Sample reproducibility report

Grant A Gibson

*Title of the paper being reproduced.*

**Summary:**

The project was fully reproducible with minor issues. There were very small discrepancies in the output for Tables 2 and 3 for women where the percentages obtained in the reproduction did not match the original paper. Code was not provided for in-text figures on pages 4 and 6 of this manuscript.

**Replicator’s Computing Environment:**

Software:

Edition Windows 10 Home

Version 21H2

Installed on ‎12/‎5/‎2020

OS build 19044.1889

Experience Windows Feature Experience Pack 120.2212.4180.0

Stata 17.0 SE standard edition - Update level 01 Jun 2022

Hardware:

Processor AMD Ryzen 5 5600X 6-Core Processor 3.70 GHz

Installed RAM 32.0 GB

System type 64-bit operating system, x64-based processor

Replication steps:

1. Downloaded data per instructions from Data availability statement
2. Downloaded auxiliary do files from the submitted material
3. Changed directory setup inside “shell.do” to match this system
4. Ran the updated “shell.do”
5. Modified figure 2 to set range on the graph to match the manuscript

**Code testing summary:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Figure or table | Relevant program | Replicated (comments) |
| Figure 1 | F1.do | Yes |
| Figure 2 | F2.do | Yes, adjustment to generated visualization required to match manuscript |
| Table 1 | Table1.do | Yes |
| Table 2 | Table2.do | No, \_n and shares of educations for women don’t match manuscript |
| Table 3 | Table3.do | No, coefficients don’t match, likely follows from error that resulted in table 2 mismatch |

**Discrepancies:**

In table 2, the Sample shares for higher education for women do not match the manuscript, total sample does not match what is reported. An excerpt of Table 2 shows the differences:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table row | Manuscript | Reproduction |
| Women – Less than High School | 27% | 25% |
| Women – High school graduate | 28% | 30% |
| Women – Some college | 6% | 9% |
| Women – College graduate | 39% | 36% |
| Total sample (\_n) | 15,234 | 14,948 |

For table 3, none of the regression coefficients matches the reproduction. A complete reproduction of the coefficients for table 3 shows the differences:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Manuscript | Reproduction |
| Male | 0.089 (0.052) | 0.078 (0.047) |
| High School graduate | -0.024 (0.007) | -0.019 (0.007) |
| Rural | -0.154 (0.010) | -0.149 (0.009) |
| Employed | -0.118 (0.017) | -0.121 (0.024) |
| Previous mental health diagnosis | 0.491 (0.004) | 0.470 (0.004) |
| Total sample (\_n) | 15,234 | 14,948 |

The reason for the discrepancies is most likely caused by the discrepancy in total sample. The ~200 missing individuals that are excluded by the code submitted could be driving the small differences in observed output.

No code was made available for the in-text figures.

Classification:

Full reproduction with minor issues (Discrepancies in output; Code missing).