



preregRS guides preregistration

Facilitating Open Science Practices for research syntheses

Jürgen Schneider, Iris Backfisch, Andreas Lachner

20. May 2021

The Problem

☒ **inferences** we can draw from research syntheses
depend on the **decisions** in the research process

(Ioannidis, 2016)

e.g. “garbage in garbage out”

(Egger et al., 2001)

☒ **degrees of freedom**, e.g. in

- literature search
- eligibility criteria
- strategy for data synthesis

☒ **transparency** allow for critical evaluation & enhance
reproducibility

(Wilson, 2019)

The Problem

- 🔓 **Open Science Practices** help to make research transparent and reproducible

(Page et al., 2021)

- ☑ **preregistration** makes research syntheses as a process transparent

(Atkinson et al., 2015; Stewart et al., 2012)

- ☰ preregistration of research syntheses is **not standard** procedure yet (outside of health)

(Ioannidis, 2016; Møller et al., 2018)

Existing solutions?

important frameworks

👉 PROSPERO

(Booth et al., 2012)

👉 PRISMA-P

(Moher et al., 2015)

👉 MARS

(Appelbaum et al., 2018)

Existing solutions?

important frameworks

👉 PROSPERO

(Booth et al., 2012)

👉 PRISMA-P

(Moher et al., 2015)

👉 MARS

(Appelbaum et al., 2018)

❗ discipline-specific frameworks

❗ “Preregistration is hard”


e.g. including power analysis, coding manual, data analysis strategy

(Nosek et al., 2019)


Existing solutions?

important frameworks

If we want culture change, we
need to “make it easy”
(Nosek, 2019)



Our Context



Research group “Transformation & Translation”

- ➔ research syntheses on the topic of digitization
- ➔ in teaching and teacher education

TüDiLB
www.tuedilb-tuebingen.de

Joint project of
University of Tübingen and
Leibniz-Institut für Wissensmedien (IWM)

Our Aims

- utilize **existing** frameworks and **standards**
 - make them **accessible & applicable**
 - for meta-analyses and systematic reviews
 - for all disciplines
 - enable **seamless integration** of data analyses, files, figures, text, ...
 - ensure **compatibility** with markup languages
- ➔ produce **standalone** HTML/PDF

preregRS

R package

preregRS = R Markdown template (install via [R-package](#))

- provides **structure**: synthesized
PROSPERO, PRISMA-P and MARS

preregRS

R package

preregRS = R Markdown template (install via [R-package](#))

- provides **structure**: synthesized PROSPERO, PRISMA-P and MARS
- **guides** with additional information

preregRS

R package

preregRS = R Markdown template (install via [R-package](#))

- provides **structure**: synthesized PROSPERO, PRISMA-P and MARS
- **guides** with additional information
- fill out like a form: provides **placeholders**

preregRS

R package

preregRS = R Markdown template (install via [R-package](#))

- provides **structure**: synthesized PROSPERO, PRISMA-P and MARS
- **guides** with additional information
- fill out like a form: provides **placeholders**
- R Markdown enables us to...



include R **code** and its **output**



encode **files** (e.g. separate coding system)



include **figures**, iframes, latex, ...



include **interactive** content (e.g. plotly)

preregRS

R package

preregRS = R Markdown template (install via [R-package](#))

- provides **structure**: synthesized PROSPERO, PRISMA-P and MARS
- **guides** with additional information
- fill out like a form: provides **placeholders**
- R Markdown enables us to...



include R **code** and its **output**



encode **files** (e.g. separate coding system)



include **figures**, iframes, latex, ...



include **interactive** content (e.g. plotly)



compile to **standalone** file

Demo

Demo

check out...

1. an empty template (compiled to HTML): bit.ly/preregRS-HTML
2. a Jupyter-Notebook with preregRS template available: bit.ly/preregRS-jupyter
3. a partial example of a preregistration: bit.ly/preregRS-example

Further developments

- Increase usability & accessibility outside of R
e.g. JBI SUMARI

- Appelbaum, M., Cooper, H., Kline, R. B., Mayo-Wilson, E., Nezu, A. M., & Rao, S. M. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for quantitative research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist*, 73(1), 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000191>
- Atkinson, K. M., Koenka, A. C., Sanchez, C. E., Moshontz, H., & Cooper, H. (2015). Reporting standards for literature searches and report inclusion criteria: Making research syntheses more transparent and easy to replicate: Reporting Standards for Literature Searches. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 6(1), 87–95. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1127>
- Booth, A., Clarke, M., Dooley, G., Ghersi, D., Moher, D., Petticrew, M., & Stewart, L. (2012). The nuts and bolts of PROSPERO: An international prospective register of systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews*, 1(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-1-2>
- Egger, M., Smith, G. D., & Sterne, J. A. C. (2001). Uses and abuses of meta-analysis. *Clinical Medicine*, 1(6), 478–484. <https://doi.org/10.7861/clinmedicine.1-6-478>
- Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2016). The Mass Production of Redundant, Misleading, and Conflicted Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 94(3), 485–514. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12210>
- Moher, D., Shamseer, L., Clarke, M., Ghersi, D., Liberati, A., Petticrew, M., Shekelle, P., & Stewart, L. A. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews*, 4(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1>
- Møller, M. H., Ioannidis, J. P. A., & Darmon, M. (2018). Are systematic reviews and meta-analyses still useful research? We are not sure. *Intensive Care Medicine*, 44(4), 518–520. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-017-5039-y>
- Nosek, B. A. (2019). *Culture change toward more open, rigorous, and reproducible research*.
- Nosek, B. A., Beck, E. D., Campbell, L., Flake, J. K., Hardwicke, T. E., Mellor, D. T., van 't Veer, A. E., & Vazire, S. (2019). Preregistration Is Hard, And Worthwhile. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23(10), 815–818. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.07.009>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Stewart, L., Moher, D., & Shekelle, P. (2012). Why prospective registration of systematic reviews makes sense. *Systematic Reviews*, 1(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-1-7>
- Wilson, D. B. (2019). Systematic Coding for Research Synthesis. In H. M. Cooper, L. V. Hedges, & J. C. Valentine (Eds.), *Handbook of research synthesis and meta-analysis* (3rd edition, pp. 153–172). Russell Sage Foundation.

Images

(in order of appearance)

title page icons | [fontawesome.com CC-BY 4.0](#) (incons used throughout the slides)

title page background | [Bogdan Karlenko on Unsplash](#) [Javier Allegue Barros on Unsplash](#)

Center for Open Science [osf.io/sxn73/](#)

[marianne bos on Unsplash](#)

[Bogdan Karlenko on Unsplash](#)

License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](#).