

## **Aims and Scope**

The Institute for Replication (I4R) supports a replication and meta-science culture in the social sciences. Replication is essential for assessing the credibility, robustness, and generalizability of research findings. Replication and meta-science help science remain a self-correcting and introspective enterprise and thereby contribute to better scientific practice and evidence-based policymaking.

The I4R Discussion Paper Series is a forum for replication and meta-scientific research in the social sciences. The series welcomes computational reproductions, direct replications in new contexts, robustness analyses, replication studies using new data, meta-analyses, methodological reviews, and other research that advances our understanding of scientific practice and scientific credibility.

The series explicitly welcomes both confirmatory and non-confirmatory replications. Replications that confirm previously published findings are considered just as valuable as those that do not confirm the previously published findings.

I4R Discussion Papers are not peer-reviewed. Submissions are screened by the editors for relevance, quality, transparency, and adherence to the professional standards described in this document. The editors reserve the right to require revision of submissions containing defamatory statements or other content inconsistent with professional scholarly discourse. Publication in the I4R Discussion Paper Series does not constitute endorsement by I4R or the editors of any statement, interpretation, criticism, or conclusion contained in a discussion paper, comment, or reply. Responsibility for such content rests with the respective authors.

For replications, I4R offers replicated authors the opportunity to comment on the replication and/or to publish a formal reply alongside the replication study. The procedure is described below.

The I4R Discussion Paper Series is hosted by RWI – Leibniz-Institute for Economic Research and provided in cooperation with EconStor, a service of ZBW – Leibniz Information Centre for Economics. The Series is indexed through different services including RePEc (IDEAS and EconPapers).

## **Procedure for Replication Reports and Replies**

The I4R editors do not adjudicate scientific disputes or determine whose arguments are superior. Their role is to moderate the process and ensure that professional standards are maintained.

Upon submission of a replication or a paper that directly comments on a previously published article, the I4R editors will provide the replicated authors with an opportunity to comment on the replication prior to publication.

Within five weeks after reception of the replication report, replicated authors may choose either:

1. to provide referee-like comments to the editors, which are then shared with the replicators, or:
2. to submit a formal reply for publication alongside the replication study.

Where a formal reply is submitted, the editors will share the reply with the replicators, who then may revise their manuscript in light of the reply. The revised replication manuscript will then be shared

again with the replicated authors, who may revise their reply accordingly. Usually this iterates quickly to publishable versions (see 'Convergence').

Submitting a reply later than five weeks is also possible but in this case the editors offer the replicators the choice between releasing their replication report immediately or waiting for the reply. In this case, replicators can write a reply to the reply after the reply by the replicated authors has been received.

### **Convergence**

This revision process of the replication and the reply is intended to promote convergence. Replicators and replicated authors are expected to focus revisions on issues already raised during the exchange. Neither replicators nor replicated authors should use later rounds to introduce new arguments that could reasonably have been raised earlier. The editors retain discretion to determine whether newly raised issues warrant further revision.

The objective is to publish a final replication paper and, where applicable, a final reply paper that fairly reflect the principal scientific arguments raised during the exchange. Resolving scientific disagreements is not the purpose of the process, although the exchange may sometimes lead to substantial agreement on particular issues.

### **Journal Submissions**

The editors generally recommend that replicators complete the I4R process before submitting a replication study to a peer-reviewed journal. This helps avoid parallel review processes and may substantially increase the efficiency of subsequent journal review, as journal editors can consider both the replication and, where applicable, the reply by the replicated authors.

If a replication study is already under review at a peer-reviewed journal when submitted to I4R, replicators are asked to inform the editors. The editors share this information with the replicated authors when they are offered to write a reply who may legitimately take such information into account when deciding whether to write a reply for the I4R series.

The purpose of this policy is to promote transparency and avoid unnecessary duplication or confusion across parallel review and reply processes.