

# «R Notebooks» og reproduserbarhet

## Assignment 1 - MSB 105 - Ole Alexander Bakkevik & Sindre Espedal

«««< HEAD ## disposisjon (dere trenger ikke dekke alt listet her)

### Introduction

There is mainly two basic reasons to be concerned about making research reproducible.

*The first* is to show evidence of the correctness of your results. Descriptions contained in scholarly publications are rarely sufficient to convince sceptical readers of the reliability of our work. In simpler times, scholarly publications showed the reader most of the work involved in getting the result. The reader could make an informed choice about the credibility of the science. Now, the reader may feel they are being asked to blindly trust in all the details that were not described in the original journal article.

Adopting a reproducible workflow means providing our audience with the code and data that demonstrates the decisions we made as we generated our results. This makes it easier for others to satisfy themselves that our results are reliable (or not, since reproducibility is no guarantee of correctness).

*The second* reason to aspire to reproducibility is to enable others to make use of methods and results. Equipped with only our published article, our colleagues might struggle to reconstruct our method in enough detail to apply it to their own data. Adopting a reproducible workflow means publishing our code and data in order to allow scientists to extend our approach to new applications with a minimum of effort. This has the potential to save a great deal of time in transmitting knowledge to future researchers. *Reproducibility Guide* (u.å.)

In this paper will discuss the topics mentioned above in an light,yet hopefully understandable manner.

### Reproducibility, R notebooks

Roger D. Peng states in his article “Reproducible Research in Computational Science, 2011” that “The standard of reproducibility calls for the data and the computer code used to analyze the data be made available to others” Peng (2011).

As a standard , it creates a tedious and non-effective approach to replication. A far more beneficial process is to independently inspect utilized data variables. R-notebook and other reproducible systems would serve as an crucial component in verifying scientific results.

## - Litteraturgjennomgang

### \* Replikerbarhet/reproduserbarhet

### \* Problemets omfang

- Vil dagens løsning med arkiv av data og event. programkode hos

## tidsskriftene kunne løse problemet?

### \* Mulig løsning (teoretisk plan):

- «Compendium», «Dynamic document», «code chunk» og «text chunk»

### \* Mulig løsning:

- R Notebooks

## - Analyse

### \* Løser R notebooks problemet med reproduserbarhet

- helt eller bare delvis

### \* Eksempler på «code chunks» («R Code Block») og «text chunk» i R notebook

### \* Har forskerne incentiver til å være «reproduserbare», eller må de tvinges?

## Incentivizing reproducibility

Over the past several years, a series of publications and policy statements have generated increasing awareness in the scientific community of the scale and implications of the problem of irreproducible data—or at least lack of robust results—particularly in the realm of basic and translational research.

Recent studies have shown that the key findings in 50% or more of published reports in certain fields cannot be reproduced. As the public, government, and private funders of research comprehend the extent of the problem, trust in the scientific enterprise erodes, and confidence in the ability of the scientific community to address this problem wanes. In addition, there is considerable potential for reputational damage to scientists, universities, and entire fields (for example, cancer biology, genomics, and psychology). *An incentive-based approach for improving data reproducibility* (u.å.)

One possible cause of irreproducible-data is stated by Hessen as “*Scientists are incentivized to produce more results at the expense of spending more time on the reproducibility of any given result*”. Hessen furthermore list three possible solutions:

- One solution is to eliminate imperfections in the peer review system.  
(Without those imperfections credit incentives are perfectly aligned with the social optimum in Hessen's model)
- Another solution focuses on the amount of credit given for irreproducible results.  
(If the credit given to irreproducible results matched the social value of those results more closely, the gap between the credit-maximizing optimum and the social optimum would be reduced)
- A third solution aims to compensate for the misalignment.  
(limiting the number of papers scientists may publish per unit time) Schulz et al. (2016)

## Incentivizing gone wrong

A good example of fraudulent science is Andrew Wakefield and his study on the link between autism and the MMR vaccine published in the Lancet. Wakefield was paid by a Legal Aid Board of parents of children with autism to conduct a pilot study of virological investigation in autistic children, some of whom were included in the Lancet publication. Additionally, Wakefield most likely manipulated the data, thus representing in false results. Since then Wakefield has become the “*godfather*” for the anti-vaccine movement, a movement whom have grown exponentially during the covid-19 pandemic. Schulz et al. (2016)

## Example list 2 level

```
l <- list(x = 1:4, y = c(TRUE, FALSE, FALSE), z = c("aa", "bb"), zz= c(2.1, 4.33))
str(l)
```

```
## List of 4
## $ x : int [1:4] 1 2 3 4
## $ y : logi [1:3] TRUE FALSE FALSE
## $ z : chr [1:2] "aa" "bb"
## $ zz: num [1:2] 2.1 4.33
```

