTO, SurveyMonkey—against 14 FAIR principles (Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability) and assessed their support of 8 survey functionalities (e.g., multilingual support, automated scoring). Finally, we applied ReproSchema to three use cases—NIMH-Minimal, the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) and HEALTHY Brain and Child Development (HBCD) Studies, and the Committee on Best Practices in Data Analysis and Sharing Checklist (eCOBIDAS)—to illustrate ReproSchema's versatility.

Results: ReproSchema provides a structured framework for standardizing survey-based data collection while ensuring compatibility with existing survey tools. Our comparison results showed that ReproSchema met 14 out of 14 FAIR criteria and supported 6 out of 8 key survey functionalities: provision of standardized assessments, multilingual support, multimedia integration, data validation, advanced branching logic, and automated scoring. Three use cases ReproSchema's flexibility: standardizing essential mental health assessments (NIMH-Minimal), systematically tracking changes in longitudinal studies (ABCD and HBCD), and converting a 71-page neuroimaging best-practices guide into an interactive checklist (eCOBIDAS).

Conclusions: ReproSchema enhances reproducibility by structuring survey-based data collection through a structured, schema-driven approach. It integrates version control, manages metadata, and ensures interoperability, maintaining consistency across studies and compatibility with common survey tools. Planned developments, including ontology mappings and semantic search, will broaden its use, supporting transparent, scalable, and reproducible research across disciplines.

Keywords: Reproducibility, survey, data collection, schema, FAIR.

Introduction

Background

Ensuring reproducibility in biomedical, clinical, behavioral, and social science research is crucial yet challenging, affecting every research process stage, from study design to results reporting[1–5]. Core issues include inconsistencies in research protocol implementation within studies over time (e.g., across generations of researchers in a lab) and across study sites (e.g., multi-site projects), variable data collection methods, unclear documentation of methodological choices, selective reporting practices, and limited transparency in data and code sharing[6,7]. While methodological diversity is essential for addressing diverse research questions, reproducibility relies on transparent reporting of methodological decisions to minimize researcher degrees of freedom. Efforts to improve reproducibility often focus on data analysis and dissemination, yet inconsistencies in questionnaire-based data collection remain overlooked. Such inconsistencies, whether in structured psychological assessments or general-purpose surveys, undermine internal reproducibility in multi-site and longitudinal studies, reducing data comparability and introducing systematic biases.

Inconsistencies in survey-based data collection arise from multiple factors, including variability in translations across languages[8,9], differences in how constructs are operationalized [10], selective inclusion of questionnaire components[2,11], variations in clinical diagnosis criteria[12,13], and inconsistencies in versioning across research teams and timepoints. Even minor modifications—such as alterations in branch logic, response scales, or scoring calculations—can significantly impact data integrity, particularly in longitudinal studies[14].

These discrepancies have profound consequences in both clinical and research contexts. In clinical settings, even slight deviations in assessment methods can lead to divergent patient outcomes, particularly in multicultural environments where assessment translations need proper cultural adaptation. In research, such inconsistencies undermine study integrity and bias conclusions, posing challenges for meta-analyses and large-scale collaborative studies that require harmonized datasets.

Several initiatives have sought to improve research reproducibility. The Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability (FAIR) principles[15] provide high-level guidance for data management and sharing, ensuring that research data are well-documented, discoverable, and reusable. While FAIR does not directly address study reproducibility, its principles support transparency and consistency in data handling, which are critical for reproducibility efforts. However, these principles primarily focus on post-collection data curation and accessibility, leaving gaps in standardizing survey-based data collection at the source. Similarly, resources like the Cognitive Atlas[16] and Cognitive Paradigm Ontology[17] have helped standardize terminologies for cognitive research but do not define data elements such as survey questions and allowable responses. The National Institute for Mental Health Data Archive[18] and the National Library of Medicine Common Data Elements[19] initiative promote standardized data elements, yet their implementation remains inconsistent across studies.

Widely used survey platforms such as Qualtrics and REDCap[20] provide structured tools for data collection but do not inherently enforce assessment standardization, version control, or interoperability across research teams and timepoints. While these platforms allow

researchers to create and distribute surveys, they do not provide mechanisms to systematically track changes or ensure that identical constructs are measured consistently over time.

To address these challenges, a schema-driven approach is needed to define and enforce standardized survey structures, ensuring consistency in question formats, response options, and metadata across studies. The Center for Expanded Data Annotation and Retrieval (CEDAR) Metadata Model[21] provides a structured system for biomedical data annotation, but its primary focus is on post-data collection metadata management rather than ensuring consistency during data collection.

Despite these efforts, ensuring consistency in survey-based data collection remains insufficiently addressed, particularly in longitudinal studies and multi-team research projects, where maintaining assessment comparability over time and across sites is critical. Without a structured framework for defining, managing, and versioning questionnaires at the point of data collection, researchers often face time-intensive and error-prone processes of harmonizing disparate datasets during later stages of analysis. A systematic solution for ensuring consistent data collection within a study—across time and research teams—while allowing flexibility for study-specific requirements is necessary to improve research integrity and facilitate large-scale data sharing and reuse.

Objectives

ReproSchema is a schema-driven ecosystem (Figure 1) that integrates a foundational schema with supporting tools to standardize survey-based data collection and facilitate reproducibility. At its core, ReproSchema has a foundational schema that structures and defines assessments—including standardized psychological scales, clinical questionnaires, and general-purpose surveys—by linking each data element (e.g., survey response, experimental measurements) with its metadata, such as collection method, timing, and conditions. This structured approach ensures consistency across studies, supports version control, and enhances data comparability and integration.

Beyond the foundational schema, ReproSchema comprises six essential components:

1. A library (reproschema-library) of standardized, reusable assessments, each formatted in JSON-LD[22], providing a structured and versioned resource for common research instruments.
2. A Python package (reproschema-py) that supports schema creation, validation, and conversion to formats compatible with existing data collection platforms such as REDCap and the Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) standard.
3. A user interface (reproschema-ui) designed for interactive survey deployment, with ongoing development to enhance integration with customized backends.
4. A backend server (reproschema-backend) for secure survey data submission, using token-based authorization for client registration and data transfer, with support for structured data storage and management.
5. A protocol template (reproschema-protocol-cookiecutter) that enables researchers to create and customize research protocols using the standardized assessments and UI.
6. A Docker container (reproschema-server) that integrates the UI (reproschema-ui) and backend (reproschema-backend) to provide a unified platform for deploying protocols and collecting survey data using widely available cloud container services.

These components operate both as an integrated system and as standalone tools, allowing

flexibility in research implementation. Unlike conventional survey platforms that primarily provide GUI-based survey creation, ReproSchema prioritizes schema-based standardization, metadata integration, and interoperability, ensuring that survey elements remain consistent across studies and over time.

/---Figure 1---/

This paper introduces ReproSchema as a comprehensive framework for addressing inconsistencies in survey-based data collection, thereby enhancing research reproducibility. The Methods section details the conceptual foundation of ReproSchema, describes its components, and presents a comparative analysis against twelve survey platforms. Additionally, three research use cases illustrate its applicability: (1) NIMH-Minimal (standardizing required mental health common data elements), (2) ABCD and HBCD Studies (tracking and managing changes in longitudinal assessments), (3) eCOBIDAS (developing an interactive checklist for neuroimaging research best practices). The Results section examines the outcomes of these use cases and highlights how ReproSchema aligns with the FAIR (Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, Reusability) principles. Finally, the Discussion section analyzes the comparative findings, summarizes ReproSchema's contributions, and outlines current limitations and future directions.

Methods

ReproSchema's Foundation and Implementation

Conceptual Framework

A schema, originating in information systems and database design, is a structured framework for organizing data[23]. The concept of schema has been applied to various fields, including Web technologies[24,25], where it defines the structure and organization of web-based data. In the context of W3C (World Wide Web Consortium) protocols[26], schemas ensure Web documents adhere to specific formatting and interoperability guidelines.

