

# Manipulation Tests in Regression Discontinuity Design: The Need for Equivalence Testing

Jack Fitzgerald, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Tinbergen Institute\*

November 21, 2024

## Abstract

Researchers applying regression discontinuity design (RDD) often test for endogenous running variable (RV) manipulation around treatment cutoffs, but misinterpret *statistically insignificant* RV manipulation as *negligible* RV manipulation. I introduce a novel procedure that can provide statistically significant evidence that RV manipulation around a cutoff is bounded beneath practically negligible levels. I demonstrate this procedure's necessity by leveraging replication data from 36 RDD publications to conduct 45 equivalence-based RV manipulation tests. Over 44% of RV density discontinuities at the cutoff cannot be significantly bounded beneath a 50% upward jump. Obtaining equivalence testing failure rates beneath 5% requires arguing that a 350% upward RV density jump at the cutoff is practically equal to zero. Meta-analytically, the average RV exhibits a density discontinuity equivalent to a 26% upward jump at the cutoff. These results imply that meaningful RV manipulation around treatment cutoffs cannot be ruled out in many published RDD papers. I provide research guidelines and the `lddtest` command in Stata/R to help researchers conduct more credible equivalence-based manipulation testing in future RDD research.

Keywords: `rddensity`, `DCdensity`, equivalence testing

JEL: C12, C18, C87, P00

---

\*Email: j.fitzgerald@vu.nl. I thank Peter Hull, Michal Kolesár, Didier Nibbering, conference participants from the Causal Data Science Meeting and the University of Groningen Workshop on Causal Inference + Machine Learning, as well as seminar participants from Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam for helpful comments and feedback.

# 1 Introduction

Regression discontinuity design (RDD) is one of the cornerstone quasi-experimental techniques propelling the credibility revolution in economics, political science, and other social sciences over the past 25 years (Imbens & Wooldridge 2009; Samii 2016; Athey & Imbens 2017; Gopalan, Rosinger, & Ahn 2020, Imbens 2024). More than 5600 papers mentioning RDD were published in 2019 alone (Cunningham 2021). RDD identifies local average treatment effects of interventions that are assigned when an agent’s ‘running variable’ (RV) crosses some cutoff. Part of the reason for RDD’s popularity is its ‘experimental appeal’. For sufficiently granular RVs, people often trust that an agent’s RV crossing the cutoff effectively randomizes that agent into or out of treatment, eliminating selection biases that would arise if agents could choose their own treatment status.

This paper offers improvements on existing testing procedures that assess violations of a critical RDD identification assumption. Causal identification in RDD hinges on the assumption that potential outcomes by treatment status are continuous functions of the RV as that RV crosses the cutoff. However, in many settings, agents can endogenously manipulate their observed RV values to opt themselves into or out of treatment (Gerard, Rokkanen, & Rothe 2020). Under such RV manipulation, RDD estimates are confounded, reflecting not just causal effects, but also differences in relevant characteristics between agents with different manipulation strategies (see Lee & Lemieux 2010; Gerard, Rokkanen, & Rothe 2020; Cunningham 2021).

RV density discontinuity tests are a popular tool to assess *ex post* whether such RV manipulation around the cutoff has occurred. McCrary (2008) proposed the first such test,

positing that if agents manipulate RV values around the cutoff, then this will be visible as a discontinuity in the RV’s density at the cutoff. His `DCdensity` procedure estimates the one-sided limits of the RV’s density as it approaches the cutoff from above and below, and assesses whether the (logarithmic) difference in RV density estimates at the cutoff is statistically significantly different from zero. An alternative version of this test, known as `rddensity`, has also recently emerged (Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma 2018; 2020). Such RV manipulation tests are quite popular in RDD papers, with Web of Science reporting that McCrary (2008) has over 1700 citations, and that Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma (2018) and Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma (2020) already have over 400 citations between them.

However, in practice, RV manipulation tests are usually applied fallaciously. Researchers utilizing RDD nearly always wish to demonstrate that RV manipulation near the cutoff is negligible. Researchers typically evidence this assertion by showing that RV density discontinuities at the cutoff are not statistically significantly different from zero (Hartman 2021). However, it is widely-known that this is bad scientific practice, as an underpowered estimate may be meaningfully large even if it is not statistically significantly different from zero (Altman & Bland 1995; Imai, King, & Stuart 2008 Wasserstein & Lazar 2016). Standard testing procedures may thus fail to detect meaningful RV manipulation near the cutoff.

This paper introduces equivalence testing frameworks that are more appropriate for demonstrating that RV manipulation around a cutoff is practically equal to zero. Under these frameworks, the researcher begins by setting a threshold for the maximally acceptable right-to-left ratio between the one-sided limits of the RV’s density as it approaches the cutoff from each side. This effectively specifies the largest RV density discontinuity that would be ‘economically insignificant’. The procedures then assess whether there is statistically sig-

nificant evidence that the right-to-left ratio between these density estimates is significantly bounded beneath this threshold.

I discuss two procedures that can provide such evidence. First, I discuss a novel equivalence testing approach to RV manipulation testing: the ‘logarithmic density discontinuity’ (LDD) equivalence test. Thereafter, I discuss Hartman’s (2021) workhorse equivalence testing framework, upon which the LDD equivalence test is based and upon which my testing framework provides several improvements.

The social sciences are increasingly recognizing the need for equivalence testing when researchers wish to demonstrate null results or negligible relationships. Equivalence testing has a long history in biomedical sciences, and applications are being increasingly advanced in econometrics, psychology, and political science (e.g., see Piaggio et al. 2012; Hartman & Hidalgo 2018; Lakens, Scheel, & Isager 2018; Dette & Schumann 2024). Recent empirical work shows that up to 63% of estimates defending null claims made in top economics journals – roughly 90% of which are not statistically significantly different from zero – cannot be significantly bounded beneath reasonable benchmark effect sizes using equivalence testing (Fitzgerald 2024). This paper shows similar results for RV manipulation tests.

I demonstrate the necessity of equivalence testing for RV manipulation tests, showing that many RVs employed in published RDD papers fail lenient equivalence-based RV manipulation tests. My analysis draws on replication data gathered by Stommes, Aronow, & Sävje (2023a), examining 45 RV density discontinuities at the cutoff across 36 RDD publications. Over 44% of these RVs’ density discontinuities at the cutoff cannot be significantly bounded beneath a 50% upward jump (or equivalently, a 33.3% downward jump). To bring this ‘failure rate’ for equivalence-based RV manipulation tests beneath 5%, one must be willing to argue that

a 350% upward jump in RV density at the cutoff is practically equal to zero. In fact, I show meta-analytic evidence that the average RV exhibits a density discontinuity equivalent to a 26% upward jump at the cutoff. These results suggest that in many published RDD analyses, estimated treatment effects may be confounded by meaningful RV manipulation at the cutoff that remains undetected by existing testing frameworks.

Given the clear need for equivalence-based approaches to RV manipulation tests, I conclude by providing guidelines on credible RV manipulation testing. I particularly advocate for researchers to set acceptable right-to-left density ratio thresholds idiosyncratically for each study, surveying independent experts about the smallest right-to-left density ratios that they would consider to be practically equal to zero given the research setting at hand. I then provide commands in Stata and R that can be used to conduct such testing, including the `lddtest` command in Stata and the `lddtest` command in the `eqtesting` R package; Section 3.2 provides download instructions from Github. I also discuss an alternative check that can be employed to assess the robustness of RDD estimates under RV manipulation, namely the `rdbounds` procedure developed by Gerard, Rokkanen, & Rothe (2020), which can be applied for RVs that fail my equivalence-based RV manipulation test. These research practices can provide more credible evidence that RV manipulation does not threaten the validity of treatment effects estimated by RDD.

