

# Online Appendix

## A Systematic Review Process

My initial sample consists of all articles registered in Web of Science as published in a Top 5 economics journal (specifically *American Economic Review*, *Econometrica*, *Journal of Political Economy*, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, and *Review of Economic Studies*) from 2015 onwards. I obtained bibliographic information on this initial set of 3732 articles, including digital object identifiers (DOIs), titles, and abstracts from Web of Science on 28 July 2023. This bibliographic information is then loaded into ASReview, an interface that employs machine learning and text classification to assist with managing systematic literature reviews by sorting abstracts from most to least relevant (van de Schoot et al. 2021). I then manually reviewed the abstracts, classifying them as relevant if the abstract makes some claim that a phenomenon or relationship is either negligible or nonexistent. After reviewing 2987 abstracts, 50 consecutive abstracts were assessed to be irrelevant, and thus the remaining 745 articles are discarded as irrelevant based on ASReview’s relevance probability ranking.<sup>1</sup> The abstract reviews yield 603 potentially relevant records, at which point all articles published prior to 2020 are discarded, ensuring the sample reflects only the most recent practice in the economics literature and has the highest probability of reproducibility while still keeping the number of (attempted) reproductions down to a practically feasible level.<sup>2</sup> 287 potentially relevant articles published from 2020-2023 arise from this first phase of the systematic search.

I then examine the abstracts of each of these 287 potentially relevant articles, isolating every null claim made in each abstract and discarding an article if, upon

---

<sup>1</sup>This is an intended feature of ASReview – the probability ranking permits early cessation of the review process with a strong reassurance that the most relevant articles still remain in the sample (van de Schoot et al. 2021).

<sup>2</sup>The additional articles from 2015-2019 help ensure the quality of the relevance probability ranking, and thus the irrelevance of discarded articles.

further inspection, its abstract does not in fact make an identifiable null claim. This step produces 556 null claims across 285 articles. For each of these null claims, I attempt to locate the model(s) used to support that claim within the article. I discard a claim if it is not defended by at least one statistically insignificant model, otherwise storing the main model(s) being used to defend that claim. I discard articles if no null claims remain after this discarding process. This step yields my intermediate sample of 2346 models across 279 claims in 158 articles. Thereafter, I attempt to reproduce every model in the intermediate sample. Models are discarded when data is not available for reproduction or the reproduction is not conformable to my final analysis. After such discarding, my final sample consists of 876 models across 135 null claims in 81 articles.

## B Final Sample

All publications included in the final sample are cited in these references. All publications in the final sample also are part of the intermediate sample. These references also cite repositories wherein the data for the final sample’s articles are stored, when applicable. Data for articles without a separate repository is linked to the online version of the article itself. Bagues & Campa (2020), which is in the final sample, makes use of data from Casas-Arce & Saiz (2015), which is not in the final sample. Historical datasets in Bureau of Labor Statistics (2022) are cited at the direction of Gertler, Huckfeldt, & Trigari (2020).

## References

- Abebe, Girum et al. (2021). “Anonymity or distance? job search and labour market exclusion in a growing African city”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 88.3, pp. 1279–1310. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdaa057.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Giuseppe De Feo, Giacomo De Luca, et al. (2021). *Replication data for: War, socialism, and the rise of fascism: An empirical exploration*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/CLJTSC.
- (2022). “War, socialism, and the rise of fascism: An empirical exploration”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.2, pp. 1233–1296. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac001.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Giuseppe De Feo, and Giacomo Davide De Luca (2020). “Weak states: Causes and consequences of the Sicilian mafia”. *The Review of Economic Studies*, pp. 537–581. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdz009.
- Ager, Philipp, Leah Boustan, and Katherine Eriksson (2021a). *Data and code for: The intergenerational effects of a large wealth shock: White Southerners after the Civil War*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E138741V1.