Beyond Web technology, schemas are essential for tracing data provenance, providing transparency and accountability by tracking data's origins, modification, and lineage[27–29]. In survey-based research, a structured schema maintains consistency and reliability in data collection, especially when assessments vary in complexity and format. A well-defined schema establishes explicit documentation for assessment structure, including question types, response formats, branch logic, scoring interpretations, thereby ensuring transparency in methodological choices. This approach reduces errors and inconsistencies that arise when researchers implement the same assessment differently, such as variations in scoring methods or selective omissions of items, which can compromise data comparability and reproducibility.

ReproSchema is inspired by the schema-based principles of the CEDAR Metadata Model but has been developed independently to standardize survey-based data collection in biomedical, clinical, behavioral, and social science research. It addresses key challenges such as version control, metadata consistency, and interoperability with existing data collection platforms. This adaptation has resulted in three primary advances:

1. **Integration with Established Standards:** ReproSchema aligns with schema.org[24] and the NeuroImaging Data Model[30] (NIDM) to enhance data harmonization across studies. For example, schema.org provides a standardized way to describe survey elements, ensuring that metadata (e.g., question labels, response formats) remain consistent across platforms. In neuroimaging, NIDM integration allows seamless linking of behavioral assessments (e.g., cognitive tests) with MRI or fMRI data to statistical output[31], enabling researchers to track relationships between questionnaire responses and brain activity. This alignment ensures that datasets remain interoperable, reusable, and compatible with large-scale collaborative studies and meta-analyses.
2. **Incorporation of LinkML:** ReproSchema adopts LinkML (Link Data Modeling Language), an open standard for defining and validating structured data models. LinkML enhances schema expressiveness and validation by enabling explicit data types, relationships, and constraints within survey structures. For example, it allows researchers to specify that a response should be an integer within a defined range (e.g., an age field must be between 18 and 99 years) or enforce controlled vocabulary terms (e.g., depression severity levels as “Mild,” “Moderate,” or “Severe”). If a questionnaire version changes, such as modifying a Likert scale from a 5-point to a 7-point format, LinkML enables automated detection of such modifications, ensuring that data collected across different versions remains interpretable. This structured validation prevents data entry errors, version mismatches, and inconsistencies that could affect longitudinal analyses or multi-site studies.
3. **Adaptation to Complex Research Structures:** ReproSchema uses a nested structure (Protocol > Activity > Item) to represent multilevel research designs (Figure 2). A *Protocol* defines the overall study framework, such as a longitudinal mental health survey or a multi-site clinical trial, comprising multiple *Activities* such as diverse assessments. Each *Activity* can represent a specific assessment, such as the PHQ-9 for depression screening or a cognitive memory test. An *Item* corresponds to an individual question or

measurement, such as “Over the past two weeks, how often have you felt down, depressed, or hopeless?” with a Likert-scale response format. This hierarchical structure allows researchers to reuse standardized assessments, maintain version control, and ensure consistent data formatting (e.g., REDCap, FHIR), as explained in subsequent practical implementation and use cases.

/---Figure 2---/

Practical Implementation

The implementation of ReproSchema introduces several innovative features aimed at enhancing research efficiency and data integrity:

1. **Persistent URI Management via Git:** ReproSchema uses Git[32] for robust version control and GitHub, a cloud-based hosting service for Git repositories, for persistent Uniform Resource Identifiers[33] (URIs) assignment. GitHub serves as a web server to manage URIs for individual schema components, such as protocols, activities, and items. This setup ensures that any schema version remains retrievable through unique Git commits, which function as immutable timestamps for specific code versions. Git is a separate version control system that can be used independently of GitHub, a cloud-based hosting service for Git repositories. Hence, any other Git-based service that provided persistent URLs can also work for reproschema. Surveys or questionnaires generated through ReproSchema inherit this version control functionality, enabling researchers to track changes to survey elements (e.g., questions, response options) and facilitate study replication or long-term review.
2. **Support for Various Question Types:** The ReproSchema schema defines a diverse range of question types, including Likert scales, dropdown menus, multiple-choice questions, numerical inputs, audio or video inputs, free-text responses, and more. It also enables conditional visibility (i.e., branching logic), where specific items or entire activities become visible based on participant responses.
3. **Inclusion of Computable Elements:** Beyond defining survey structures, ReproSchema incorporates computable elements to streamline data analysis and enhance automation. The schema allows for predefined calculations on numerical responses, such as computing sums, means, or standard deviations. For instance, in the DSM-5 Adult Self-Report Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure, ReproSchema can automate the computation of an anxiety sub-score by averaging responses from the first five questions (e.g., “Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge,” “Not being able to stop or control worrying”). This automated computation is particularly valuable in large-scale or longitudinal studies, where manual scoring increases the risk of errors and inefficiencies. Moreover, computed values can inform subsequent data collection steps enabling adaptive survey designs. For example, if a participant’s computed anxiety score exceeds a predefined threshold, additional follow-up assessments could be triggered dynamically. By embedding computational logic within the schema, ReproSchema enables efficient, standardized, and adaptive data collection workflows.
4. **Integration of UI Elements:** ReproSchema provides a graphical user interface (ReproSchema-UI) for survey execution, enabling participants to complete assessments interactively while ensuring structured data entry. The UI supports a range of input types,

including numerical fields, text boxes, and multiple-choice selections, sliders, and date pickers. Additionally, it accommodates more advanced data capture methods such as (1) File uploads for submitting scanned documents or images (e.g., medical records, task responses), (2) Audio checks and recordings for voice-based assessments (e.g., speech fluency tasks in cognitive research), (3) Digital consent forms to ensure compliance with ethical requirements in online studies.

The UI is designed to be configurable through JavaScript and is hosted as an open-source GitHub repository, allowing researchers to modify and deploy it according to their study needs. While ReproSchema does not provide built-in survey hosting, researchers can deploy the UI alongside the backend using the Docker-based reproschema-server, which integrates both components into a unified deployment. This setup ensures flexibility in different research environments. For example, a researcher studying cognitive decline may deploy a ReproSchema-server instance to collect audio recordings from participants and store them securely for further analysis.

5. **Interoperability:** ReproSchema's nested-layer design ensures compatibility with existing data collection and management platforms, enabling seamless conversion and integration with other research workflows. The schema supports bidirectional format conversion, allowing researchers to: (1) Convert ReproSchema-based assessments to REDCap surveys, ensuring compatibility with widely used clinical research infrastructure, (2) Translate surveys into the Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) standard[34], facilitating integration with electronic health record (EHR) systems. Additionally, the modular schema design enables mapping between ReproSchema and other standardized formats. For instance, a research team conducting a multi-site study across institutions using different survey tools may use ReproSchema to maintain a centralized, schema-defined questionnaire while allowing site-specific exports to local data collection platforms. We also provide tools to map the data collected through ReproSchema to REDCap output format and NIMH submission template.

Comparison Analysis

This subsection compares ReproSchema capabilities with other platforms, focusing on the FAIR principles and generic functions found across survey platforms. Through the following selection process and two sets of comparison criteria, we highlight the importance of standardized protocols and assessments in improving research outcomes. This comparison evaluates ReproSchema's role in enhancing the consistency and reliability of research data collection.

Identification and Selection of Platforms

We conducted an online search on May 20th, 2024, to identify online platforms for survey data collection widely used in biomedical, clinical, behavioral, and social science. We used the keywords *online survey data collection research tool* and *online behavioral experiment data collection research tool* in two separate searches, including "behavioral experiment" to capture tools using questionnaires alongside experiments. We then complemented the search list by consulting relevant experts on tools commonly used in biomedicine, clinical trials, and mental health data collection.

Search results were categorized into platform websites and recommendation articles.