## 2 Running Variable Manipulation Testing

Currently, researchers reporting RDD results predominantly use one of two tests to assess the presence of RV manipulation near the cutoff, the first of which is the `DCdensity` pro-

cedure in Stata and R (McCrary 2008).<sup>1</sup> The first and most popular RV manipulation test, **DCdensity** begins by creating a fine-gridded histogram of running variable  $Z$  and smoothing the histogram using separate local linear regressions to the left and right of cutoff  $c$ , respectively producing probability density function estimates  $\hat{f}_-(Z)$  and  $\hat{f}_+(Z)$ . The command then estimates the one-sided limits of  $Z$ 's density as it approaches  $c$  from the left and right, which I respectively denote as  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  and  $\hat{f}_+(c)$ . The estimate of interest to the **DCdensity** procedure is the logarithmic density discontinuity  $\hat{\theta} \equiv \ln(\hat{f}_+(c)) - \ln(\hat{f}_-(c))$ , and McCrary (2008) provides an asymptotically consistent standard error estimate  $\text{SE}(\hat{\theta})$ ; see Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of McCrary (2008) for precise computational details. The procedure concludes by testing whether  $\hat{\theta}$  is statistically significantly different from zero, assessing the extremity of test statistic  $\frac{\hat{\theta}}{\text{SE}(\hat{\theta})}$  on the standard normal distribution.

The second density discontinuity testing procedure commonly used for RV manipulation testing is performed by the **rddensity** command in Stata, R, and Python (Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma 2018; 2020). This procedure differs from **DCdensity** in at least two important respects. First, though **DCdensity** and **rddensity** both estimate density functions  $\hat{f}_-(Z)$  and  $\hat{f}_+(Z)$ , **rddensity** does so using local polynomial estimation rather than local linear histogram smoothing. Second, the **rddensity** procedure considers *linear* estimates of the RV's density discontinuity at the cutoff, rather than *logarithmic* estimates. Specifically, the point estimate of interest to **rddensity** is  $\hat{f}_+(c) - \hat{f}_-(c)$ . By default, **rddensity** computes an asymptotic plug-in estimator of  $\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{f}_+(c) - \hat{f}_-(c))$ , though a jackknife alternative is available (Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma 2018). The procedure also produces separate variance

---

<sup>1</sup>**DCdensity** support is provided in Stata by the **DCdensity.ado** file hosted by Justin McCrary at <https://eml.berkeley.edu/~jmccrary/DCdensity/>, and in R *via* the **rdd** R package (Dimmery 2016).

estimators for both RV density estimates to the left and right of the cutoff, respectively  $\widehat{\text{Var}}\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right)$  and  $\widehat{\text{Var}}\left(\hat{f}_+(c)\right)$ . `rddensity` concludes by assessing whether this linear RV density discontinuity is statistically significantly different from zero, examining the extremity of test statistic  $\frac{\hat{f}_+(c) - \hat{f}_-(c)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{f}_+(c) - \hat{f}_-(c))}}$  on the standard normal distribution.

Though there are other estimators and tests of RV density discontinuities (see Otsu, Xu, & Matsushita 2013; Frandsen 2017; Bugni & Canay 2021; Ma, Jales, & Yu 2021; Igarashi 2023), these estimators and tests are not in widespread use. This is in part because apart from Bugni & Canay (2021), who offer the `rdcont` Stata package, no other proposed estimators or tests are accompanied by public-facing statistical software commands. However, even `rdcont` does not produce effect size estimates for the density discontinuity at the cutoff, and thus is not useful for the equivalence tests discussed in this paper.

In practice, researchers are seldom interested in using these tests to demonstrate that there *is* evidence of RV manipulation around the cutoff. Rather, researchers typically use these tests to demonstrate that such manipulation does *not* occur, and thus that endogenous RV manipulation does not pose a threat to the validity of their causal identification strategy. In practice, researchers interpret statistically insignificant manipulation test statistics as evidence that RV manipulation near the cutoff is negligible (Hartman 2021). Such practice is demonstrated in empirical applications both in the original publications introducing these methods and in texts that advocate for the usage of these tests (e.g., see McCrary 2008; Lee & Lemieux 2010; Eggers et al. 2015; Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma 2018; Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma 2020; Cunningham 2021; Huntington-Klein 2022).

The common way in which these RV manipulation tests are used is thus inappropriate. As Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma (2018; 2020) note, the hypotheses that are functionally assessed

by both `DCdensity` and `rddensity` can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 : \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z) &= \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z) \\ H_A : \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z) &\neq \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Researchers typically use statistically insignificant test statistics in RV manipulation tests as evidence in favor of Equation 1’s  $H_0$ . However, this inference is a well-known misinterpretation of statistical significance (see Altman & Bland 1995; Wasserstein & Lazar 2016).

If the researcher uses the testing framework in Equation 1 when interested in showing that  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z) = \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)$ , then the researcher begins by assuming in the null hypothesis that what they want to show is true (see also Fitzgerald 2024). Such a testing framework shifts the burden of proof off of the researcher, who will not conclude that there is meaningful RV manipulation near the cutoff unless the data forces the researcher to abandon  $H_0$ . It is therefore a logical fallacy to infer that a statistically insignificant RV manipulation test result is evidence of no meaningful manipulation. Formally, this inference is an ‘appeal to ignorance’, which is committed when one argues that a claim is supported simply because no one has yet produced evidence against the claim. Imai, King, & Stuart (2008) specifically term this inference the ‘balance testing fallacy’ in placebo test contexts.

Thus in the way that they are currently applied, RV manipulation tests suffer from major credibility challenges. For researchers interested in showing that there is no RV manipulation near the cutoff, imprecision is ‘good’, in the sense that less power and more imprecision make it easier to obtain the researcher’s desired finding (Imai, King, & Stuart 2008). This creates two perverse incentives. On one hand, simulation evidence shows that randomly dropping



observations from a dataset can increase the likelihood of finding statistically insignificant placebo effects, even as the placebo effect estimates themselves grow larger (Imai, King, & Stuart 2008). Researchers can thus get closer to obtaining statistically insignificant RV manipulation test results either by trimming their sample or by setting restrictive bandwidths. On the other hand, statistically significant evidence of RV manipulation may go unreported. In some cases, there may even be good justification for this latter practice, as in very large datasets, a negligibly small RV density discontinuity may be misclassified as ‘significant’ simply due to very high power. Both of these selective reporting issues manifest as ‘reverse  $p$ -hacking’, and there is strong evidence of such selective reporting in top economics journals (Dreber, Johanneson, & Yang 2024). The key danger of these credibility flaws is that in many RDD studies, there may be meaningful RV manipulation near the cutoff that standard tests are not well-powered enough to detect, or significant RV manipulation near the cutoff that simply remains unreported to reviewers and readers.

### 3 Equivalence-Based Manipulation Tests

A more credible equivalence-based testing framework for RV manipulation testing can be constructed from hypotheses of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_0 : \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z) &\not\approx \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z) \\
 H_A : \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z) &\approx \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2}$$

If one can set a range within which  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z) \approx \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)$ , then this is a feasibly testable hypothesis framework, as one can assess whether the RV’s density discontinuity at the cutoff

is bounded within that range using interval testing procedures. This section details two such procedures.

Both procedures that I detail here require the researcher to specify the largest ratio of  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  to  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  that they would consider ‘practically equal’ to 1. I parameterize this maximal acceptable right-to-left density ratio as  $\epsilon > 1$ . This effectively requires the researcher to specify the maximal RV density discontinuity that they would consider to be ‘economically insignificant’. This is a subjective judgment call that will differ depending on the RV being examined and the specific research setting. In Section 6, I provide guidelines for how to credibly set this threshold.

Density ratios are useful effect size measures of RV density discontinuities at the cutoff because they are generally interpretable and comparable. Though some RV manipulation testing frameworks (e.g., `rddensity`) center linear density discontinuities as the estimand of interest, linear density discontinuities require idiosyncratic information about the dataset for proper interpretation, and are thus not generally comparable across datasets (Hartman 2021). For example, if  $Z$  crossing  $c$  induces a histogram discontinuity of 12 observations, this is more notable in a dataset of 100 observations than it is in a dataset of 1,000,000 observations. The usual practice of converting observation counts to probability densities creates similar comparability issues. For instance, if  $Z$  crossing  $c$  induces a three percentage point jump in probability density, this is more notable in a dataset of 1,000,000 observations than it is in a dataset of 100 observations. In contrast, density ratios at the cutoff are always comparable across datasets, and are relatively easy to interpret. This is important for equivalence-based testing procedures, as it helps researchers define valid thresholds for practically negligible effect sizes.