- Ager, Philipp, Leah Boustan, and Katherine Eriksson (2021b). “The intergenerational effects of a large wealth shock: White Southerners after the Civil War”. *American Economic Review* 111.11, pp. 3767–3794. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20191422.
- Akhtari, Mitra, Diana Moreira, and Laura Trucco (2022). “Political turnover, bureaucratic turnover, and the quality of public services”. *American Economic Review* 112.2, pp. 442–493. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20171867.
- Alesina, Alberto, Armando Miano, and Stefanie Stantcheva (2022). *Replication package for Immigration and redistribution*. Dataset V1. Geneva, Switzerland: Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.5997521.
- (2023). “Immigration and redistribution”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 90.1, pp. 1–39. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdac011.
- Almås, Ingvild, Alexander W. Cappelen, and Bertil Tungodden (2020). “Cutthroat capitalism versus cuddly socialism: Are Americans more meritocratic and efficiency-seeking than Scandinavians?” *Journal of Political Economy* 128.5, pp. 1753–1788. DOI: 10.1086/705551.
- Andrabi, Tahir et al. (2020a). *Data and code for: Upping the ante: The equilibrium effects of unconditional grants to private schools*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E118805V1.
- (2020b). “Upping the ante: The equilibrium effects of unconditional grants to private schools”. *American Economic Review* 110.10, pp. 3315–3349. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20180924.
- Arbatli, Cemal Eren et al. (2020). “Diversity and conflict”. *Econometrica* 88.2, pp. 727–797. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA13734.
- Asher, Sam and Paul Novosad (2020a). *Data and code for: Rural roads and local economic development*. Dataset V2. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E109703V2.

- Asher, Sam and Paul Novosad (2020b). “Rural roads and local economic development”. *American Economic Review* 110.3, pp. 797–823. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20180268.
- Ashraf, Nava, Oriana Bandiera, Edward Davenport, et al. (2020). “Losing prosociality in the quest for talent? Sorting, selection, and productivity in the delivery of public services”. *American Economic Review* 110.5, pp. 1355–1394. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20180326.
- Ashraf, Nava, Oriana Bandiera, Scott S. Lee, et al. (2020). *Data and code for: Losing prosociality in the quest for talent*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E111683V1.
- Ashraf, Nava, Natalie Bau, Corinne Low, et al. (2019). *Replication data for: ‘Negotiating a better future: How interpersonal skills facilitate intergenerational investment’*. Dataset V3. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/IJE4RJ.
- (2020). “Negotiating a better future: How interpersonal skills facilitate intergenerational investment”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135.2, pp. 1095–1151. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjz039.
- Ashraf, Nava, Natalie Bau, Nathan Nunn, et al. (2020). “Bride price and female education”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.2, pp. 591–641. DOI: 10.1086/704572.
- Attanasio, Orazio and Elena Pastorino (2020). “Nonlinear pricing in village economies”. *Econometrica* 88.1, pp. 207–263. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA13918.
- Bagues, Manuel and Pamela Campa (2020). “Women and power: Unpopular, unwilling, or held back? A comment”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.5, pp. 2010–2016. DOI: 10.1086/705669.

- Balán, Pablo et al. (2022). “Local elites as state capacity: How city chiefs use local information to increase tax compliance in the Democratic Republic of the Congo”. *American Economic Review* 112.3, pp. 762–797. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20201159.
- Bandiera, Oriana et al. (2021a). *Replication data for: ‘The allocation of authority in organizations: A field experiment with bureaucrats’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/OJQW02.
- (2021b). “The allocation of authority in organizations: A field experiment with bureaucrats”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.4, pp. 2195–2242. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjab029.
- Bazzi, Samuel, Gabriel Koehler-Derrick, and Benjamin Marx (2019). *Replication data for: ‘The institutional foundations of religious politics: Evidence from Indonesia’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/OY4SM9.
- (2020). “The institutional foundations of religious politics: Evidence from Indonesia”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135.2, pp. 845–911. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjz038.
- Becker, Sascha O. et al. (2020a). *Data and code for: Forced migration and human capital: Evidence from post-WWII population transfers*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E115202V1.
- (2020b). “Forced migration and human capital: Evidence from post-WWII population transfers”. *American Economic Review* 110.5, pp. 1430–1463. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20181518.
- Beraja, Martin et al. (2023a). “AI-tocracy”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.3, pp. 1349–1402. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjad012.
- (2023b). *Replication data for: ‘AI-tocracy’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/GCOVGX.