Platform websites refer to the official sites of the platforms, while recommendation articles include sources listing recommended tools, such as “best data collection tools for research.” Results from these websites and articles were collected to form a comprehensive list. The search results were iterated over until no new tools appeared in ten consecutive results. Results from the two searches were then combined to ensure comprehensive coverage. Only tools with at least a Web version available were included.

A total of 53 tools were identified: 4 from the expert panel, 36 from the “online survey data collection research tool” search, and 13 from the “online behavioral experiment data collection research tool” search. We filtered those tools based on two criteria: research/academia orientation and primary functionality type. Tools were labeled “Yes” for research/academia orientation if their websites explicitly indicated use for research purposes or if research institutions were mentioned as primary users. The primary functionality types were categorized as questionnaire-focused, experiment & questionnaire, and experiment-focused. For example, if a platform only supports using questionnaires in conjunction with an experiment, we label this platform as “experiment-focused”. Of the 53 tools, 24 were identified as research/academia focused. From these, we filtered out 11 tools that were experiment-focused, leaving 13 tools.

We then verified the remaining platforms using Google Scholar, including those with their own publication or that are widely used in publications (i.e., at least 10 publications). One platform was excluded due to insufficient publication support. In total, 12 platforms were included in our final comparison. The selection process is illustrated in Figure 3 as a PRISMA chart, with a full list of platforms and selection criteria provided in Multimedia Appendix 1.

/---Figure 3---/

Comparison Criteria

We developed two sets of comparison criteria to evaluate ReproSchema and the 12 selected tools. The first set focuses on overarching principles for (meta)data management and reusability, while the second set examines practical aspects of tool functionality.

In the first set, we first asked whether the platform had a schema and then evaluated adherence to the FAIR Principles—Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability (Textbox 1). While originally developed for data stewardship, FAIR principles also contribute to reproducibility by ensuring that research data, including protocols, are well-documented and structured to facilitate reuse across studies. The FAIR Principles emphasize that data and metadata should be well-documented, easily discoverable, accessible under clear conditions, interoperable through shared standards, and reusable through detailed provenance and licensing information.

In the context of survey and questionnaire design and curation before data collection, we interpret “data” as elements within a questionnaire (e.g., single questions, response options) and “metadata” as information associated with the questionnaire and its elements during design. In the supplementary material (Multimedia Appendix 1), we provided the original FAIR principles and our adapted version side-by-side to ensure clarity and operationalize these principles for our comparison. Since the FAIR principles serve as general guidelines for scientific data management and our comparison focuses specifically on the survey and questionnaire design phase, some criteria may not be directly applicable in our context. Nonetheless, we listed all criteria for completeness but excluded one less relevant standard (R4) from the comparison as the focus of our work does not involve the relevant standards in the field.

Textbox 1. Adapted FAIR principles as the comparison criteria.

Findability

F1: Does the platform assign unique and persistent identifiers to questionnaires and their elements (e.g., questions, response options)?

F2: Does the platform support metadata to describe questionnaires, including description, version, date created, etc.?

F3: Is it easy to associate metadata with the underlying questionnaire?

F4: Are questionnaires and their elements indexed in a searchable database or repository?

Accessibility

A1: Can questionnaires and their elements be accessed using standardized protocols (e.g., HTTP, REST API)?

A2: Are the protocols used for accessing questionnaires open, free, and widely supported?

A3: Does the platform support secure access mechanisms (e.g., OAuth, API keys)?

A4: Is the metadata describing the questionnaires accessible even if the actual questionnaire's content is removed or archived?

Interoperability

I1: Are standardized formats used for representing surveys and their elements (e.g., JSON, XML)?

I2: Does the platform use standardized sets of terms and definitions to describe questionnaires and their parts (like questions and answer choices)?

I3: Are references to related questionnaires, question items, or external resources included?

Reusability

R1: Detailed-Metadata: Is detailed metadata provided for questionnaires and their elements, covering all relevant aspects (e.g., methodology, intended use)?

R2: Are clear and accessible usage licenses provided for surveys and their elements?

R3: Is detailed provenance information available for surveys and their elements, including creation and modification history?

R4: Do surveys and their elements comply with relevant standards in the field? (excluded)

Our second set of criteria (Textbox 2) focuses on survey-platform-generic functions of the tools, emphasizing survey design and curation rather than post-data collection procedures. To support consistent evaluation, we anchored the "Shared Assessments" criterion in widely used mental health instruments (e.g., PHQ-9, GAD-7). These assessments offer publicly available, well-defined formats that enable us to determine whether platforms accommodate the reuse of validated instruments. Although this choice draws from mental health research, the intent is not to restrict the scope of evaluation to a single domain. Instead, it reflects a practical approach to assessing platform support for structured and reproducible assessment workflows that extend across research contexts.

Textbox 2. The functionality comparison criteria.

1. Shared Assessments: Whether the platform provides at least one of the widely used

- mental health assessments (e.g., PHQ-9, GAD-7, etc.) for immediate use.
2. Multilingual: Whether the platform supports multiple languages for assessments.
 3. Multimedia: Whether users can directly upload multimedia clips, such as video or audio, into assessments.
 4. Validation: If the platform offers customizable mechanisms to ensure that entered data meets specific criteria, such as age within a predetermined range.
 5. Logic: If the platform supports skip or branch logic, allowing the response to a question to determine the subsequent question.
 6. Score: Whether users can implement derivative calculations based on questionnaire responses.
 7. Adaptability: Whether the platform is optimized for use across various devices, including mobile phones, tablets, and desktops.
 8. Non-Code: Whether the platform is accessible to researchers without programming skills.

Our comparison applied different approaches for the two sets of criteria. For the comparison of FAIR principles, we reviewed each platform's associated publications (specifically publications about the platform itself) and its documentation. This approach was chosen because the FAIR principles relate to design guidelines, which should be reflected in the platform's foundational design principles.

For the functionality comparison, we relied on platform documentation and created test accounts where applicable to assess the user experience firsthand. In cases where creating a test account was unsuccessful, we referred to the supplementary material. This method was chosen because the functionality set is more user-oriented and evaluating it through direct interaction or online documentation provides a practical perspective on the platform's usability and features.

It is important to note that some platforms (e.g., LORIS) provide functions beyond survey design and data collection; however, our comparison only considers the survey-related features. Consequently, our comparison results depend heavily on the platform's documentation and features available at the time of comparison, which may not always reflect the latest state of the platform.

ReproSchema in Research: Use Cases Overview

This subsection demonstrates ReproSchema's practical utility in research through three use cases of survey design: the NIMH-Minimal initiative[35], the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD)[36] and HEALthy Brain and Child Development (HBCD) Studies[37], and the Best Practices in Data Analysis and Sharing Checklist[38] (eCOBIDAS). These examples highlight ReproSchema's adaptability and ability to provide tailored solutions for various research needs.

The NIMH-Minimal case illustrates the comprehensive use of ReproSchema in developing standardized data collection protocols. The ABCD and HBCD case showcases ReproSchema's utility in standardizing and tracking changes to data elements for longitudinal studies. The eCOBIDAS case demonstrates ReproSchema's flexibility in various survey types and research contexts.

While all three originate from mental health or neuroimaging contexts, their core

challenges are broadly applicable. These include tracking historical changes across study waves, managing multi-site collaborations, enforcing standardized protocols, and implementing interactive, logic-based assessments. ReproSchema addresses these challenges at the structural level, making the solutions transferable across domains. The Results section further details each use case and the specific problems ReproSchema was designed to solve.

Results

ReproSchema Components Overview

The ReproSchema project integrates five key components designed to standardize research protocols and enhance consistency across various stages of data collection. These components are briefly described below (Table 1), with detailed features and descriptions.

Table 1. Each component's description and key features.

