

Anne Scheel

Human-Technology Interaction Group
School of Innovation Sciences
Eindhoven University of Technology

Faculty of IE&IS, ATLAS 9.417
Postbus 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands
a.m.scheel@tue.nl

6th April, 2020

Dear Dr Kousta,

We would like to submit the attached manuscript for your consideration as a regular research article at *Nature Human Behaviour*.

In light of the replication crisis in the social sciences and concerns about publication bias and ‘questionable research practices’, our paper addresses the question of how the emerging literature of Registered Reports compares to the standard literature. We analysed the full population of published Registered Reports and a random sample of hypothesis-testing articles from the standard literature in Psychology. Our results show that 96% of standard reports found results that supported their first tested hypothesis (a figure in line with previous research), but the same was true for only 44% of Registered Reports.

We preregistered our study (osf.io/sy927) and have made all data, materials, and analysis code available online (osf.io/dbhgr). This includes a rich dataset with quotes of the coded hypotheses and conclusions for each paper, which we hope can be a useful resource for future meta-scientific research.

A first version of our manuscript is available as a preprint (psyarxiv.com/p6e9c), which has been downloaded over 750 times and [attracted the attention of journalists](#). To comply with *Nature Human Behaviour* submission guidelines, we shortened the abstract, removed subheadings from the Discussion section, reformatted the paper, and additionally updated the number of journals currently offering Registered Reports. Other than these changes, the attached manuscript is identical to the preprint.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Kind regards,

Anne Scheel, Mitchell Schijen, and Daniël Lakens
Eindhoven University of Technology