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This document is intended to text and demo a reproducible workflow.

## Objective

This project aims to both examine the Registered Revisions policy itself and test a novel meta-trial approach to metascience experimentation.

## Design

Rather than one trial, this is designed as a semi-centralized prospective meta analysis. Individual journal-based randomized trials are based on a “study in a kit” with a shared central research design and data collection infrastructure. Within each trial, participating submitting authors are enrolled if peer reviewers ask for additional data or analyses, and are then randomized to either Registered Revisions or standard procedures. In the Registered Revisions arm, authors are asked to make a revision plan in response to these requests, and In Principal Acceptance is based on a combination of editorial and peer reviewer acceptance of the plan and other revisions. Key data collected include time to editorial decisions, research results (e.g. statistical significance of published findings), and experiential results. Each individual trial’s data are fully owned by the journals while contributing to a future meta-analysis.

## Results
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As of the date of submission ({start\_date}), {n\_journals} journals have actively running pilots, {n\_authors\_cons} authors have signed consent to be potentially enrolled, {n\_participants\_randomized} participants were found to have qualifying comments from peer reviewers and were randomized to trial arms ({n\_participants\_RR} to Registered Revisions, {n\_participants\_SP} to Standard Procedures), {n\_participants\_returned\_revisions} have had revisions and/or revision plans submitted back to editors and reviewers, and {n\_participants\_editorial\_decisions} ({p\_participants\_editorial\_decisions}) have reached final editorial decisions. Additional results are expected to be available at the time of presentation when the pilot is closed.
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## Conclusions

Participating pilot journal editors are broadly positive concerning the overall study design, trial implementation, and the Registered Revisions policy itself as it enters the main phase. The {n\_participants\_randomized} participants will continue to be monitored, with additional participants to be recruited. The meta study design may open new avenues for metascientific research, while also providing strong causal evidence for the impact of Registered Revisions.