Component	Description	Key Features
Foundational schema (reproschema)	Provides the structured framework for defining and linking data elements, ensuring consistency, interoperability, and standardization across studies	1. Provides a standardized framework for structuring questionnaires across diverse research domains, independent of specific topics
		2. Standardizes organization, from specific questionnaire items to the entire research protocol
Assessment Library (reproschema-library)	Provides a collection of standardized questionnaires for various research needs	1. Covers a wide range of assessments in clinical, cognitive, and behavioral sciences
		2. Features version tracking and updating for each questionnaire
		3. Open for researchers to add new assessments
Python-based CLI Tool (reproschema-py)	Aids in creating, validating, and converting between formats	1. Standardizes schema creation and validation
		2. Provides conversion tools between other formats (e.g., REDCap, FHIR) and ReproSchema formats
User Interface (reproschema-ui)	Enhances the setup and management of studies,	1. Offers a user-friendly platform for visualizing and adjusting

		research protocols
	improving data collection	2. Flexible use, either standalone or integrated with the assessment library
Backend (reproschema-backend)	Manages survey data submission and storage, enabling structured, reproducible data collection with token-based authorization	1. Supports token-based authentication for secure data submission
		2. Provides API endpoints for integrating with front-end interfaces and external systems
Protocol Template (reproschema-protocol-cookiecutter)	Offers a user-friendly template for researchers to develop standardized research protocols	1. Provides a step-by-step guide for protocol development
		2. Includes detailed documentation and examples, facilitating implementation
Docker container (reproschema-server)	Integrates the UI and backend, streamlining deployment for researchers	1. Bundles frontend and backend into a single deployable unit
		2. Simplifies setup and hosting using Docker

These components, designed to function independently and together, form a comprehensive toolkit catering to various research needs—from creating individual assessments to designing entire study protocols. The ReproSchema project emphasizes flexibility, collaboration, and accessibility, aiming to facilitate a cohesive research process that is both standardized and adaptable to specific research contexts.

Our online document provides more detailed and up-to-date technical information. The documentation includes a complete walkthrough to help users set up a new data collection form and describes how to reuse and contribute to the existing library of assessments.

Comparison Results

This analysis compares ReproSchema with twelve platforms across three distinct research domains: clinical research, general surveys and questionnaires, and online behavioral experiments. The platforms include CEDAR[21], formr[39], Kobo Toolbox[40], LORIS[41], MindLogger[42], OpenClinica[43], Pavlovia[44], PsyToolkit[45,46], Qualtrics[47], REDCap[20], SurveyCTO[48], and SurveyMonkey[49].

The table below (Table 2) provides an overview of each platform and its version at the time of comparison.

Table 2. Platform overview, version, and release date.

Platform	Description	Version
CEDAR	A metadata management tool focused on enhancing the annotation and retrieval of biomedical research data, adhering to FAIR principles.	v1.6.0
former	A survey framework focusing on longitudinal online studies, integrating survey tools with data analysis capabilities.	v0.21.0
Kobo Toolbox	A data collection, management, and visualization platform used globally for research and social good.	v2.024.12b
LORIS	A web-based data management system specializing in neuroimaging and behavioral research that can handle longitudinal multi-site study data.	v25.0.1
MindLogger	A mobile and web platform that collects, manages, and analyzes mental health and behavioral data.	v1.25.0
OpenClinica	An electronic data capture (EDC) platform optimized for clinical trial data management.	Community Edition (OC4)
Pavlovia.org	A platform for hosting, sharing, and running online experiments and surveys.	v2024.1.4 (PsychoPy version)
PsyToolkit	A website for designing, running, and analyzing online experiments and surveys in cognitive and personality psychology.	v3.4.6
Qualtrics	A survey tool offering functionalities for academic research, market studies, and customer feedback, with analytics capabilities.	May 2024
REDCap	A web application for building and managing online surveys and databases used in clinical and research data collection.	v13.8.2
ReproSchema	A system designed for standardizing and	v1.0.0

	sharing research protocols, ensuring reproducibility and consistency across research settings.	
SurveyCTO	A data collection platform specialized in mobile data and working in offline settings.	v2.81.3
SurveyMonkey	An online survey development software that provides survey creation and analysis tools for diverse research needs.	May 2024

In the following, Table 3 (Table 3) presents a comparative analysis of each platform's performance, evaluated against the adapted FAIR principles. The assessment criteria consisted of four categories: Findability (F1-F4), Accessibility (A1-A4), Interoperability (I1-I3), and Reusability (R1-R3). The results reveal varying degrees of compliance across the platforms, with some demonstrating stronger adherence to the criteria than others. Table 4 (Table 4) presents each platform's functional capabilities, highlighting their abilities to support key functions related to survey design and data management.

Table 3. Comparison based on the adapted FAIR principles

Platform	Schema	F1	F2	F3	F4	A1	A2	A3	A4	I1	I2	I3	R1	R2	R3
CE DA R	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
for mr			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓
Ko boT ool box			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓
LO RIS			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓
Mi nd Lo gge r	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Op en Cli nic a			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓
Pav lovi a					✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓
Psy Too lkit					✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				
Qu altr ics					✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓
RE DC ap			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓			✓

Re pro Sch em a	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sur vey CT O			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				
Sur vey Mo nke y						✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				

Table 4. Comparison based on functionality

Platform	Shared Assessment	Multi lingual	Multi media	Validation	Logic	Score	Adapt ability	Non-Code
CEDAR	✓		✓					
formr		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
KoboToolbox			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
LORIS			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
MindLogger	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
OpenClinica		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pavlovía		✓	✓	✓	✓			
PsyToolkit	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Qualtrics		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
REDCap	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
ReproSchema	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
SurveyCTO		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
SurveyMonkey		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

ReproSchema Use Cases

ReproSchema has been applied in various research settings to address common challenges in survey data collection and management. This section presents three applications: NIMH-Minimal, the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) and HEALthy Brain and Child Development (HBCD) Studies, and an interactive checklist of Best Practices in Data Analysis and Sharing (eCOBIDAS). These examples illustrate how ReproSchema provides tailored solutions for standardizing assessments, maintaining version control, and ensuring data consistency across studies (Table 5). By examining these use cases and their associated requirements, researchers can better assess the utility of ReproSchema for their own projects.

The NIMH-Minimal project is the National Institute of Mental Health's (NIMH) recommended data collection instruments for mental health research[35]. These standards specify essential data elements such as age and sex and assessments like the DSM-5[50] Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure and WHODAS 2.0[51] for adults or equivalents for those under 18. ReproSchema ensures compliance with these evolving standards by providing a structured, version-controlled repository for assessments. Tools such as the `reproschema-protocol-cookiecutter` and the `reproschema-library` enable researchers to systematically implement NIMH's required assessments while maintaining methodological consistency across studies.

ReproSchema outputs responses in JSON-LD format, with each activity stored as a separate file. Both assessments and outputs follow the same schema, ensuring structured, version-controlled, and interoperable data that integrates seamlessly into diverse workflows. To streamline data submission, ReproSchema provides an automated mapping of responses to the National Data Archive (NDA) Common Data Elements format via the `reproschema2cde` tool. This reduces the burden on researchers while ensuring compliance with NDA standards. Beyond NDA, ReproSchema's schema-driven structure enables flexible mapping to other formats, enhancing interoperability and simplifying cross-study comparisons.

The ABCD and HBCD studies, extensive longitudinal studies funded by the NIH, investigate the effects of social and environmental factors on child development from pregnancy through adulthood. Initially utilizing REDCap for data collection, both studies faced significant challenges due to frequent updates to questionnaires. These updates, such as correcting branch logic errors, typographical mistakes, and changing response scales, led to data inconsistencies and complications in longitudinal data analysis. ReproSchema addressed these challenges by enabling structured, version-controlled questionnaire development. Each iteration of the questionnaires is systematically tracked using Git tags and annotations, preserving the history of modifications and ensuring that researchers can trace when and why changes were made. The transition from REDCap to ReproSchema improves data consistency and facilitates reuse of standardized data dictionaries, supporting more reliable multi-site and longitudinal analyses.