### 3.1 A Novel Testing Framework

`DCdensity` is particularly useful for addressing an unwieldy feature of tests on RV density ratios. Specifically, ratios are linearly asymmetric effect sizes in percentage terms. For example, a right-to-left density ratio of  $\frac{3}{2}$  is equivalent to a 50% upward jump, whereas a right-to-left density ratio of  $\frac{2}{3}$  is equivalent to a 33.3% downward jump. Fortunately, the *logarithms* of these right-to-left ratios are linearly symmetric around zero. For instance,  $\ln\left(\frac{2}{3}\right) = -\ln\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)$ . Estimates from `DCdensity` can thus be used to construct equivalence tests with linearly symmetric bounds. As aforementioned in Section 2, the point estimate of interest to the McCrary procedure can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\theta} &\equiv \ln\left(\hat{f}_+(c)\right) - \ln\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right) \\ &= \ln\left(\frac{\hat{f}_+(c)}{\hat{f}_-(c)}\right),\end{aligned}$$

and thus `DCdensity` directly estimates the logarithmic right-to-left ratio between RV density estimates at the cutoff. Further, McCrary (2008) shows that  $\hat{\theta}$  is an asymptotically normal and consistent estimator of the RV's logarithmic density discontinuity at the cutoff. This provides useful inference guarantees for tests based on standard Gaussian inference.

My proposed testing framework assesses whether the  $\hat{\theta}$  estimate produced by `DCdensity` is bounded within a linearly symmetric interval that converts maximal acceptable right-to-left density ratio  $\epsilon$  and its inverse  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$  into logarithms ( $\ln(\epsilon)$  and  $-\ln(\epsilon)$  respectively). I term this framework the ‘logarithmic density discontinuity (LDD) equivalence test.’

**Definition 3.1** (The Logarithmic Density Discontinuity Equivalence Test). *The researcher*

wants to test the hypotheses in Equation 2 with Type I error rate  $\alpha \in (0, 0.5)$ . They thus set maximally acceptable right-to-left density ratio  $\epsilon > 1$ , formulating null hypothesis

$$H_0 : \ln \left( \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z) \right) - \ln \left( \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z) \right) < -\ln(\epsilon)$$

or

$$\ln \left( \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z) \right) - \ln \left( \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z) \right) > \ln(\epsilon)$$

and alternative hypothesis

$$H_A : \ln \left( \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z) \right) - \ln \left( \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z) \right) \geq -\ln(\epsilon)$$

and

$$\ln \left( \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z) \right) - \ln \left( \lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z) \right) \leq \ln(\epsilon).$$

The researcher then estimates  $\hat{\theta}$  and  $SE(\hat{\theta})$  using the *DCdensity* procedure. Thereafter, test statistics are computed as

$$t_{LDD}^- = \frac{\hat{\theta} - \ln(\epsilon)}{SE(\hat{\theta})} \qquad t_{LDD}^+ = \frac{\hat{\theta} + \ln(\epsilon)}{SE(\hat{\theta})},$$

and the researcher obtains the relevant test statistic

$$t_{LDD} = \arg \min_{t \in \{t_{LDD}^-, t_{LDD}^+\}} \{|t|\}.$$

Let  $\Phi(\cdot)$  be the cumulative density function of the standard normal distribution, and let

$z_\alpha^* = \Phi^{-1}(1-\alpha)$ . If  $t_{LDD} = t_{LDD}^-$ , then the researcher rejects  $H_0$  and concludes that  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z)$  is practically equal to  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)$  if and only if  $t_{LDD} \geq z_\alpha^*$ . If  $t_{LDD} = t_{LDD}^+$ , then the researcher rejects  $H_0$  and concludes that  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z)$  is practically equal to  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)$  if and only if  $t_{LDD} \leq -z_\alpha^*$ .

This test is an extension of the ‘two one-sided tests’ framework, a workhorse framework in frequentist equivalence testing (Schuirmann 1987). This test holds size  $\alpha$  because its decision rule is based on the smaller of its two one-sided test statistics, and thus the test is an intersection-union test of two one-sided tests that each hold size  $\alpha$  (Berger & Hsu 1996). The LDD equivalence test in Definition 3.1 can also be inverted to produce ‘equivalence confidence intervals’ (ECIs).

**Definition 3.2** (The Logarithmic Density Discontinuity Equivalence Confidence Interval).

*The researcher wishes to assess the hypotheses in Equation 2 using a test with Type I error rate  $\alpha \in (0, 0.5)$ . They thus set a maximally acceptable right-to-left density ratio  $\epsilon > 1$ , obtain  $\hat{\theta}$  and  $SE(\hat{\theta})$  from the **DCdensity** procedure, and formulate a real interval*

$$ECI_{1-\alpha} = \left[ \hat{\theta} - z_\alpha^* SE(\hat{\theta}), \hat{\theta} + z_\alpha^* SE(\hat{\theta}) \right].$$

*The researcher concludes that  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z)$  is practically equal to  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)$  if and only if  $ECI_{1-\alpha} \subset [-\ln(\epsilon), \ln(\epsilon)]$ .*

LDD ECIs are essentially inversions of the LDD equivalence test. That is, when exponentiated, the LDD ECI provides the smallest range of ratios within which one can significantly bound the ratio of  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  to  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  using the LDD equivalence test described in Definition

3.1. One can conclude that the ratio of  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  to  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  is statistically significantly bounded between  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$  and  $\epsilon$  if and only if the LDD ECI is entirely contained within  $[-\ln(\epsilon), \ln(\epsilon)]$ .

## 3.2 Statistical Software Commands

I provide statistical software commands in Stata and R to implement my proposed LDD equivalence testing procedure from Section 3.1. For Stata, I provide the `lddtest` command, which can be accessed from <https://github.com/jack-fitzgerald/lddtest>. For R, I provide a similar `lddtest` command in the `eqtesting` R package. `eqtesting` can be accessed from <https://github.com/jack-fitzgerald/eqtesting>. Each of these commands is effectively a wrapper for `DCdensity`. The Stata version of `lddtest` relies on McCrary’s (2008) original Stata code, while the R version of `lddtest` uses the `DCdensity` command from Dimmery’s (2016) `rdd` package as a dependency. In addition to the running variable, both commands require users to specify the cutoff  $c$  and the maximal acceptable right-to-left ratio  $\epsilon$  between density estimates on each side of the cutoff.

## 3.3 The Hartman Test and `rddensity`

The LDD equivalence test draws inspiration from Hartman (2021), who establishes the current workhorse framework for equivalence-based RV manipulation testing. Her approach is similar in spirit to mine, but her framework relies on the linear RV density estimates at the cutoff  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  and  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  produced by `rddensity`, rather than the logarithmic density discontinuity estimate  $\hat{\theta}$  produced by `DCdensity`. I term her framework the ‘Hartman test’.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>The Hartman test can be implemented in R using the `rdd.tost.ratio` command, provided at <https://github.com/ekhartman/rdd-equivalence/blob/master/RDD-equivalence.functions.R>. The command relies on inputs generated by the `rddensity` command in R (Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma 2020). See Hartman

**Definition 3.3** (The Hartman Test). *The researcher wishes to assess the hypotheses in Equation 2 using a test with Type I error rate  $\alpha \in (0, 0.5)$ . They thus set a maximally acceptable right-to-left density ratio  $\epsilon > 1$  and formulate null and alternative hypotheses*

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 : \frac{\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)}{\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z)} &< \frac{1}{\epsilon} \text{ or } \frac{\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)}{\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z)} > \epsilon \\ H_A : \frac{\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)}{\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z)} &\geq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \text{ and } \frac{\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)}{\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z)} \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The researcher then uses the **rddensity** procedure to obtain  $\hat{f}_-(c)$ ,  $\hat{f}_+(c)$ ,  $\widehat{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c))$ , and  $\widehat{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c))$ . Test statistics are computed as

$$t_H^- = \frac{\hat{f}_+(c) - \frac{\hat{f}_-(c)}{\epsilon}}{\sqrt{\widehat{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \widehat{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c))}} \quad t_H^+ = \frac{\hat{f}_+(c) - \epsilon \hat{f}_-(c)}{\sqrt{\widehat{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) + \epsilon^2 \widehat{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c))}}, \quad (3)$$

and the relevant test statistic is

$$t_H = \arg \min_{t \in \{t_H^-, t_H^+\}} \{|t|\}.$$

If  $t_H = t_H^-$ , then the researcher rejects  $H_0$  and concludes that  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z)$  is practically equal to  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)$  if and only if  $t_H \geq z_\alpha^*$ . If  $t_H = t_H^+$ , then the researcher rejects  $H_0$  and concludes that  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^-} f(Z)$  is practically equal to  $\lim_{Z \rightarrow c^+} f(Z)$  if and only if  $t_H \leq -z_\alpha^*$ .

