

# 19 Ways Journal Editors Can Promote Transparency and Replicability

Steve Lindsay



30th APS Annual Convention

Slides posted at [web.uvic.ca/~dslind/?q=resources](http://web.uvic.ca/~dslind/?q=resources)

# Problems/Challenges Facing Psychology

- Big

- Develop as a cumulative science that is useful

- Small


- Shift norms for conducting/reporting to increase replicability
  - Less of an issue in some areas than others
  - Replicability not the sole criterion, but an important one

1. Sign on to the [Transparency and Openness Promotion guidelines](#).
2. Encourage detailed [preregistration](#).
3. Be wary of papers that report a single underpowered study with surprising findings especially if critical  $p$  values are greater than .03.
4. If the work has potential but you doubt its replicability, consider inviting a revision with a [preregistered replication](#), perhaps under terms of a [Registered Report](#).




5. Ask submitters if/how reviewers can access data and materials (and to address longer-term plans for availability); reward easy access.

# Percentage of articles reporting data available from 2012 to 2015 for Psych Science versus comparison journals.



From Kidwell et al., 2016, COS

<http://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.1002456>



Of articles claiming data to be available, what percentage actually delivered?

Similar patterns regarding stimulus materials.

6. Ensure that your Associate Editors have appropriate stats/methods chops and are committed to promoting transparency and replicability.

7. Consider appointing Statistical Advisers.

8. Ensure that for each submission at least one reviewer has stats chops.

9. Require compelling rationale as to why sample size appropriate (see, e.g., [Anderson, Kelley, & Maxwell, 2017](#)). Not precedent.

10. Require report of an index of precision (e.g., 95% confidence or credible intervals) around DV means and estimates of effect size.

11. Require fine-grained graphical presentations showing distributions (scatter plots, box plots, frequency histograms).
12. Don't let authors describe *NS* results as strong evidence for null, nor describe a pattern in which an effect is significant in one condition and not in another as if it evidenced an interaction.
13. Attend to measurement sensitivity, reliability, validity, manip checks, demand characteristics, experimenter bias, etc.
14. Require authors to address anticipated constraints on generality.
15. Use tools such as [StatCheck](#) to detect errors in stats reporting.



16. Consider inviting submissions that propose [Registered Reports](#).

17. Consider inviting submissions reporting pre-registered direct replications of findings published in your journal (ideally as RRs).

18. Publish the action editor's name with each article.

19. If you learn of errors in a work you published, strive to correct them in a transparent manner.

Bonus: Include in each article an Open Practices Statement that addresses availability of data, materials, and preregistration.

**QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS?**