The eCOBIDAS project transformed the extensive 71-page PDF report of the Committee on Best Practices in Data Analysis and Sharing (COBIDAS)[38,52] into an online interactive checklist. The original document detailing best practices for neuroimaging research, was often difficult for researchers to navigate due to its length and complexity, which could be overwhelming for researchers. ReproSchema addressed these challenges by converting the report into a dynamic, interactive tool with build-in branching logic, allowing researchers to focus only on the sections relevant to their specific projects. This interactive format reduces information

overload and generated automatic, customizable reports that could be directly integrated into manuscripts, enhancing compliance with best practices.

To evaluate ReproSchema's effectiveness in real-world applications, we conducted an iterative assessment of challenges encountered in survey-based data collection, particularly in longitudinal and multi-site studies. We consulted researchers and reviewed documented inconsistencies, identifying common pain points such as version tracking, metadata accessibility, and interoperability. These challenges were mapped to ReproSchema's existing features to assess their effectiveness in resolving them. Table 5 summarizes this mapping, demonstrating how ReproSchema provides concrete solutions across different study contexts.

Table 5. Challenges, requirements, and solutions provided by ReproSchema across use cases.

Challenge	Requirement	Use cases	ReproSchema Solutions
Adhering to evolving data collection standards	Version tracking	NIMH-Minimal, A/HBCD	Git version control with tags for protocols and items
Ensuring uniformity in data collection	Adherence to standardized data collection	NIMH-Minimal	Cookiecutter and UI creating protocols adhering to guidelines
Customizing assessments based on participant demographics	Tailored data collection for different age groups	NIMH-Minimal	Dynamic UI elements to customize assessments like DSM-5 cross-cutting and WHODAS 2.0
Maintaining data consistency over time	Data consistency in longitudinal studies	A/HBCD	Systematic tracking and annotation of questionnaire changes
Handling diverse question types	Customizable UI elements	All	Interactive elements like Likert scales, dropdowns, etc.
Managing complex survey structures	Handling complex survey structures	All	Nested structure (Protocol > Activity > Item)
Integrating with pre-existing data collection systems	Interoperability with existing platforms	A/HBCD	Conversion tools like redcap2reproschema
Overcoming the discouraging length of the original PDF	Interactive format with branching logic	eCOBIDAS	Interactive checklist with branching logic
Ensuring easy access to metadata	Comprehensive metadata accessibility	All	Persistent URIs for schema components

Supporting multiple languages	Multilingual support	All	Support for multiple languages in UI
-------------------------------	----------------------	-----	--------------------------------------

Discussion

This study presented ReproSchema ecosystem and evaluated ReproSchema's role in improving the reproducibility of survey-based data collection by comparing it against twelve widely used platforms. Our findings show that ReproSchema aligns closely with the FAIR principles (Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability) and provides a structured, version-controlled approach to survey design.

ReproSchema's Contribution to Reproducibility

ReproSchema addresses a critical gap in reproducibility efforts by ensuring that survey-based data collection is both standardized and traceable. While initiatives such as the Open Science Framework (OSF) and NIH reproducibility guidelines emphasize data sharing and transparency, they do not enforce reproducibility at the point of data collection, where inconsistencies often arise.

ReproSchema enhances survey reproducibility in three key ways. First, it standardizes data collection by ensuring that all study sites follow consistent assessment protocols, reducing variability in how surveys are designed and administered. Second, it implements robust version control, allowing researchers to systematically track changes to questionnaires over time, ensuring that modifications—such as adjustments to question wording, response scales, or branching logic—are explicitly documented. Finally, it facilitates assessment reuse, reducing the need for post-hoc harmonization, which is often error-prone and labor-intensive.

This structured approach is particularly valuable in longitudinal studies, such as ABCD and HBCD, where even minor inconsistencies in survey instruments across study waves can compromise data reliability and reproducibility, or specific changes are required to reflect evolution of scientific understanding or policy changes and should be tracked. By maintaining survey consistency across time points, ReproSchema supports transparent, reproducible research practices, aligning with broader open science initiatives.

Comparison Results

The comparison results highlight that while many platforms excel in individual functionalities, they often lack robust metadata management and version control mechanisms. ReproSchema, along with CEDAR and MindLogger, stands out for its ability to preserve questionnaire integrity over time and facilitate cross-study comparability. However, we acknowledge that certain usability challenges remain, particularly for researchers unfamiliar with structured data models.

Comparison of Adapted FAIR Principles Across Platforms

Findability and Metadata Accessibility

Survey-based research often lacks structured metadata, making it difficult for researchers to locate, reuse, or compare assessments across studies. While many platforms allow users to store questionnaires in searchable databases, they often lack unique, persistent identifiers for

individual survey elements, leading to inconsistencies in metadata documentation.

ReproSchema mitigates this issue by assigning structured schemas and unique URIs to every survey component—questions, response options, branching logic, and metadata—ensuring that assessments remain identifiable and retrievable over time. CEDAR and MindLogger adopt similar approaches, reinforcing the role of structured metadata in reproducible research. In contrast, platforms such as formr and Pavlovia, which prioritize experimental flexibility, do not provide the same level of findability.

Interoperability and Reusability

Ensuring interoperability is critical for multi-institutional research, yet many platforms store surveys in proprietary or platform-specific formats, restricting their integration with external tools. ReproSchema addresses this limitation by offering bidirectional conversion tools that facilitate seamless translation between ReproSchema and REDCap, as well as between ReproSchema and the Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) standard. This functionality enables direct integration with clinical and research data management systems, ensuring that assessments remain usable across different platforms while maintaining structured metadata and version control.

Many platforms also struggle with reusability due to limited version control. While REDCap and Qualtrics provide some degree of modification history, they often lack detailed provenance tracking or explicit usage licensing. In contrast, ReproSchema's Git-based version control system allows researchers to track changes systematically and maintain data consistency across study waves, ensuring reproducibility.

Comparative Summary of Platform FAIR Alignment

Among the evaluated platforms, ReproSchema, CEDAR, MindLogger, and LORIS align most closely with FAIR principles, though each has a distinct focus: (1) CEDAR is optimized for biomedical data annotation. (2) MindLogger is tailored for mobile-based mental health assessments. (3) ReproSchema provides a general-purpose schema for survey-based data collection.

In contrast, platforms such as LORIS, OpenClinica, and REDCap demonstrate partial FAIR alignment, particularly in data management. Platforms like formr, Pavlovia, and PsyToolkit, developed primarily for psychology research, prioritize experimental flexibility over structured metadata. General-purpose tools such as Qualtrics and SurveyMonkey show variable adherence to FAIR principles, often lacking built-in mechanisms for metadata standardization and reuse.

While FAIR principles are now widely accepted as best practices, many platforms were not originally designed with these principles in mind, explaining the variability in FAIR compliance across platforms.

Comparison of Functionality Capabilities Across Platforms

Survey Design Features and Usability

Survey tools differ significantly in functionality and intended use. General-purpose platforms like Qualtrics and SurveyMonkey prioritize ease of use but lack enforced standardization and version control. Research-focused platforms such as REDCap and OpenClinica support structured data collection but provide limited assessment reuse mechanisms. ReproSchema, MindLogger, and formr offer a more comprehensive feature set, including multilingual support, multimedia integration, validation tools, and adaptive branching logic.

Mobile Optimization

Unlike MindLogger and Survey CTO, which provide dedicated mobile applications, ReproSchema's data collection component operates as a Web-based platform, ensuring accessibility via mobile browsers. While this ensures device compatibility, certain mobile-native optimizations—such as offline data collection—remain underdeveloped. Expanding support for offline functionality could further enhance ReproSchema's applicability to mHealth and field-based research, where real-time mobile data collection is essential. While we evaluated skip and branch logic, we recognize that some platforms also support piping, which integrates prior responses into later questions. Though not separately assessed, this is an important feature to consider in future evaluations and schema improvements.