- Bergquist, Lauren Falcao and Michael Dinerstein (2020a). “Competition and entry in agricultural markets: Experimental evidence from Kenya”. *American Economic Review* 110.12, pp. 3705–3747. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20171397.
- (2020b). *Data and code for: Competition and entry in agricultural markets: Experimental evidence from Kenya*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E119743V1.
- Berkouwer, Susanna B. and Joshua T. Dean (2022a). “Credit, attention, and externalities in the adoption of energy efficient technologies by low-income households”. *American Economic Review* 112.10, pp. 3291–3330. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20210766.
- (2022b). *Data and code for: Credit, attention, and externalities in the adoption of energy efficient technologies by low-income household*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E166661V1.
- Bessone, Pedro et al. (2021). “The economic consequences of increasing sleep among the urban poor”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.3, pp. 1887–1941. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjab013.
- Blakeslee, David, Ram Fishman, and Veena Srinivasan (2020a). *Replication package for: Way down in the hole: Adaptation to long-term water loss in rural India*. Dataset V1. Nashville, TN, U.S.A.: American Economic Association. URL: <https://www.aeaweb.org/journals/dataset?id=10.1257/aer.20180976>.
- (2020b). “Way down in the hole: Adaptation to long-term water loss in rural India”. *American Economic Review* 110.1, pp. 200–224. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20180976.
- Bold, Tessa et al. (2022a). *Data and code for: Market access and quality upgrading: Evidence from four field experiments*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E158401V1.

- Bold, Tessa et al. (Aug. 2022b). “Market access and quality upgrading: Evidence from four field experiments”. *American Economic Review* 112.8, pp. 2518–2552. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20210122.
- Breza, Emily, Supreet Kaur, and Yogita Shamdasani (2021a). *Data and code for: Labor rationing*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E141441V1.
- (2021b). “Labor rationing”. *American Economic Review* 111.10, pp. 3184–3224. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20201385.
- Brocas, Isabelle and Juan D. Carrillo (2021). “Steps of reasoning in children and adolescents”. *Journal of Political Economy* 129.7, pp. 2067–2111. DOI: 10.1086/714118.
- (2024). “Steps of reasoning in children and adolescents”. Dataset 695096b. San Francisco, CA, U.S.A.: Github. URL: [https://github.com/labelinstitute/dev\\_DM/tree/main/Levels](https://github.com/labelinstitute/dev_DM/tree/main/Levels).
- Brodeur, Abel, Nikolai Cook, and Anthony Heyes (2020). “Methods matter: *p*-hacking and publication bias in causal analysis in economics”. *American Economic Review* 110.11, pp. 3634–3660. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20190687.
- (2022). *Data and code for: Methods matter: P-hacking and publication bias in causal analysis in economics*. Dataset V2. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E120246V1.
- Brownback, Andy and Sally Sadoff (2020). “Improving college instruction through incentives”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.8, pp. 2925–2972. DOI: 10.1086/707025.
- Bryan, Gharad, James J. Choi, and Dean Karlan (2020). *Replication data for: ‘Randomizing religion: The impact of Protestant evangelism on economic outcomes’*. Dataset V3. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/RNGHDV.