Hartman's testing framework can (at times) also be inverted to allow estimation of the smallest ratio value  $\epsilon^*$  that would permit a statistically significant bounding of  $\frac{\hat{f}_+(c)}{\hat{f}_-(c)}$ . When tractable, this inversion procedure permits estimation of what I term the 'Hartman equivalence' (2021) for details.

lence confidence interval' (Hartman ECI).<sup>3</sup>

**Definition 3.4** (The Hartman Equivalence Confidence Interval). *The researcher wants to find the smallest ratio  $\epsilon^* > 1$  such that one can significantly bound  $\frac{\hat{f}_+(c)}{\hat{f}_-(c)}$  within the range  $[\frac{1}{\epsilon^*}, \epsilon^*]$  at significance level  $\alpha$  using the Hartman test in Definition 3.3. If  $\frac{\hat{f}_+(c)}{\hat{f}_-(c)} < 1$ , then the researcher solves*

$$z_\alpha^* = \frac{\hat{f}_+(c) - \frac{\hat{f}_-(c)}{\epsilon^*}}{\sqrt{\widehat{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) + \frac{1}{(\epsilon^*)^2} \widehat{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c))}} \quad (4)$$

*for  $\epsilon^*$  and selects the smallest  $\epsilon^* > 1$  from among the quadratic solutions. If  $\frac{\hat{f}_+(c)}{\hat{f}_-(c)} > 1$ , then the researcher solves*

$$-z_\alpha^* = \frac{\hat{f}_+(c) - \epsilon^* \hat{f}_-(c)}{\sqrt{\widehat{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) + (\epsilon^*)^2 \widehat{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c))}} \quad (5)$$

*for  $\epsilon^*$  and selects the smallest  $\epsilon^* > 1$  from among the quadratic solutions.*

When the Hartman ECI is tractable, one can conclude that a density discontinuity at the cutoff is practically equal to zero under the Hartman test if and only if  $[\frac{1}{\epsilon^*}, \epsilon^*] \subset [\frac{1}{\epsilon}, \epsilon]$ . Because the Hartman ECI is just an inversion of the Hartman test, this decision rule produces identical conclusions to the Hartman test (conditional on the Hartman ECI being tractable). When defined, Hartman ECIs are asymmetric on the linear scale and symmetric on the logarithmic scale (Hartman 2021). The denominators of the test statistics in Equations 3, 4, and 5 are variants of the asymptotic plug-in variance estimator proposed for `rddensity` by

---

<sup>3</sup>In what follows, for simplicity, I omit the virtually nonexistent case where  $\frac{\hat{f}_+(c)}{\hat{f}_-(c)} = 1$  exactly.



Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma (2020).

The LDD equivalence test that I propose in Section 3.1 improves on the Hartman test in two ways. First, density ratios are only a valid effect size measure if  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  and  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  both exceed zero. This condition should always hold in principle, as  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  and  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  are both point estimates of probability density functions. However, in practice, **rddensity** can frequently produce negative estimates of  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  and/or  $\hat{f}_+(c)$ . As I note in Section 4, **rddensity** yields negative estimates of  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  or  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  for two of the 45 RVs in my replication sample.

**rddensity**'s capacity to produce non-positive probability density estimates is an issue of functional form misspecification. As noted in Section 2, **rddensity** estimates probability density functions using linearly additive polynomial functions of the RV. The resulting misspecification issue is closely related to a well-known problem of 'linear probability models' that regress outcomes bounded between zero and one on continuous predictors: such linear probability models can produce predicted probabilities that are greater than one or less than zero (Horrace & Oaxaca 2006). Though the local linear regression methods employed by **DCdensity** are not immune to this problem, **rddensity** amplifies this issue in its bias correction procedure, which relies on bias estimates from higher-order polynomial specifications (see Cattaneo, Jansson, & Ma 2018; 2020). This can lead to outliers with  $Z$  values far away from  $c$  effectively receiving undue weight in the probability density estimation (see Gelman & Imbens 2018). These properties pose validity challenges to the Hartman test, which relies on **rddensity**. If either  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  or  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  are non-positive, then the point estimate of interest to the Hartman test may be a negative ratio, require division by zero, or arise from comparisons of two negative point estimates that should in principle never be negative.

The LDD equivalence test addresses this issue by using **DCdensity** rather than **rddensity**.

Because `DCdensity`'s  $\hat{\theta}$  estimand is the difference between  $\ln(\hat{f}_+(c))$  and  $\ln(\hat{f}_-(c))$ ,  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  and  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  are both guaranteed to be positive whenever  $\hat{\theta}$  is defined. Further, `DCdensity` approaches bias correction using undersmoothing, avoiding skew and inference issues associated with correcting for bias using estimates produced by higher-order polynomial specifications (McCrary 2008). Section 4 shows empirically that `DCdensity` is less likely than `rddensity` to yield non-positive  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  or  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  estimates.

The second key issue with the Hartman test is that the ‘critical ratio’  $\epsilon^*$  is not always tractable to calculate, even when  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  and  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  are both positive. This issue can arise from one of two scenarios. First, solving Equation 4 or Equation 5 yields quadratic solutions for  $\epsilon^*$ , producing solution candidates of the form

$$\epsilon^* = \frac{-v \pm \sqrt{v^2 - 4uw}}{2u}.$$

Online Appendix A shows that the radicands of these candidates are negative whenever

$$4(z_\alpha^*)^4 \text{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c)) \text{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) > (\hat{f}_-(c))^2 + 4(z_\alpha^*)^2 \hat{f}_+(c) \text{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c)).$$

If this occurs, then no analytic solution for  $\epsilon^*$  exists on the real plane, as solving Equation 4 or Equation 5 for  $\epsilon^*$  then requires taking the square root of a negative number. Second, even for non-negative radicands, there may be no  $\epsilon^*$  candidate that exceeds 1, which is a required property of  $\epsilon^*$  (see Definition 3.4). At times, the absence of an analytically tractable  $\epsilon^* > 1$  can imply that there is no  $\epsilon > 1$  for which one can significantly bound  $\frac{\hat{f}_+(c)}{\hat{f}_-(c)} \in [\frac{1}{\epsilon}, \epsilon]$ .

The LDD equivalence test that I propose in Section 3.1 does not suffer from this property.

Provided that `DCdensity` can produce valid estimates for  $\hat{\theta}$  and  $\text{SE}(\hat{\theta})$ , it is always possible to obtain an ECI from the LDD equivalence test, which implies that one can always find a critical  $\epsilon^*$  for which  $\hat{\theta}$  is significantly bounded within  $[-\ln(\epsilon^*), \ln(\epsilon^*)]$ .

Resultantly, though no valid Hartman ECIs can be defined for many RV density discontinuities, similar issues do not arise for ECIs arising from my LDD equivalence test. As I discuss in Section 4, when RV density discontinuities are computed using local linear regression under `rddensity`, four of the 45 RVs in my replication sample have non-tractable Hartman ECIs. When local quadratic regression is used instead, `rddensity` produces non-tractable Hartman ECIs for seven RVs. However, I show that these tractability issues are completely eliminated for all RVs in my replication sample after switching to the LDD equivalence test.