Technical Accessibility

One limitation of schema-based platforms is the requirement for programming knowledge. While SurveyMonkey and Qualtrics provide no-code survey builders, ReproSchema currently requires familiarity with structured data models. However, tools such as `reproschema-ui` and `reproschema-protocol-cookiecutter` help lower this barrier, and future development of graphical interfaces and use of AI technologies could further improve usability for non-technical users.

It is important to note that a lack of a feature in our comparison does not necessarily mean its absence—some functionalities may exist but were not explicitly represented in platform documentation. This analysis does not rank platforms but rather highlights trade-offs and strengths, helping researchers select tools suited to their study needs.

Limitations and Future Directions

While ReproSchema enhances survey-based reproducibility, several areas require further development to improve its accessibility and functionality. Integrating semantic search capabilities into the ReproSchema library could enable researchers to more efficiently identify relevant assessments, streamlining study design and data collection. Additionally, ontology mapping, such as implementing SSSOM (A Simple Standard for Sharing Ontology Mappings), would improve interoperability with external research standards, allowing for more seamless integration with existing data repositories and standards.

Although ReproSchema's Git-based version control ensures transparency and traceability, reliance on GitHub may pose accessibility challenges for researchers unfamiliar with version control systems. Exploring alternative or supplementary version control mechanisms could lower this barrier and make the platform more widely usable. Furthermore, expanding integration with participant recruitment platforms, such as Prolific or Mechanical Turk[53–57] could facilitate diverse and large-scale data collection, particularly for behavioral and social science studies. Lastly, enhancing documentation and training resources and providing AI-based tools would make ReproSchema more accessible to researchers unfamiliar with schema-based approaches, ultimately promoting broader adoption across disciplines.

Conclusion

ReproSchema provides a structured, metadata-driven approach to survey-based research, ensuring consistency, interoperability, and version control in data collection. By integrating FAIR principles, version-tracking mechanisms, and open collaboration, it addresses key barriers to reproducibility in survey research, offering a scalable solution for studies that require standardized, transparent assessment protocols.

Beyond its immediate applications, ReproSchema represents a shift in how survey instruments are designed, maintained, and shared. Its schema-based structure facilitates harmonized data collection across diverse research disciplines, making it a valuable resource for multi-site collaborations, longitudinal studies, and cross-disciplinary data integration. As the scientific community continues to emphasize open and reproducible research, tools like ReproSchema will be crucial for reducing inconsistencies in data collection especially for multi-site and longitudinal collaborative projects.

Future efforts will focus on expanding usability and adoption, particularly by improving graphical interfaces, enhancing interoperability with existing research infrastructures, and lowering technical barriers for non-programmers. By addressing these challenges, ReproSchema has the potential to set a new standard for survey-based research, enabling more transparent, reproducible, and scalable data collection practices across biomedical, behavioral, and social sciences.

References

1. Baker M. 1,500 scientists lift the lid on reproducibility. *Nature*. 2016;533(7604):452-454. doi:10.1038/533452a
2. OPEN SCIENCE COLLABORATION. Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*. 2015;349(6251):aac4716. doi:10.1126/science.aac4716
3. Goodman SN, Fanelli D, Ioannidis JPA. What does research reproducibility mean? *Sci Transl Med*. 2016;8(341):341ps12-341ps12. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.aaf5027
4. Stuppel A, Singerman D, Celi LA. The reproducibility crisis in the age of digital medicine. *Npj Digit Med*. 2019;2(1):1-3. doi:10.1038/s41746-019-0079-z
5. Hardwicke TE, Wallach JD, Kidwell MC, Bendixen T, Crüwell S, Ioannidis JPA. An empirical assessment of transparency and reproducibility-related research practices in the social sciences (2014–2017). *R Soc Open Sci*. 2020;7(2):190806. doi:10.1098/rsos.190806
6. Kennedy DN, Abraham SA, Bates JF, et al. Everything matters: The repronim perspective on reproducible neuroimaging. *Front Neuroinformatics*. 2019;13. Accessed December 19, 2023. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fninf.2019.00001>
7. Begley CG, Ioannidis JPA. Reproducibility in science. *Circ Res*. 2015;116(1):116-126. doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.114.303819
8. Sperber AD. Translation and validation of study instruments for cross-cultural research. *Gastroenterology*. 2004;126:S124-S128. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2003.10.016
9. Geisinger KF. Cross-cultural normative assessment: Translation and adaptation issues influencing the normative interpretation of assessment instruments. *Psychol Assess*. 1994;6(4):304-312. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.6.4.304
10. Grant S, Aitchison T, Henderson E, et al. A comparison of the reproducibility and the sensitivity to change of visual analogue scales, borg scales, and likert scales in normal subjects during submaximal exercise. *Chest*. 1999;116(5):1208-1217. doi:10.1378/chest.116.5.1208
11. Benjamini Y. Selective inference: The silent killer of replicability. *Harv Data Sci Rev*. 2020;2(4). doi:10.1162/99608f92.fc62b261
12. Norman GR, Eva KW. Diagnostic error and clinical reasoning. *Med Educ*. 2010;44(1):94-100. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03507.x
13. Whiting P, Rutjes AWS, Reitsma JB, Glas AS, Bossuyt PMM, Kleijnen J. Sources of variation and bias in studies of diagnostic accuracy. *Ann Intern Med*. 2004;140(3):189-202. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-140-3-200402030-00010
14. Jäckle A, Al Baghal T, Eckman S, Sala E. How to pop the question? Interviewer and respondent behaviours when measuring change with proactive dependent interviewing. In: *Advances in Longitudinal Survey Methodology*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2021:368-398. doi:10.1002/9781119376965.ch15
15. Wilkinson MD, Dumontier M, Aalbersberg IJ, et al. The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Sci Data*. 2016;3(1):160018. doi:10.1038/sdata.2016.18
16. Poldrack R, Kittur A, Kalar D, et al. The cognitive atlas: Toward a knowledge foundation for cognitive neuroscience. *Front Neuroinformatics*. 2011;5. Accessed December 19, 2023. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fninf.2011.00017>
17. Turner JA, Laird AR. The cognitive paradigm ontology: Design and application. *Neuroinformatics*. 2012;10(1):57-66. doi:10.1007/s12021-011-9126-x

