

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

12th July, 2020

Dear Dr Simons,

We would like to submit the attached manuscript for your consideration as an Empirical Article at *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*.

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 code to reproduce our analyses and manuscript 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 to our delight has already attracted a broad readership and been the subject of several open-science oriented journal clubs. To comply with *AMPPS* submission guidelines, we reformatted the paper and shortened all sections, moving some methodological details to the Appendix, but generally trying to keep all relevant information. In addition, we updated the number of journals currently offering Registered Reports.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Kind regards,

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