- Bryan, Gharad, James J. Choi, and Dean Karlan (2021). “Randomizing religion: The impact of Protestant evangelism on economic outcomes”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.1, pp. 293–380. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjaa023.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Census Bureau (2022). *Survey of Income and Program Participation Datasets*. Datasets 1990-2008. Suitland, MD, U.S.A.: United States Census Bureau. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/OQNZYE.
- Byrne, David P, Leslie A Martin, and Jia Sheen Nah (2022a). “Price discrimination by negotiation: A field experiment in retail electricity”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.4, pp. 2499–2537. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac021.
- (2022b). *Replication data for: ‘Price discrimination by negotiation: A field experiment in retail electricity’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/KRHAWJ.
- Campbell, Douglas L and Karsten Mau (2020). *Replication files for “On ‘Trade induced technical change: The impact of Chinese imports on innovation, IT, and productivity’”*. Dataset V1. Geneva, Switzerland: Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3972652.
- (2021). “On “Trade induced technical change: The impact of Chinese imports on innovation, IT, and productivity””. *The Review of Economic Studies* 88.5, pp. 2555–2559. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdab037.
- Caprettini, Bruno and Hans-Joachim Voth (2022). *Replication data for: ‘New Deal, new patriots: How 1930s government spending boosted patriotism during WWII’*. Dataset V2. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/3A8CBI.
- (2023). “New Deal, new patriots: How 1930s government spending boosted patriotism during World War II”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.1, pp. 465–513. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac028.

- Carlana, Michela, Eliana La Ferrara, and Paolo Pinotti (2022). “Goals and gaps: Educational careers of immigrant children”. *Econometrica* 90.1, pp. 1–29. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA17458.
- Carrera, Mariana, Heather Royer, Mark Stehr, Justin Sydnor, Afra Sial, et al. (2021). *Replication package for: “Who chooses commitment? Evidence and welfare implications”*. Dataset V1. Geneva, Switzerland: Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.5173081.
- Carrera, Mariana, Heather Royer, Mark Stehr, Justin Sydnor, and Dmitry Taubinsky (2021). “Who chooses commitment? Evidence and welfare implications”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 89.3, pp. 1205–1244. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdab056.
- Casas-Arce, Pablo and Albert Saiz (2015). “Women and power: Unpopular, unwilling, or held back?” *Journal of Political Economy* 123.3, pp. 641–669. DOI: 10.1086/680686.
- Chew, Soo Hong, Wei Huang, and Xiaojian Zhao (2020). “Motivated false memory”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.10, pp. 3913–3939. DOI: 10.1086/709971.
- Chodorow-Reich, Gabriel, Plamen T. Nenov, and Alp Simsek (2021a). *Data and code for “Stock market wealth and the real economy: A local labor market approach”*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E123521V1.
- (2021b). “Stock market wealth and the real economy: A local labor market approach”. *American Economic Review* 111.5, pp. 1613–1657. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20200208.
- Corno, Lucia, Eliana La Ferrara, and Justine Burns (2022a). *Data and code for: “Interaction, stereotypes, and performance. Evidence from South Africa*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E174501V1.
- (2022b). “Interaction, stereotypes, and performance: Evidence from South Africa”. *American Economic Review* 112.12, pp. 3848–3875. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20181805.

- DellaVigna, Stefano et al. (2021). *Data and code for: “Estimating social preferences and gift exchange at work”*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E148481V1.
- (2022). “Estimating social preferences and gift exchange at work”. *American Economic Review* 112.3, pp. 1038–1074. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20190920.
- Derenoncourt, Ellora and Claire Montialoux (2020). *Replication data for: ‘Minimum wages and racial inequality’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/MHNS1S.
- (2021). “Minimum wages and racial inequality”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.1, pp. 169–228. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjaa031.
- Dhar, Diva, Tarun Jain, and Seema Jayachandran (2022a). *Data and code for: Reshaping adolescents’ gender attitudes: Evidence from a school-based experiment in India*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E149882V1.
- (2022b). “Reshaping adolescents’ gender attitudes: Evidence from a school-based experiment in India”. *American Economic Review* 112.3, pp. 899–927. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20201112.
- Djourelouva, Milena (2023a). *Data and code for: Persuasion through slanted language: Evidence from the media coverage of immigration*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E182482V1.
- (2023b). “Persuasion through slanted language: Evidence from the media coverage of immigration”. *American Economic Review* 113.3, pp. 800–835. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20211537.
- Egger, Dennis et al. (2022). “General equilibrium effects of cash transfers: Experimental evidence from Kenya”. *Econometrica* 90.6, pp. 2603–2643. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA17945.