## 4 Data and Methods

My empirical analysis leverages the replication data from Stommes, Aronow, & Sävje (2023a), who assess the robustness of RDD findings in top political science journals. Stommes, Aronow, & Sävje (2023a) systematically collect all empirical RDD articles published in *American Journal of Political Science*, *American Political Science Review*, and *Journal of Politics* from 2009-2018.<sup>4</sup> They obtain replication data on 36 publications, and make this data available in a Harvard Dataverse repository (Stommes, Aronow, & Sävje 2023b). Some of the publications which Stommes, Aronow, & Sävje (2023a) replicate store data in multiple datasets. I proceed by examining RV density discontinuities at the cutoff for each distinct dataset. This yields 45 RV manipulation tests across 36 RDD publications.

---

<sup>4</sup>One article with available replication data examined by Stommes, Aronow, & Sävje (2023a) is in fact published in print in 2019, but was published online in 2018.

Though my results arise from data on political science publications, my findings are also very relevant for empirical practice in economics. The vast majority of my sample is comprised of data from close election designs, which remain quite popular in economics (see Cunningham 2021). 73% of the RVs in my sample are electoral vote shares, and 75% of the articles in my sample identify causal effects exclusively through the electoral victories that arise when these vote shares cross a given cutoff. Other publications in the sample exploit additional RVs that are popular in economic research, including spatial discontinuities and age discontinuities. In fact, of the 81 publications documented in Lee & Lemieux’s (2010) survey of RDD applications in economics, nearly 42% exploit discontinuities in vote shares, spatial distance, and/or age for identification. Therefore, if robustness checks on the RVs in this sample reveal serious issues, then this raises concerns about the RVs used in many RDD applications in economics.

I estimate each RV density discontinuity in three ways. The first set of results arises from `DCdensity`. The second set is obtained by estimating the RV density discontinuity using `rddensity`, employing local linear estimation to obtain the point estimate and local quadratic estimation to compute the bias correction. The third set of results is again obtained from `rddensity`, but now utilizing local quadratic estimation for the point estimate and local cubic estimation for the bias correction. I restrict `rddensity` estimations to local linear and local quadratic specifications to avoid skew and inference issues that can arise when higher-order polynomials are estimated in RDD settings (see Gelman & Imbens 2018). In all cases, I estimate RV density discontinuities at the cutoff using the default bandwidths computed by each command. Standard errors for `rddensity` are computed using the default jackknife estimator. Though `DCdensity` produces a direct  $\hat{\theta}$  point estimate, I can compute

	Min	P10	P25	P50	P75	P90	Max	Mean	SD	N
$N$	134	257.6	706	1450	21773	114514	517255	41070.333	102542.26	45
$\hat{\theta}$ , DCdensity	-1.141	-0.273	-0.065	0.028	0.237	0.616	1.466	0.077	0.439	45
$ \hat{\theta} $ , DCdensity	0.000	0.012	0.044	0.140	0.375	0.784	1.466	0.279	0.345	45
SE $(\hat{\theta})$ , DCdensity	0.005	0.017	0.040	0.105	0.221	0.369	0.551	0.152	0.142	45
Standard $p$ -value, DCdensity	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.236	0.556	0.824	0.999	0.325	0.334	45
$\epsilon^*$ , DCdensity	1.036	1.085	1.179	1.426	2.015	3.651	8.586	2.001	1.512	45
$\hat{\theta}$ , rddensity, local linear	-2.223	-0.445	-0.103	0.023	0.474	0.785	1.389	0.085	0.576	44
$ \hat{\theta} $ , rddensity, local linear	0.000	0.034	0.064	0.235	0.529	0.822	2.223	0.391	0.427	44
Standard $p$ -value, rddensity, local linear	0.000	0.010	0.102	0.340	0.492	0.791	1.000	0.365	0.295	44
$\epsilon^*$ , rddensity, local linear	1.066	1.112	1.309	1.984	5.028	9.896	45.882	4.887	7.793	41
$\hat{\theta}$ , rddensity, local quadratic	-2.670	-0.308	-0.106	-0.017	0.092	0.514	1.848	-0.002	0.567	44
$ \hat{\theta} $ , rddensity, local quadratic	0.000	0.026	0.061	0.103	0.315	0.608	2.670	0.291	0.485	44
Standard $p$ -value, rddensity, local quadratic	0.000	0.021	0.162	0.558	0.720	0.913	1.000	0.495	0.318	44
$\epsilon^*$ , rddensity, local quadratic	1.114	1.137	1.270	1.511	2.096	3.323	25.390	2.717	4.224	38

*Note:* Summary statistics are computed across the 45 density discontinuities estimated in my replication sample. The  $N$  column denotes the number of RV density discontinuities for which the variable is non-missing.

Table 1: Summary Statistics of Replication Results

an equivalent  $\hat{\theta}$  estimate for **rddensity** from its  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  and  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  outputs using the identity  $\hat{\theta} \equiv \ln(\hat{f}_+(c)) - \ln(\hat{f}_-(c))$ , provided that **rddensity** produces non-negative  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  and  $\hat{f}_+(c)$ . I drop any **rddensity** estimates for which either  $\hat{f}_-(c) \leq 0$  or  $\hat{f}_+(c) \leq 0$ . All estimates are computed in R.

Table 1 displays summary statistics of the results from my replications. Summary statistics are only calculated for 44 of the 45 discontinuities in my sample for variables concerning **rddensity**. This is because both local linear and local quadratic estimates from **rddensity** yield non-positive estimates for either  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  or  $\hat{f}_+(c)$  on one RV in the sample.

Sample sizes for the RVs themselves appear to be reasonably large. The median sample size  $N$  is 1450, and all RVs possess at least 134 observations. The mean of sample sizes is right-skewed by very large sample sizes near the top of  $N$ 's distribution. This implies that in principle, most of the RV manipulation tests I perform should not be severely underpowered.

Some of the RV density discontinuities in this sample would be deemed significant by standard testing frameworks. Standard  $p$ -values are computed directly by **DCdensity** and

`rddensity` using tests of the form in Equation 1. `rddensity` produces standard  $p$ -values beneath 5% for 15.6% of RV density discontinuities using local linear estimation, and for 11.1% of RV density discontinuities using local quadratic estimation. `DCdensity` estimates standard  $p$ -values below 5% for 37.8% of RV density discontinuities.

Examining the observation counts for  $\epsilon^*$  across each of the three testing frameworks makes the Hartman ECI’s tractability issues apparent. As discussed in Section 3.3, when `rddensity`’s point estimates are computed using local linear (local quadratic) estimation, four (seven) RVs do not produce tractable Hartman ECIs. These cases arise either due to tractability failures of the Hartman ECI or because `rddensity` yields non-positive estimates for either  $\hat{f}_-(c)$  or  $\hat{f}_+(c)$ .

I conduct equivalence testing for each RV density discontinuity by assessing whether there is statistically significant evidence (at  $\alpha = 0.05$ ) that  $\hat{\theta} \in [-\ln(1.5), \ln(1.5)]$ . This functionally assesses whether each RV density discontinuity can be significantly bounded beneath a 50% upward jump (or equivalently, a 33.3% downward jump). I conduct this testing using the LDD equivalence test outlined in Definition 3.1 for the estimates derived from `DCdensity`, and do so using the Hartman test in Definition 3.3 for the estimates obtained from `rddensity`. In the terminology of these tests, I effectively set the threshold  $\epsilon = 1.5$ .

I select  $\epsilon = 1.5$  as my benchmark right-to-left density ratio for three reasons. First, Chen, Cohen, & Chen (2010) provide evidence from the epidemiology literature that an odds ratio of 1.5 corresponds closely to a Cohen’s  $d$  value of 0.2, which is a small effect size per Cohen (1988). Setting  $\epsilon = 1.5$  thus effectively assesses whether RV density discontinuities can be bounded beneath sizes typically judged to be small in the social sciences. Second, this follows the practice of Hartman (2021), who uses this threshold in her re-analysis of the vote share


RVs constructed in Eggers et al. (2015). Third and finally, most people would likely find a 50% upward jump to be a large discontinuity in practical settings. For example, voters would likely and rightfully be concerned about election results where the number of politicians just above the winning vote cutoff is 50% higher than the number of politicians just below.