18. Lee SM, Majumder MA. National Institutes of Mental Health Data Archive: Privacy, consent, and diversity considerations and options for improvement. *AJOB Neurosci.* 2022;13(1):3-9. doi:10.1080/21507740.2021.1904025
19. NIH Common Data Elements (CDE) Repository. Accessed February 19, 2024. <https://cde.nlm.nih.gov/home>
20. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform.* 2009;42(2):377-381. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
21. Musen MA, Bean CA, Cheung KH, et al. The center for expanded data annotation and retrieval. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2015;22(6):1148-1152. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocv048
22. Sporny M, Longley D, Kellogg G, Lanthaler M, Lindström N. *JSON-LD 1.1.*; 2020.
23. Hull R. Relative information capacity of simple relational database schemata. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD Symposium on Principles of Database Systems.* PODS '84. Association for Computing Machinery; 1984:97-109. doi:10.1145/588011.588027
24. Guha RV, Brickley D, Macbeth S. Schema.org: evolution of structured data on the web. *Commun ACM.* 2016;59(2):44-51. doi:10.1145/2844544
25. Batini C, Lenzerini M, Navathe SB. A comparative analysis of methodologies for database schema integration. *ACM Comput Surv.* 1986;18(4):323-364. doi:10.1145/27633.27634
26. Jacobs I. The World Wide Web Consortium. In: *Linking the World's Information: Essays on Tim Berners-Lee's Invention of the World Wide Web.* Vol 52. 1st ed. Association for Computing Machinery; 2023:155-165. Accessed February 19, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3591366.3591380>
27. Karvounarakis G, Ives ZG, Tannen V. Querying data provenance. In: *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data.* SIGMOD '10. Association for Computing Machinery; 2010:951-962. doi:10.1145/1807167.1807269
28. Li C, Sugimoto S. Provenance description of metadata application profiles for long-term maintenance of metadata schemas. *J Doc.* 2018;74(1):36-61. doi:10.1108/JD-03-2017-0042
29. Glavic B. Data provenance. *Found Trends® Databases.* 2021;9(3-4):209-441. doi:10.1561/19000000068
30. Maumet C, Auer T, Bowring A, et al. Sharing brain mapping statistical results with the neuroimaging data model. *Sci Data.* 2016;3(1):160102. doi:10.1038/sdata.2016.102
31. Queder N, Tien VB, Abraham SA, et al. NIDM-Terms: community-based terminology management for improved neuroimaging dataset descriptions and query. *Front Neuroinformatics.* 2023;17. doi:10.3389/fninf.2023.1174156
32. Loeliger J, McCullough M. *Version Control with Git: Powerful Tools and Techniques for Collaborative Software Development.* O'Reilly Media, Inc.; 2012.
33. Berners-Lee T, Fielding RT, Masinter LM. *Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax.* Internet Engineering Task Force; 2005. doi:10.17487/RFC3986
34. Benson T, Grieve G. Principles of FHIR. In: Benson T, Grieve G, eds. *Principles of Health Interoperability: SNOMED CT, HL7 and FHIR.* Health Information Technology Standards. Springer International Publishing; 2016:329-348. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-30370-3_18
35. NIMH Data Archive - NDA. Accessed February 19, 2024. <https://nda.nih.gov/nda/nimh-common-data-elements>
36. Casey BJ, Cannonier T, Conley MI, et al. The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development

- (ABCD) study: Imaging acquisition across 21 sites. *Dev Cogn Neurosci*. 2018;32:43-54. doi:10.1016/j.dcn.2018.03.001
37. Volkow ND, Gordon JA, Freund MP. The healthy brain and child development study—shedding light on opioid exposure, COVID-19, and health disparities. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2021;78(5):471-472. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.3803
38. Nichols TE, Das S, Eickhoff SB, et al. Best practices in data analysis and sharing in neuroimaging using MRI. *Nat Neurosci*. 2017;20(3):299-303. doi:10.1038/nn.4500
39. Arslan RC, Walther MP, Tata CS. formr: A study framework allowing for automated feedback generation and complex longitudinal experience-sampling studies using R. *Behav Res Methods*. 2020;52(1):376-387. doi:10.3758/s13428-019-01236-y
40. KoboToolbox. KoboToolbox. Accessed May 22, 2024. <https://www.kobotoolbox.org/>
41. Das S, Zijdenbos A, Vins D, Harlap J, Evans A. LORIS: a web-based data management system for multi-center studies. *Front Neuroinformatics*. 2012;5. Accessed February 19, 2024. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fninf.2011.00037>
42. Klein A, Clucas J, Krishnakumar A, et al. Remote digital psychiatry for mobile mental health assessment and therapy: MindLogger platform development study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021;23(11):e22369. doi:10.2196/22369
43. Cavelaars M, Rousseau J, Parlayan C, et al. OpenClinica. *J Clin Bioinforma*. 2015;5(1):S2. doi:10.1186/2043-9113-5-S1-S2
44. Pavlovia. Accessed April 28, 2024. <https://pavlovia.org/>
45. Stoet G. PsyToolkit: a software package for programming psychological experiments using Linux. *Behav Res Methods*. 2010;42(4):1096-1104. doi:10.3758/BRM.42.4.1096
46. Stoet G. PsyToolkit: A Novel Web-Based Method for Running Online Questionnaires and Reaction-Time Experiments. *Teach Psychol*. 2017;44(1):24-31. doi:10.1177/0098628316677643
47. Qualtrics XM - Experience Management Software. Qualtrics. Accessed April 28, 2024. <https://www.qualtrics.com/>
48. SurveyCTO. SurveyCTO. Accessed May 22, 2024. <https://www.surveyccto.com/>
49. How SurveyMonkey Works: Get Started for Free. SurveyMonkey. Accessed April 28, 2024. <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/take-a-tour/>
50. Regier DA, Kuhl EA, Kupfer DJ. The DSM-5: Classification and criteria changes. *World Psychiatry*. 2013;12(2):92-98. doi:10.1002/wps.20050
51. Üstün TB, Organization WH. *Measuring Health and Disability: Manual for Who Disability Assessment Schedule WHODAS 2.0*. World Health Organization; 2010.
52. Nichols TE, Das S, Eickhoff SB, et al. *Best Practices in Data Analysis and Sharing in Neuroimaging Using MRI*. Organization for Human Brain Mapping; 2016:71. Accessed April 24, 2024. <https://www.humanbrainmapping.org/files/2016/COBIDASreport.pdf>
53. Douglas BD, Ewell PJ, Brauer M. Data quality in online human-subjects research: Comparisons between MTurk, Prolific, CloudResearch, Qualtrics, and SONA. *PLOS ONE*. 2023;18(3):e0279720. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0279720
54. Buhrmester MD, Talaifar S, Gosling SD. An evaluation of Amazon's Mechanical Turk, its rapid rise, and its effective use. *Perspect Psychol Sci*. 2018;13(2):149-154. doi:10.1177/1745691617706516
55. Sheehan KB, Pittman M. *Amazon's Mechanical Turk for Academics: The HIT Handbook for Social Science Research*. Melvin & Leigh, Publishers; 2016:x, 141.
56. Palan S, Schitter C. Prolific.ac—A subject pool for online experiments. *J Behav Exp*

Finance. 2018;17:22-27. doi:10.1016/j.jbef.2017.12.004

57. Shapiro DN, Chandler J, Mueller PA. Using Mechanical Turk to study clinical populations. *Clin Psychol Sci*. 2013;1(2):213-220. doi:10.1177/2167702612469015

Abbreviations

ABCD – Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development

CLI – Command-line interface

CEDAR – Center for Expanded Data Annotation and Retrieval

DSM-5 – Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition

eCOBIDAS – Committee on Best Practices in Data Analysis and Sharing

EDC – Electronic data capture

FAIR – Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability

FHIR – Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources

GAD-7 – Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7

HBCD – HEALthy Brain and Child Development

HTTP – Hypertext Transfer Protocol

JSON – JavaScript Object Notation

JSON-LD – JavaScript Object Notation for Linked Data

LinkML – Linked Data Modeling Language

LORIS – Longitudinal Online Research and Imaging System

NDA – National Data Archive

NIDM – Neuroimaging Data Model

NIMH – National Institute of Mental Health

OSF – Open Science Framework

PHQ-9 – Patient Health Questionnaire-9

REST API – Representational State Transfer Application Programming Interface

SSSOM – A Simple Standard for Sharing Ontology Mappings

UI – User interface

URI – Uniform Resource Identifier

W3C – World Wide Web Consortium

XML – Extensible Markup Language

Data Availability

Repositories for each component in the ReproSchema project:

reproschema: <https://github.com/ReproNim/reproschema>;

reproschema-library: <https://github.com/ReproNim/reproschema-library>;

reproschema-py: <https://github.com/ReproNim/reproschema-py>;

reproschema-ui: <https://github.com/ReproNim/reproschema-ui>;

reproschema-

backend: <https://github.com/ReproNim/reproschema-backend>;

reproschema-protocol-cookiecutter: <https://github.com/ReproNim/reproschema-protocol-cookiecutter>;

reproschema-server: <https://github.com/ReproNim/reproschema-server>;

reproschema-demo-protocol: <https://github.com/ReproNim/reproschema-demo-protocol>;

online document: <https://www.repronim.org/reproschema/>

Repositories for three use cases:

NIMH minimal: <https://github.com/ReproNim/nimh-minimal>;

NIMH minimal ReproSchema output map to CDE:

<https://github.com/ReproNim/reproschema2cde>;

the ABCD and HBCD study: <https://github.com/ReproNim/abcd-redcap2rs>;

<https://github.com/ReproNim/hbcd-redcap2rs>;

eCOBIDAS: <https://github.com/ohbm/eCOBIDAS>

Supplementary

material:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1fTLolBJpgG4sEWkftIA8cKD4U5VCNHsSI28c1NJufsI/edit?usp=sharing>

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Sooyoung Ahn, Alisha Kodibagkar, Henry Rossiter, Yao Xiao, Frances Mulligan, and ReproNim colleagues for their contributions. We acknowledge the use of ChatGPT (GPT-4o) by OpenAI for language refinement, specifically for grammar, word choice, conciseness, and academic tone. All suggestions were reviewed and adopted at the authors' discretion.