- Eichenbaum, M S, B K Johansson, and S T Rebelo (2020). “Monetary policy and the predictability of nominal exchange rates”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 88.1, pp. 192–228. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdaa024.
- Enikolopov, Ruben, Alexey Makarin, and Maria Petrova (2020). “Social Media and protest participation: Evidence from Russia”. *Econometrica* 88.4, pp. 1479–1514. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA14281.
- Exley, Christine L and Judd B Kessler (2022a). *Replication data for: ‘The gender gap in self-promotion’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/YSWKHY.
- (2022b). “The gender gap in self-promotion”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.3, pp. 1345–1381. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac003.
- Exley, Christine L., Muriel Niederle, and Lise Vesterlund (2020). “Knowing when to ask: The cost of leaning in”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.3, pp. 816–854. DOI: 10.1086/704616.
- Fajgelbaum, Pablo D et al. (2020a). *Replication data for: ‘The return to protectionism’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/KSOVSE.
- (2020b). “The return to protectionism”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135.1, pp. 1–55. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjz036.
- Fé, Eduardo, David Gill, and Victoria Prowse (2022). “Cognitive skills, strategic sophistication, and life outcomes”. *Journal of Political Economy* 130.10, pp. 2643–2704. DOI: 10.1086/720460.
- Fehr, Dietmar, Günther Fink, and B. Kelsey Jack (2022). “Poor and rational: Decision-making under scarcity”. *Journal of Political Economy* 130.11, pp. 2862–2897. DOI: 10.1086/720466.
- Flückiger, Matthias et al. (2022a). *Replication package for: Roman transport network connectivity and economic integration*. Dataset V1. Geneva, Switzerland: Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4788227.

- Flückiger, Matthias et al. (2022b). “Roman transport network connectivity and economic integration”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 89.2, pp. 774–810. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdab036.
- Fuster, Andreas, Greg Kaplan, and Basit Zafar (2021). “What would you do with \$500? spending responses to gains, losses, news, and loans”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 88.4, pp. 1760–1795. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdaa076.
- (2022). *Replication package for: “What would you do with \$500? spending responses to gains, losses, news, and loans”*. Dataset V1. Geneva, Switzerland: Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4115399.
- Gertler, Mark, Christopher Huckfeldt, and Antonella Trigari (2020). “Unemployment fluctuations, match quality, and the wage cyclical of new hires”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 87.4, pp. 1876–1914. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdaa004.
- Giorcelli, Michela and Petra Moser (2020). “Copyrights and creativity: Evidence from Italian opera in the napoleonic age”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.11, pp. 4163–4210. DOI: 10.1086/710534.
- Grosjean, Pauline, Federico Masera, and Hasin Yousaf (2020). *Replication data for: ‘Inflammatory political campaigns and racial bias in policing’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/A3B9HE.
- (2023). “Inflammatory political campaigns and racial bias in policing”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.1, pp. 413–463. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac037.
- Guarnieri, Eleonora and Ana Tur-Prats (2023a). “Cultural distance and conflict-related sexual violence”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.3, pp. 1817–1861. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjad015.
- (2023b). *Replication data for: ‘Cultural distance and conflict-related sexual violence’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/B3LJGQ.