It should be easy to show that density discontinuities at the cutoff for RVs used for causal identification in RDD publications can be significantly bounded beneath a 50% upward jump, especially in high-caliber journals such as those sampled by Stommes, Aronow, & Sävje (2023a). If this condition holds for a given RV, then this RV ‘passes’ my lenient benchmark equivalence test. I compute the proportion of RVs that ‘fail’ this benchmark equivalence test, which I term the equivalence testing ‘failure rate’ (see also Fitzgerald 2024). I compute this failure rate at two levels. The RV-level failure rate is just the proportion of all RVs that fail the equivalence test. The article-level failure rate is obtained by first computing the RV-level failure rate *within* each article, and then calculating the average within-article failure rate *across* articles. I estimate precision by computing the standard errors of these means.

## 5 Results

### 5.1 Equivalence Testing Failure Rates

In my sample, equivalence testing failure rates for RV density discontinuities at the cutoff are quite high. Figure 1 displays the main failure rate estimates, and Online Appendix Table A1 provides a table version of these results. These equivalence testing failure rates range from 44.4-82.1%. To provide a sense of interpretation, Model 1 in Figure 1 implies that in



*Note:* Equivalence testing failure rates at a 5% significance level with  $\epsilon = 1.5$  are provided along with 90% and 95% confidence intervals based on the standard error of the mean. Equivalence tests are conducted using the LDD equivalence test in Definition 3.1 for results from `DCdensity` and using the Hartman test in Definition 3.3 for results from `rddensity`.

Figure 1: Main Failure Rate Estimates

my sample, 44.4% of RV density discontinuities at the cutoff cannot be significantly bounded beneath a 50% upward jump. This implies that treatment effects estimated by RDDs that exploit the RVs in my sample may in many cases be confounded by meaningful endogenous RV manipulation near the cutoff, and there is no reliable evidence to reassure researchers that such manipulation does not occur.

These results cannot be explained by the choice of aggregation procedure; both RV-level and article-level failure rates are persistently significant. The results also cannot be explained away by the specific testing procedure employed. Equivalence testing failure rates remain significant regardless of whether logarithmic density discontinuities are estimated by `DCdensity` or `rddensity`, and regardless of whether local linear or local quadratic estimation is used to estimate the RV density discontinuity in `rddensity`.




Because these dimensions do not impact the significance of my main equivalence testing failure rate estimates, I primarily preference logarithmic RV density discontinuities arising from `DCdensity` in my discussion of results. I make this choice for two reasons. First, the RV-level failure rates arising from `DCdensity` are the smallest of my main failure rate estimates. Therefore, Model 1’s estimates are the most robust in Figure 1 given my general findings about the severe magnitude of equivalence testing failure rates. Second, as discussed in Section 2, `DCdensity` produces a standard error for logarithmic density discontinuities, whereas this is not true for `rddensity`; the failure rates displayed in Figure 1 must be computed using the Hartman test (see Section 3.3). This point gains heightened importance when I compute meta-analytic estimates for logarithmic RV density discontinuities in Section 5.3.

## 5.2 Failure Curves

My large equivalence testing failure rate estimates cannot be explained by my choice of maximal acceptable right-to-left density ratio  $\epsilon$ . Figure 2 displays ‘failure curves’, which show the distribution of RV-level equivalence testing failure rates across different  $\epsilon$  thresholds and testing procedures (see also Fitzgerald 2024). The shapes of the failure curves reflect the fact that equivalence testing failure rates decline when one is willing to tolerate larger RV density discontinuities at the cutoff. The failure curves for the Hartman test stochastically dominate the failure curve for the LDD equivalence test, implying that equivalence testing failure rates are uniformly higher for the Hartman test in this sample.

The failure curves in Figure 2 show that in my sample, equivalence testing failure rates for RV manipulation tests remain significantly above nominal levels even as the  $\epsilon$  threshold



Test ■ DCdensity ■ rddensity, local linear ■ rddensity, local quadratic

*Note:* Failure curves are displayed with uncertainty bands representing 95% confidence intervals of RV-level equivalence testing failure rates, based on the standard error of the mean. The black and gray dashed horizontal lines respectively denote 0% and 5% failure rates.

Figure 2: Failure Curves for Different Testing Procedures

is allowed to grow exceedingly large. Consider the RV density discontinuity that one would need to tolerate in order to obtain equivalence testing failure rates beneath a traditional 5% rate. The horizontal dashed line in Figure 2 denotes a 5% equivalence testing failure rate; the failure curve for DCdensity only crosses this line when  $\epsilon = 4.509$ . This implies that in order to obtain equivalence testing failure rates beneath 5%, one must be willing to claim that a right-to-left density ratio of  $\epsilon = 4.509$  is practically equal to 1. This is identical to arguing that a 350.9% upward jump in RV density at the cutoff is practically equal to zero. Because such an argument is ludicrous, a more reasonable alternative conclusion emerges: RV manipulation near the cutoff cannot be reliably bounded beneath reasonable thresholds for a substantial proportion of RVs used in RDD analyses published in top political science journals.

### 5.3 Meta-Analytic Results


How large is the average RV density jump at the cutoff? To examine this question, I obtain a meta-analytic estimate of *absolute* logarithmic RV density discontinuities, utilizing LDD estimates  $\hat{\theta}$  and their standard errors  $\text{SE}(\hat{\theta})$  from `DCdensity`. I focus on absolute LDDs rather than raw LDDs because RV manipulation in either direction of the cutoff raises concerns about treatment effects estimated by RDD.

I compute my meta-analytic estimate using an unrestricted weighted least squares approach (Stanley et al. 2023). Let  $i$  index a given RV. This approach employs a regression of the form

$$\frac{|\hat{\theta}_i|}{\text{SE}(\hat{\theta}_i)} = \beta \frac{1}{\text{SE}(\hat{\theta}_i)} + \mu_i,$$

where  $\beta$  is the meta-analytic estimate of interest. In this setting,  $\beta$  is equivalent to a weighted average of effect sizes  $|\hat{\theta}_i|$ , where the weights are given by  $\left(\text{SE}(\hat{\theta}_i)\right)^{-2}$  (Stanley et al. 2023). This reflects the fact that unrestricted weighted least squares gives more weight to more precise estimates, which gives the procedure strong empirical advantages over other meta-analytic estimation methods such as random effects estimation (see Stanley et al. 2023).

Figure 3 displays the meta-analytic absolute LDD estimate, along with absolute LDDs at the cutoff for each RV examined in my sample. The meta-analytic estimate for  $|\hat{\theta}| = 0.233$ , with a standard error  $\text{SE}(|\hat{\theta}|) = 0.025$ . This estimate implies that the meta-analytic average RV density discontinuity at the cutoff is equivalent to a 26.2% upward jump. This average discontinuity is precisely estimated, and is quite significantly bounded beneath a threshold of  $\ln(1.5)$ . However, as aforementioned in Section 4, I select this threshold in part because it is



### Absolute Logarithmic RV Density Discontinuity at the Cutoff

*Note:* Above the black horizontal line, absolute logarithmic RV density discontinuities at the cutoff are displayed for each of the 45 RVs in my sample, along with 90% and 95% confidence intervals. The meta-analytic estimate is displayed below the black horizontal line. Dashed vertical black and gray lines respectively denote zero and  $\ln(1.5)$ . Logarithmic RV density discontinuities are estimated using `DCdensity`.

Figure 3: Meta-Analytic Estimates

particularly large, and would raise valid manipulation concerns in research-relevant settings such as elections. For many RDD applications, researchers may have good reason to be wary of RV manipulation of the magnitude demonstrated in Figure 3.

