AI Replication Games October 16th

A one hour training for quantitative social sciences

Juan Pablo Posada Aparicio

Institute for Replication, University of Ottawa

October 2025

Session goals

- Align on the Replication Games storyline, schedule, and roles before event day.
- Clarify randomization, treatment arms, and deliverables drawn from the preregistered design.

Roadmap, about 60 minutes

- 5 minutes. Pre-games context and storyline.
- 10 minutes. Study design, randomization, and assignments.
- 15 minutes. Event-day operations, deliverables, and support.
- 20 minutes. ChatGPT Plus feature tour across the research workflow.
- 5 minutes. Q and A.

Pre-games storyline

- Kick off the Replication Games and align on the narrative before event day.
- Friendly human versus AI-augmented challenge tests speed, accuracy, and issue-spotting.
- We study vertical gaps across expertise tiers and horizontal gaps across disciplines.

Organizers and support network

- Institute for Replication with Abel Brodeur coordinates the University of Ottawa hub.
- Support crew: Ghina Abdul Baki, Juan Pablo Aparicio, Bruno Barbarioli, Lenka Fiala, Derek Mikola, David Valenta.
- University of Ottawa hosts in person; virtual participants rely on Zoom. Email: instituteforreplication@gmail.com.

Study design essentials

- You will be randomly assigned to work either as a human-only participant or as part of the cyborg (AI-assisted) arm.
- Around 300 participants stratified by expertise tier and discipline tag.
- Randomized 1:1 within strata to AI-assisted access versus human-only control.
- Task pool spans Economics, Political Science, and Psychology with assignments balancing in- and out-of-discipline exposure.

Treatment arms and tiers

- **Human control**. No external AI during the work window; document everything manually.
- **Cyborg arm**. ChatGPT Plus with Advanced Data Analysis, Deep Research, Agent Mode, and Codex CLI support; other AI tools are allowed if they document usage.
- Tiers from Undergraduate to Professor; we log discipline tags, coding experience, and AI familiarity for heterogeneity analyses.

Participant prep checklist

- Complete this orientation and skim the reporting workbook (GitHub template).
- Bookmark the preregistered repository materials on OSF (osf.io/dkfzt) for mirrored access.
- Accept the ChatGPT workspace invite promptly.
- Confirm hardware and required software licenses (R/Stata/Python) before event day.
- Review the assignment email so you know your tier, discipline tag, arm, and assigned article.

Event-day timeline and workflow

- 8:45 local check-in or remote login; 9:00 shared Dropbox folder unlocks (OSF mirror provided for anyone without Dropbox) alongside the reporting sheet.
- Read instructions, note the focal result highlighted on the first page of the paper, and confirm you have every required file.
- Reproduce the assigned result, logging timestamps; audit code for major and minor errors.
- Run robustness checks and keep the reporting sheet—referee-report tab included—updated throughout the seven-hour window.

Deliverables, compliance, and support

- Submit the reproduced result, error log, and reporting workbook by 16:00, plus qualitative notes if helpful.
- Control arm pledges no AI; AI arm completes a short end-of-day survey noting which AI tools they used and how often (no prompt logging required).
- Primary outcomes cover success, timing, error counts, and robustness; secondary outcomes review narratives and recommendations.
- Technical or design questions: email instituteforreplication@gmail.com.

What we mean by computational reproducibility

- Anyone with the shared code, data, and instructions should be able to rerun the workflow and obtain the same focal result.
- Re-runs should execute end-to-end without manual tweaks, with scripts producing identical figures, tables, and statistics.
- The results (tables/figures) to be reproduced will be highlighted in the PDF of the article.

Classifying coding issues

- **Major errors**: Significantly change the numerical result, invalidate inference, or change conclusions.
- **Minor errors**: Issues that do not alter the reported outcome, inference or conclusions.
- Missing file paths, hard-coded directories, or absent packages are expected, do not treat them as coding errors.

Required robustness checks

- Each participant proposes and runs two targeted robustness checks tied to the assigned result.
- Prioritize checks that stress key assumptions (e.g., alternative specifications, sample trims, inference methods).
- Record the design, implementation status, and outcomes for each check in the reporting sheet.

Referee report deliverable

- Use the referee-report tab inside the reporting sheet to summarize findings, robustness evidence, and recommendations.
- Keep the narrative at or below 1,000 words and skip dedicated sections on data/code availability, computational reproducibility, or documentation—fold any blockers into your summary or recommendations.
- Focus on clarity: describe reproduction status, major/minor issues, and follow-up suggestions for the original authors.
- Keep evidence-linked: cite code cells, logs, or file names so the organizers can audit quickly.

Post-event follow-up

- Focus groups by treatment capture qualitative experience across arms.
- De-identified outputs enter the replication archive once the preregistration lock lifts.
- Participants receive summary results before journal submission and can provide feedback.

ChatGPT Plus toolkit

- **Advanced Data Analysis**. Run Python, upload files, and produce figures or tables in chat.
- **Browsing & Deep Research**. Reach current sources with citations and credibility checks.
- **Custom GPTs & Agent Mode**. Tailor assistants and supervise multistep execution inside your workflow.

Q and A

Thank you.