- Hartley, Robert Paul, Carlos Lamarche, and James P. Ziliak (2022). “Welfare reform and the intergenerational transmission of dependence”. *Journal of Political Economy* 130.3, pp. 523–565. DOI: 10.1086/717893.
- Hau, Harald, Yi Huang, and Gewei Wang (2020). “Firm response to competitive shocks: Evidence from China’s minimum wage policy”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 87.6, pp. 2639–2671. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdz058.
- Hazell, Jonathon et al. (2022a). *Replication data for: ‘The slope of the Phillips curve: Evidence from U.S. states’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/OQNZYE.
- (2022b). “The slope of the Phillips curve: Evidence from U.S. states”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.3, pp. 1299–1344. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac010.
- He, Guojun, Shaoda Wang, and Bing Zhang (2020a). *Replication data for: ‘Watering down environmental regulation in China’*. Dataset V3. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/LVS8VX.
- (2020b). “Watering down environmental regulation in China”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135.4, pp. 2135–2185. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjaa024.
- Huber, Kilian (2021). “Are bigger banks better? Firm-level evidence from Germany”. *Journal of Political Economy* 129.7, pp. 2023–2066. DOI: 10.1086/714120.
- Jack, William et al. (2023a). “Credit access, selection, and incentives in a market for asset-collateralized loans: Evidence from Kenya”. *Review of Economic Studies* 90.6, pp. 3153–3185. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdad026.
- (2023b). *Replication package for: Credit access, selection, and incentives in a market for asset-collateralized loans: Evidence from Kenya*. Dataset V2. Geneva, Switzerland: Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7594227.
- Jordà, Òscar et al. (2021). “Bank capital redux: Solvency, liquidity, and crisis”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 88.1, pp. 260–286. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdaa040.

- Kelly, Morgan, Joel Mokyr, and Cormac Gráda (2023). “The mechanics of the Industrial Revolution”. *Journal of Political Economy* 131.1, pp. 59–94. DOI: 10.1086/720890.
- Kline, Patrick, Evan K Rose, and Christopher R Walters (2022a). *Replication data for: ‘Systemic discrimination among large U.S. employers’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/HL04XC.
- (2022b). “Systemic discrimination among large U.S. employers”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.4, pp. 1963–2036. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac024.
- Kosse, Fabian et al. (2020). “The formation of prosociality: Causal evidence on the role of social environment”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.2, pp. 434–467. DOI: 10.1086/704386.
- Kranz, Sebastian and Peter Pütz (2022a). *Data and code for: Methods matter: p-hacking and publication bias in causal analysis in economics: Comment*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E159221V1.
- (2022b). “Methods matter: p-hacking and publication bias in causal analysis in economics: Comment”. *American Economic Review* 112.9, pp. 3124–3136. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20210121.
- Le Pennek, Caroline and Vincent Pons (2022). *Replication data for: ‘How do campaigns shape vote choice? Multicountry evidence from 62 elections and 56 TV debates’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/XMDFQ0.
- (2023). “How do campaigns shape vote choice? Multicountry evidence from 62 elections and 56 TV debates”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.2, pp. 703–767. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjad002.
- Lee, Kenneth, Edward Miguel, and Catherine Wolfram (2020). “Experimental evidence on the economics of rural electrification”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.4, pp. 1523–1565. DOI: 10.1086/705417.

- Li, Xiaomin and Colin F Camerer (2022a). “Predictable effects of visual salience in experimental decisions and games”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.3, pp. 1849–1900. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac025.
- (2022b). *Replication data for: ‘Predictable effects of visual salience in experimental decisions and games’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/9LCYKG.
- Mayshar, Joram, Omer Moav, and Luigi Pascali (2022). “The origin of the state: Land productivity or appropriability?” *Journal of Political Economy* 130.4, pp. 1091–1144. DOI: 10.1086/718372.
- Moreira, Diana, Mitra Akhtari, and Laura Trucco (2021). *Data and code for: Political turnover, bureaucratic turnover, and the quality of public services*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E150323V1.
- Moscona, Jacob and Karthik A Sastry (2022). *Replication data for: ‘Does directed innovation mitigate climate damage? Evidence from U.S. agriculture’*. Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/5ELEPA.
- (2023). “Does directed innovation mitigate climate damage? Evidence from U.S. agriculture”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.2, pp. 637–701. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac039.
- Mueller, Andreas I., Johannes Spinnewijn, and Giorgio Topa (2020). *Data and codes for: “Job seekers’ perceptions and employment prospects: Heterogeneity, duration dependence, and bias”*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E120501V1.
- (2021). “Job seekers’ perceptions and employment prospects: Heterogeneity, duration dependence, and bias”. *American Economic Review* 111.1, pp. 324–363. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20190808.
- Okeke, Edward N. (2023a). *Data and code for: “When a doctor falls from the sky: The impact of easing doctor supply constraints on mortality”*. Dataset V1. Ann



- Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E181581V1.
- Okeke, Edward N. (2023b). “When a doctor falls from the sky: The impact of easing doctor supply constraints on mortality”. *American Economic Review* 113.3, pp. 585–627. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20210701.
- Romero, Mauricio, Justin Sandefur, and Wayne Sandholtz (2018). *Partnership schools for Liberia*. Dataset V4. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/50PIYU.
- Romero, Mauricio, Justin Sandefur, and Wayne Aaron Sandholtz (Feb. 2020). “Outsourcing education: Experimental evidence from Liberia”. *American Economic Review* 110.2, pp. 364–400. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20181478.
- Sadoff, Sally, Anya Samek, and Charles Sprenger (2020). “Dynamic inconsistency in food choice: Experimental evidence from two food deserts”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 87.4, pp. 1954–1988. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdz030.
- Sánchez de la Sierra, Raúl (2021). “Whither formal contracts?” *Econometrica* 89.5, pp. 2341–2373. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA16083.
- Sarsons, Heather et al. (2021). “Gender differences in recognition for group work”. *Journal of Political Economy* 129.1, pp. 101–147. DOI: 10.1086/711401.
- Stantcheva, Stefanie (2021a). *Replication data for: ‘Understanding tax policy: How do people reason?’* Dataset V1. Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard Dataverse. DOI: 10.7910/DVN/OAHUIP.
- (2021b). “Understanding tax policy: How do people reason?” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.4, pp. 2309–2369. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjab033.
- Tabellini, Marco (2020). “Gifts of the immigrants, woes of the natives: Lessons from the age of mass migration”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 87.1, pp. 454–486. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdz027.

Weidmann, Ben and David J. Deming (2021). “Team players: How social skills improve team performance”. *Econometrica* 89.6, pp. 2637–2657. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA18461.

Weigel, Jonathan et al. (2022). *Replication data for: Local elites as state capacity: How city chiefs use local information to increase tax compliance in the D.R. Congo*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E147561V1.

## C Intermediate Sample

The following publications are included in the intermediate sample, but are not included in the final sample.

## References

- Abebe, Girum et al. (2021). “Anonymity or distance? job search and labour market exclusion in a growing African city”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 88.3, pp. 1279–1310. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdaa057.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Giuseppe De Feo, Giacomo De Luca, et al. (2022). “War, socialism, and the rise of fascism: An empirical exploration”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.2, pp. 1233–1296. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac001.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Giuseppe De Feo, and Giacomo Davide De Luca (2020). “Weak states: Causes and consequences of the Sicilian mafia”. *The Review of Economic Studies*, pp. 537–581. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdz009.
- Ager, Philipp, Leah Boustan, and Katherine Eriksson (2021). “The intergenerational effects of a large wealth shock: White Southerners after the Civil War”. *American Economic Review* 111.11, pp. 3767–3794. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20191422.
- Akhtari, Mitra, Diana Moreira, and Laura Trucco (2022). “Political turnover, bureaucratic turnover, and the quality of public services”. *American Economic Review* 112.2, pp. 442–493. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20171867.
- Alesina, Alberto, Armando Miano, and Stefanie Stantcheva (2023). “Immigration and redistribution”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 90.1, pp. 1–39. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdac011.
- Almås, Ingvild, Alexander W. Cappelen, and Bertil Tungodden (2020). “Cutthroat capitalism versus cuddly socialism: Are Americans more meritocratic and efficiency-seeking than Scandinavians?” *Journal of Political Economy* 128.5, pp. 1753–1788. DOI: 10.1086/705551.