## 6 Conclusion

I introduce several equivalence-based RV manipulation tests for RDD applications. In a large sample of RDD publications in top political science journals, I find that RVs often fail lenient versions of these tests. Over 44% of RVs in these publications have density discontinuities at the cutoff that cannot be significantly bounded beneath a 50% upward jump. Bringing equivalence testing failure rates beneath 5% requires arguing that upward RV density jumps of 350% are practically equal to zero, and meta-analytic estimates even suggest an average upward RV density jump of 26% at the cutoff. These results suggest that many RVs used in RDD research may exhibit meaningful manipulation near the cutoff that standard testing procedures cannot detect. Therefore, in many RDD publications, treatment effect confounding from RV manipulation near the cutoff cannot be reliably ruled out.

Because these findings make clear that equivalence-based procedures are needed for RV manipulation testing in RDD, I conclude by offering guidelines on how such testing can be done credibly. Perhaps the most important question is the maximally acceptable right-to-left ratio  $\epsilon$  between RV density limits at the cutoff. This threshold is ultimately a subjective judgment call, and will differ for different research settings. Thus though benchmark thresholds are useful in meta-analytic work that examines research across an entire field, the same cannot be said for individual RDD applications. The  $\epsilon = 1.5$  threshold that I use in this paper is by no means a universal benchmark for all studies, and is selected for this analysis in part because it represents a discontinuity that would be seen as very large in practice (see Section 4). I therefore recommend setting  $\epsilon$  idiosyncratically for each unique research setting, rather than relying on disciplinary benchmark thresholds.

Credible equivalence testing depends on the threshold  $\epsilon$  being set independently to avoid  $p$ -hacking. To that end, I recommend that researchers aggregate  $\epsilon$  by surveying other experts for their judgments of the largest percentage upward jump in RV density at the cutoff that they would consider to be practically equal to zero. Online platforms such as the Social Science Prediction Platform (DellaVigna, Pope, & Vivaldi 2019) possess centralized pools of researchers who can offer their judgments and predictions on the RV density discontinuity that will be observed at a given cutoff. If the research setting is highly idiosyncratic and requires specialized field knowledge for reasonably accurate predictions and judgments, then it may be reasonable to use the platform’s email list feature to invite specific groups of researchers with specialized field expertise to offer their predictions and judgments. Though researchers may reasonably consider such a survey to be too much of a time and effort investment to elicit a threshold for a robustness check, eliciting predictions and judgments on RV density discontinuities can be naturally coupled with eliciting predictions and judgments on the primary treatment effect(s) of interest, which can yield a myriad of useful insights (see DellaVigna, Pope, & Vivaldi 2019).

Once a maximally acceptable right-to-left density ratio  $\epsilon$  is set, I recommend using my proposed logarithmic density discontinuity equivalence testing approach to assess whether the right-to-left ratio of density estimates on each side of the cutoff can be significantly bounded beneath  $\epsilon$  (see Section 3.1). I recommend using this approach, rather than combining `rddensity` with the Hartman test, to avoid invalid non-positive density estimates that can emerge from `rddensity` and intractable test results that can arise from the Hartman test (see Section 3.3 and Section 4). My recommended procedure can be implemented using the `lddtest` Stata command or the `lddtest` command in the `eqtesting` R package. Both the

`eqtesting` R package and the `lddtest` Stata command are available for download from Github, and Section 3.2 provides download instructions.

In the event that my testing procedures do not yield statistically significant evidence that RV manipulation near the cutoff is negligible, I recommend that researchers employ alternative procedures to assess the robustness of their estimates to RV manipulation. Specifically, in this case, I recommend that researchers use the `rdbounds` procedure in Stata and R developed by Gerard, Rokkanen, & Rothe (2020), which partially identifies local average treatment effects in RDD settings with RV manipulation at the cutoff. Because significant evidence of negligible RV manipulation is neither strictly necessary nor sufficient to ensure that research conclusions arising from RDD are robust to RV manipulation, it may also be reasonable for researchers to abandon RV manipulation testing entirely, instead simply assessing whether their original RDD estimates yield the same research conclusions as those arising from the `rdbounds` procedure.

## 7 Declaration of Interest

I am grateful to the Amsterdam Law and Behavior Institute for PhD funding. I currently hold a 12-month term as a member of the Superforecaster Panel for the Social Science Prediction Platform (SSPP; see DellaVigna, Pope, & Vivaldi 2019). The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily represent the views of the SSPP, or of the researchers who created and/or operate the SSPP. This project has approval from the Ethical Review Board of Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam’s School of Business and Economics.

## References

- Altman, D. G. and J. M. Bland (Aug. 1995). “Statistics notes: Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence”. *BMJ* 311.7003, pp. 485–485. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.311.7003.485.
- Athey, Susan and Guido W. Imbens (May 2017). “The state of applied econometrics: Causality and policy evaluation”. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31.2, pp. 3–32. DOI: 10.1257/jep.31.2.3.
- Berger, Roger L. and Jason C. Hsu (Nov. 1996). “Bioequivalence trials, intersection-union tests and equivalence confidence sets”. *Statistical Science* 11.4. DOI: 10.1214/ss/1032280304.
- Bugni, Federico A. and Ivan A. Canay (Mar. 2021). “Testing continuity of a density via  $g$ -order statistics in the regression discontinuity design”. *Journal of Econometrics* 221.1, pp. 138–159. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.02.004.
- Cattaneo, Matias D., Michael Jansson, and Xinwei Ma (Mar. 2018). “Manipulation testing based on density discontinuity”. *The Stata Journal* 18.1, pp. 234–261. DOI: 10.1177/1536867x1801800115.
- (Sept. 2020). “Simple local polynomial density estimators”. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 115.531, pp. 1449–1455. DOI: 10.1080/01621459.2019.1635480.
- Chen, Henian, Patricia Cohen, and Sophie Chen (Apr. 2010). “How big is a big odds ratio? Interpreting the magnitudes of odds ratios in epidemiological studies”. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation* 39.4, pp. 860–864. DOI: 10.1080/03610911003650383.



- Cohen, Jack (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. 2nd ed. L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Cunningham, Scott (Aug. 2021). *Causal inference: The mixtape*. 1st ed. Yale University Press.
- DellaVigna, Stefano, Devin Pope, and Eva Vivaldi (Oct. 2019). “Predict science to improve science”. *Science* 366.6464, pp. 428–429. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaz1704.
- Detle, Holger and Martin Schumann (Feb. 2024). “Testing for equivalence of pre-trends in difference-in-differences estimation”. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* Forthcoming. DOI: 10.1080/07350015.2024.2308121.
- Dimmery, Drew (Mar. 2016). *rdd: Regression discontinuity estimation*. DOI: 10.32614/CRAN.package.rdd.
- Dreber, Anna, Magnus Johannesson, and Yifan Yang (Mar. 2024). “Selective reporting of placebo tests in top economics journals”. *Economic Inquiry* Forthcoming. DOI: 10.1111/ecin.13217.
- Eggers, Andrew C. et al. (Jan. 2015). “On the validity of the regression discontinuity design for estimating electoral effects: New evidence from over 40,000 close races”. *American Journal of Political Science* 59.1, pp. 259–274. DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12127.
- Fitzgerald, Jack (May 2024). *The need for equivalence testing in economics*. Institute for Replication Discussion Paper Series No. 125. URL: <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/296190>.
- Frandsen, Brigham R. (May 2017). “Party bias in union representation elections: Testing for manipulation in the regression discontinuity design when the running variable is discrete”. *Advances in Econometrics* 38, pp. 281–315. DOI: 10.1108/s0731-905320170000038012.