Funding Statement

This project is supported by NIH P41EB019936 and OT2OD032720.

Authors' Contributions

YC: data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, software, visualization, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing; DJ: data curation, investigation, software, validation, writing – review & editing, SAA: data curation, investigation, software, validation, writing – review & editing; RG: data curation, investigation, software, writing – review & editing; EN: data curation, validation, writing – review & editing; DML: data curation, software, validation, writing – review & editing; IB: data curation, validation, writing – review & editing; AJ: resources, supervision, writing – review & editing; A Keshavan: software, resources, validation, writing – review & editing; A Klein: software, resources, writing – review & editing; JC: software, resources, writing – review & editing; ZR: software, resources, writing – review & editing; SMH, JL, HB, SD, DF, and DK: resources, writing – review & editing; SSG: conceptualization, investigation, methodology, software, funding acquisition, resources, supervision, project administration, writing – review & editing.


Conflicts of Interest

Although currently employed by Flexxbotics and Octave Bioscience, SAA and A Keshavan were not employed by these companies while contributing to this project.

Supplementary Files

Figures

ReproSchema workflow overview. This figure presents the ReproSchema workflow, which standardizes survey data collection to enhance research reproducibility and interoperability across studies. The workflow consists of six key components: (A) ReproSchema supports multiple input formats, including questionnaires in PDF or DOC format (which can be converted to ReproSchema format using large language models (LLMs), such as Claude 3.7 Sonnet, as demonstrated in the supplementary material), existing assessments from the ReproSchema library, and REDCap CSV exports (which can be automatically converted using `redcap2reproschema`). (B) The `reproschema-protocol-cookiecutter` tool provides a structured, stepwise process for researchers to create and publish a protocol on GitHub, ensuring organized metadata and version control. This tool enables schema validation and user interface (UI) serving. (C) ReproSchema protocols are stored in GitHub repositories (or other Git-compatible services), where version-controlled URIs ensure persistent access to protocols, activities, and assessment items, supporting reproducibility and provenance tracking. (D) The ReproSchema-UI provides a browser-based interface for interactive survey deployment, allowing researchers and participants to collect structured data while maintaining schema integrity. (E) Survey responses are stored in JSON-LD format, with embedded URIs linking each protocol, activity, and item to their respective sources in the ReproSchema library. This structure ensures data provenance, traceability, and semantic interoperability. (F) The `reproschema-py` tools facilitate output conversion into various standardized formats, including the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Common Data Elements (`reproschema2cde`), the Brain Imaging Data Structure (BIDS) phenotype format (`reproschema2bids`), and REDCap CSV format (`output2redcap`), ensuring compatibility with existing research workflows.



Mapping a research protocol to ReproSchema. This figure illustrates how an assessment is structured and represented in ReproSchema, as well as how it appears in the user interface. The entire assessment (outlined in red) is an Activity. Each individual question (green) is an Item, and the available answer choices (purple) are ResponseOptions. When a participant selects an answer (orange), that selection is recorded as a Response. One protocol can have multiple activities. The right panel demonstrates how different Activities within a protocol are organized in the UI, allowing users to navigate between different activities.

The figure shows a screenshot of a user interface for a depression assessment, overlaid with a ReproSchema diagram. The diagram uses colored arrows to map UI elements to ReproSchema concepts:

- Protocol:** A red arrow points from the 'Protocol' label to the entire assessment form, which is outlined in red.
- Item:** Green arrows point from the 'Item' label to individual questions (e.g., '1 Little interest or pleasure in doing things').
- ResponseOption:** Purple arrows point from the 'ResponseOption' label to the answer choices (0, 1, 2, 3) for each question.
- Response:** Orange arrows point from the 'Response' label to the selected answer (e.g., '2' for question 1, '3' for question 8).

The assessment form includes a title, a list of 9 items, a 'TOTAL' score field, and a final question about difficulty. The right panel shows a 'Demo protocol' menu with options like Screening, Consent, Voice, Health, Anxiety, Substance use, Behavior, Other Questions, and ThankYou.

	Not at all	Somewhat	Much more than usual	Worst ever
1 Little interest or pleasure in doing things	0	1	2	3
2 Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless	0	1	2	3
3 Trouble falling or staying asleep, or sleeping too much	0	1	2	3
4 Feeling tired or having little energy	0	1	2	3
5 Poor appetite or overeating	0	1	2	3
6 Feeling bad about yourself - or that you are a failure or have let yourself or your family down	0	1	2	3
7 Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the newspaper or watching television	0	1	2	3
8 Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed. Or the opposite - being so fidgety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual	0	1	2	3
9 Thoughts that you would be better off dead, or of hurting yourself in some way	0	1	2	3

add columns: + +
TOTAL: _____


10 If you checked off any problems, how difficult have these problems made it for you to do your work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?

Not difficult at all
Somewhat difficult
Very difficult
Extremely difficult

Protocol
Activity
Item
ResponseOption
Response
ResponseActivity
Response

Demo protocol
Select Language
✓ English (US)
Spanish
Screening
Consent
Voice
Health
Anxiety
Substance use
Behavior
Other Questions
ThankYou

PRISMA-style flowchart. This figure illustrates the selection process for survey and experiment data collection platforms, narrowing from 53 identified tools to 12 final selections based on research orientation, functionality, and publication support.



Multimedia Appendixes

Supplementary material for tool selection and comparison.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/def9b1aefe8a7a5ba9ae7d87a8812794.xlsx>

Example of using Claude 3.7 Sonnet to convert a PDF questionnaire into ReproSchema format. This demonstrates an automated approach to structuring survey data and highlights ongoing efforts to integrate LLM agents into the ReproSchema workflow.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/2c872075b7fb9e57b1174fb28e2708ca.pdf>



Related publication(s) - for reviewers eyes onlies

Mapping a research protocol to ReproSchema.

Protocol

Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by any of the following problems?

	Not at all	Somewhat	Much more than last two weeks	Very much
1 Little interest or pleasure in doing things	0	1	2	3
2 Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless	0	1	2	3
3 Trouble falling or staying asleep, or sleeping too much	0	1	2	3
4 Feeling tired or having little energy	0	1	2	3
5 Poor appetite or overeating	0	1	2	3
6 Feeling bad about yourself - or that you are a failure or have let yourself or your family down	0	1	2	3
7 Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the newspaper or watching television	0	1	2	3
8 Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed. Or the opposite - being so fidgety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual	0	1	2	3
9 Thoughts that you would be better off dead, or of hurting yourself in some way	0	1	2	3

add columns: + -

TOTAL: _____

10 If you checked off any problems, how difficult have these problems made it for you to do your work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?

Not difficult at all
Somewhat difficult
Very difficult
Extremely difficult

ReproSchema

- Protocol
 - Activity
 - Item
 - ResponseOption
 - ResponseOption
 - Activity
 - ResponseActivity
 - Response
 - Response

Demo protocol

Select Language
☒ English (US)
☐ Spanish

☐ Screening
☐ Consent
☐ Voice
☐ Health
☐ Anxiety
☐ Substance use
☐ Behavior
☐ Other Questions
☐ ThankYou