## Session info

```
# Example session info:
```

```
sessionInfo()
```

```
## R version 4.1.1 (2021-08-10)
## Platform: x86_64-apple-darwin17.0 (64-bit)
## Running under: macOS Big Sur 10.16
```

```
##
## Matrix products: default
## BLAS:   /Library/Frameworks/R.framework/Versions/4.1/Resources/lib/libRblas.0.dylib
## LAPACK: /Library/Frameworks/R.framework/Versions/4.1/Resources/lib/libRlapack.dylib
##
## locale:
## [1] en_US.UTF-8/en_US.UTF-8/en_US.UTF-8/C/en_US.UTF-8/en_US.UTF-8
##
## attached base packages:
## [1] stats      graphics  grDevices  utils      datasets  methods    base
##
## loaded via a namespace (and not attached):
## [1] compiler_4.1.1  magrittr_2.0.1  fastmap_1.1.0   tools_4.1.1
## [5] htmltools_0.5.2 yaml_2.2.1      stringi_1.7.4   rmarkdown_2.10
## [9] knitr_1.33      stringr_1.4.0   xfun_0.25       digest_0.6.27
## [13] rlang_0.4.11    evaluate_0.14
```

The session info function provides the reader information regarding which operating system, packages and data sets that have been used. This information is crucial in terms of gaining reproducibility.

## Reproducibility across sectors

Other areas where application of reproducibility would prove beneficiary is e.g. the pharmaceutical industry. Present day studies show that replicating present day clinical-research data is demanding. Which often leads to drugs to prolong their release to actual patient trials. One human factor could be the fear of being “discredited” among peers, which lead to an bias among researchers. Ultimately causing studies not to be reproduced. *Why Is Reproducing Pharmaceutical Medical Research so Hard?* (u.å.)

## Conclusion

Providing studies that are reproducible is vital in terms of quality assurance , cost- effective and deterring fraudulent scientists is crucial.

For generelle tanker rundt reproduserbarhet er Peng (2011) en god kilde. Videre gir McCullough et al. (2008) en god illustrasjon av problemets omfang innen fagområdet økonomi. McCullough et al. (2008) diskuterer også om tidsskriftenes arkiver av datasett og programkode er en tilfredsstillende løsning av problemet

## Introduction

## Litterature

**Replicability** Being able to replicate research results by other researchers is one important part of the methodology in science. In the past, there has been little testing of replicability. Reasons for this are that it is not promoted to replicate another researcher's work. Criticism can also arise about lack of creativity and imagination. A critical question is also asked to the integrity of the researcher as one can be interpreted as critical to the findings or that one does not trust the researcher. Such arguments makes it less attractive to conduct replication studies.

Dewald and co tried to replicate a number of datasets and they found that accidental errors in empirical articles are rather common than unusual (Dewald et al., 1986). Although it is quite common for errors to occur in empirical economic research, it is quite frustrating and difficult to replicate and build on the research when there are many errors in the dataset and that also does not appear to significantly affect the conclusion of the authors.

In recent times, technology has made it easier, cheaper and more efficient to make and maintain journal archives. Still, McCullough et al. (2008) has in the article "Do Economics Journal Archives Promote Replicable Research?" shown findings that the potential offer is reduced when editors fail to enforce and authors do not adhere to the guidelines of the journal archives. It is noted that few researchers use the opportunity as offered to engage in replication because economic profession is considering replication as an ideal to be known but not to be practiced (McCullough et al., 2008).

##Possible solutions **Compendium and "Code Chunks"** (Gentleman og Lang, 2007) points out that compendium is an important tool for integrating codes and data etc. This is because when such tools are collected and assembled it must be possible to distribute and update, given that the compendium is of the right quality, so will the possibility of reproduction be simple.

Another possible solution is "Code Chunks" or "Text Chunks". Code and text chunks are a tool used to display data and code for illustrations. Text chunks are used to describe and interpret results and codes. Dynamic document will therefore be an optimal compendium since all the data and components will be available for reproducibility (Gentleman og Lang, 2007).

##Analysis


##conclusion By using dynamic documents in the form of codes, data, explanations, etc. in the form of code chunks and text chunks, there are good opportunities for both replication and reproducibility of research, and also further research on previous studies. - Motivate researchers to share to make their work available - Disadvantage? maybe too many different packages (difficult to keep track)

# Litteraturliste

«««< HEAD <div id="refs"></div>

# Appendix

## Display of Git commits and three branches



*An incentive-based approach for improving data reproducibility.* (u.å.). <https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/scitranslmed.aaf5003>

Dewald, W. G., Thursby, J. G., og Anderson, R. G. (1986). Replication in Empirical Economics: The Journal of Money, Credit and Banking Project. *The American Economic Review*, 76(4), 587–603.

Gentleman, R., og Lang, D. T. (2007). Statistical Analyses and Reproducible Research. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 16(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1198/106186007X178663>

McCullough, B. D., McGeary, K. A., og Harrison, T. D. (2008). Do Economics Journal Archives Promote Replicable Research? *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie*, 41(4), 1406–1420. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5982.2008.00509.x>

Peng, R. D. (2011). Reproducible Research in Computational Science. *Science*, 334(6060), 1226–1227. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1213847>

*Reproducibility Guide.* (u.å.). <https://ropensci.github.io/reproducibility-guide/sections/introduction/>

Schulz, J. B., Cookson, M. R., og Hausmann, L. (2016). The impact of fraudulent and irreproducible data to the translational research crisis solutions and implementation. *Journal of Neurochemistry*, 139(S2), 253–270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jnc.13844>

*Why is reproducing pharmaceutical medical research so hard?* (u.å.). <https://www.pharmaceutical-technology.com/features/why-is-it-so-hard-to-reproduce-medical-research-results/>