- Gelman, Andrew and Guido Imbens (July 2018). “Why high-order polynomials should not be used in regression discontinuity designs”. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 37.3, pp. 447–456. DOI: 10.1080/07350015.2017.1366909.
- Gerard, François, Miikka Rokkanen, and Christoph Rothe (July 2020). “Bounds on treatment effects in regression discontinuity designs with a manipulated running variable”. *Quantitative Economics* 11.3, pp. 839–870. DOI: 10.3982/qe1079.
- Gopalan, Maithreyi, Kelly Rosinger, and Jee Bin Ahn (Mar. 2020). “Use of quasi-experimental research designs in education research: Growth, promise, and challenges”. *Review of Research in Education* 44.1, pp. 218–243. DOI: 10.3102/0091732x20903302.
- Hartman, Erin (Oct. 2021). “Equivalence testing for regression discontinuity designs”. *Political Analysis* 29.4, pp. 505–521. DOI: 10.1017/pan.2020.43.
- Hartman, Erin and F. Daniel Hidalgo (Oct. 2018). “An equivalence approach to balance and placebo tests”. *American Journal of Political Science* 62.4, pp. 1000–1013. DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12387.
- Horrace, William C. and Ronald L. Oaxaca (Mar. 2006). “Results on the bias and inconsistency of ordinary least squares for the linear probability model”. *Economics Letters* 90.3, pp. 321–327. DOI: 10.1016/j.econlet.2005.08.024.
- Huntington-Klein, Nick (Aug. 2022). *The effect: An introduction to research design and causality*. 1st ed. CRC Press.
- Igarashi, Gaku (Nov. 2023). “A nonparametric discontinuity test of density using a beta kernel”. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* 35.2, pp. 323–354. DOI: 10.1080/10485252.2022.2150766.

- Imai, Kosuke, Gary King, and Elizabeth A. Stuart (Apr. 2008). “Misunderstandings between experimentalists and observationalists about causal inference”. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* 171.2, pp. 481–502. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-985x.2007.00527.x.
- Imbens, Guido W and Jeffrey M Wooldridge (Mar. 2009). “Recent developments in the econometrics of program evaluation”. *Journal of Economic Literature* 47.1, pp. 5–86. DOI: 10.1257/jel.47.1.5.
- Imbens, Guido W. (Apr. 2024). “Causal inference in the social sciences”. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* 11.1, pp. 123–152. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-statistics-033121-114601.
- Lakens, Daniël, Anne M. Scheel, and Peder M. Isager (June 2018). “Equivalence testing for psychological research: A tutorial”. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science* 1.2, pp. 259–269. DOI: 10.1177/2515245918770963.
- Lee, David S and Thomas Lemieux (June 2010). “Regression discontinuity designs in economics”. *Journal of Economic Literature* 48.2, pp. 281–355. DOI: 10.1257/jel.48.2.281.
- Ma, Jun, Hugo Jales, and Zhengfei Yu (July 2020). “Minimum contrast empirical likelihood inference of discontinuity in density”. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 38.4, pp. 934–950. DOI: 10.1080/07350015.2019.1617155.
- McCrary, Justin (Feb. 2008). “Manipulation of the running variable in the regression discontinuity design: A density test”. *Journal of Econometrics* 142.2, pp. 698–714. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2007.05.005.

- Otsu, Taisuke, Ke-Li Xu, and Yukitoshi Matsushita (Oct. 2013). “Estimation and inference of discontinuity in density”. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 31.4, pp. 507–524. DOI: 10.1080/07350015.2013.818007.
- Piaggio, Gilda et al. (Dec. 2012). “Reporting of noninferiority and equivalence randomized trials”. *JAMA* 308.24, pp. 2594–2604. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2012.87802.
- Samii, Cyrus (July 2016). “Causal empiricism in quantitative research”. *The Journal of Politics* 78.3, pp. 941–955. DOI: 10.1086/686690.
- Schuirmann, Donald J. (Dec. 1987). “A comparison of the two one-sided tests procedure and the power approach for assessing the equivalence of average bioavailability”. *Journal of Pharmacokinetics and Biopharmaceutics* 15.6, pp. 657–680. DOI: 10.1007/bf01068419.
- Stanley, T.D. et al. (May 2023). “Unrestricted weighted least squares represent medical research better than random effects in 67,308 Cochrane Meta-analyses”. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 157, pp. 53–58. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2023.03.004.
- Stommes, Drew, P. M. Aronow, and Fredrik Sävje (Apr. 2023a). “On the reliability of published findings using the regression discontinuity design in political science”. *Research & Politics* 10.2, p. 205316802311664. DOI: 10.1177/20531680231166457.
- (Mar. 2023b). *Replication Data for: On the reliability of published findings using the regression discontinuity design in political science*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/XT15Y0.

# Online Appendix

## A Quadratic Solutions and Hartman ECI Intractability

Per Definition 3.4, if  $\hat{f}_+(c) < \hat{f}_-(c)$ , then computing the Hartman ECI requires solving

$$z_\alpha^* = \frac{\hat{f}_+(c) - \frac{\hat{f}_-(c)}{\epsilon^*}}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) + \frac{1}{(\epsilon^*)^2} \text{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c))}}$$

for  $\epsilon^*$ . After simplification, this resolves to

$$\left[ \text{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c)) (z_\alpha^*)^2 \right] (\epsilon^*)^2 + \left[ \hat{f}_-(c) \right] \epsilon + \left[ \text{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) (z_\alpha^*)^2 - \hat{f}_+(c) \right] = 0. \quad (\text{A1})$$

This equation has a quadratic solution:

$$\epsilon^* = \frac{-\hat{f}_-(c) \pm \sqrt{\left( \hat{f}_-(c) \right)^2 - 4 (z_\alpha^*)^4 \text{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c)) \text{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) + 4 (z_\alpha^*)^2 \hat{f}_+(c) \text{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c))}}{2 (z_\alpha^*)^2 \text{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) - 2 \hat{f}_+(c)}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

In contrast, if  $\hat{f}_+(c) > \hat{f}_-(c)$ , then computing the Hartman ECI requires solving

$$-z_\alpha^* = \frac{\hat{f}_+(c) - \epsilon^* \hat{f}_-(c)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) + (\epsilon^*)^2 \text{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c))}}$$

for  $\epsilon^*$ . After simplification, one obtains

$$\left[ \text{Var}(\hat{f}_+(c)) (z_\alpha^*)^2 - \hat{f}_+(c) \right] (\epsilon^*)^2 + \left[ \hat{f}_-(c) \right] \epsilon + \left[ \text{Var}(\hat{f}_-(c)) (z_\alpha^*)^2 \right] = 0. \quad (\text{A3})$$

This equation also has a quadratic solution:

$$\epsilon^* = \frac{-\hat{f}_-(c) \pm \sqrt{\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right)^2 - 4(z_\alpha^*)^4 \text{Var}\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right) \text{Var}\left(\hat{f}_+(c)\right) + 4(z_\alpha^*)^2 \hat{f}_+(c) \text{Var}\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right)}}{2(z_\alpha^*)^2 \text{Var}\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right)}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Notice that the radicands of the quadratic solutions in Equations A2 and A4 are equivalent and equal

$$\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right)^2 - 4(z_\alpha^*)^4 \text{Var}\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right) \text{Var}\left(\hat{f}_+(c)\right) + 4(z_\alpha^*)^2 \hat{f}_+(c) \text{Var}\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right).$$

This arises because for a quadratic equation of the form

$$\epsilon^* = \frac{-v \pm \sqrt{v^2 - 4uw}}{2u},$$

$v$  is equivalent between Equations A1 and A3; specifically,  $v = \hat{f}_-(c)$ . These two equations also share  $u$  and  $w$  terms that change positions between equations. Thus the radicands of both Equation A2 and Equation A4 turn negative whenever

$$4uw > v^2$$

$$4(z_\alpha^*)^4 \text{Var}\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right) \text{Var}\left(\hat{f}_+(c)\right) > \left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right)^2 + 4(z_\alpha^*)^2 \hat{f}_+(c) \text{Var}\left(\hat{f}_-(c)\right).$$

# B Appendix Tables

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Failure Rate	0.444 (0.075)	0.75 (0.066)	0.636 (0.073)	0.549 (0.082)	0.569 (0.083)	0.821 (0.063)
Aggregation Level	RV	RV	RV	Article	Article	Article
Effect Size Measure	DCdensity	rddensity	rddensity	DCdensity	rddensity	rddensity
Estimation Type		Local Linear	Local Quadratic		Local Quadratic	Local Quadratic

*Note:* This table provides the numerical estimates displayed in Figure 1.

Table A1: Main Failure Rate Estimates