- Andrabi, Tahir et al. (2020). “Upping the ante: The equilibrium effects of unconditional grants to private schools”. *American Economic Review* 110.10, pp. 3315–3349. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20180924.
- Arbatli, Cemal Eren et al. (2020). “Diversity and conflict”. *Econometrica* 88.2, pp. 727–797. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA13734.
- Asher, Sam and Paul Novosad (2020). “Rural roads and local economic development”. *American Economic Review* 110.3, pp. 797–823. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20180268.
- Ashraf, Nava, Oriana Bandiera, et al. (2020). “Losing prosociality in the quest for talent? Sorting, selection, and productivity in the delivery of public services”. *American Economic Review* 110.5, pp. 1355–1394. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20180326.
- Ashraf, Nava, Natalie Bau, Corinne Low, et al. (2020). “Negotiating a better future: How interpersonal skills facilitate intergenerational investment”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135.2, pp. 1095–1151. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjz039.
- Ashraf, Nava, Natalie Bau, Nathan Nunn, et al. (2020). “Bride price and female education”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.2, pp. 591–641. DOI: 10.1086/704572.
- Attanasio, Orazio and Elena Pastorino (2020). “Nonlinear pricing in village economies”. *Econometrica* 88.1, pp. 207–263. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA13918.
- Bagues, Manuel and Pamela Campa (2020). “Women and power: Unpopular, unwilling, or held back? A comment”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.5, pp. 2010–2016. DOI: 10.1086/705669.
- Balán, Pablo et al. (2022). “Local elites as state capacity: How city chiefs use local information to increase tax compliance in the Democratic Republic of the Congo”. *American Economic Review* 112.3, pp. 762–797. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20201159.
- Bandiera, Oriana et al. (2021). “The allocation of authority in organizations: A field experiment with bureaucrats”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.4, pp. 2195–2242. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjab029.

- Bazzi, Samuel, Gabriel Koehler-Derrick, and Benjamin Marx (2020). “The institutional foundations of religious politics: Evidence from Indonesia\*”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135.2, pp. 845–911. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjz038.
- Becker, Sascha O. et al. (2020). “Forced migration and human capital: Evidence from post-WWII population transfers”. *American Economic Review* 110.5, pp. 1430–1463. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20181518.
- Beraja, Martin et al. (2023). “AI-tocracy”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.3, pp. 1349–1402. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjad012.
- Bergquist, Lauren Falcao and Michael Dinerstein (2020). “Competition and entry in agricultural markets: Experimental evidence from Kenya”. *American Economic Review* 110.12, pp. 3705–3747. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20171397.
- Berkouwer, Susanna B. and Joshua T. Dean (2022). “Credit, attention, and externalities in the adoption of energy efficient technologies by low-income households”. *American Economic Review* 112.10, pp. 3291–3330. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20210766.
- Bessone, Pedro et al. (2021). “The economic consequences of increasing sleep among the urban poor”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.3, pp. 1887–1941. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjab013.
- Blakeslee, David, Ram Fishman, and Veena Srinivasan (2020). “Way down in the hole: Adaptation to long-term water loss in rural India”. *American Economic Review* 110.1, pp. 200–224. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20180976.
- Bold, Tessa et al. (Aug. 2022). “Market access and quality upgrading: Evidence from four field experiments”. *American Economic Review* 112.8, pp. 2518–2552. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20210122.
- Breza, Emily, Supreet Kaur, and Yogita Shamdasani (2021). “Labor rationing”. *American Economic Review* 111.10, pp. 3184–3224. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20201385.
- Brocas, Isabelle and Juan D. Carrillo (2021). “Steps of reasoning in children and adolescents”. *Journal of Political Economy* 129.7, pp. 2067–2111. DOI: 10.1086/714118.

- Brodeur, Abel, Nikolai Cook, and Anthony Heyes (2020). “Methods matter:  $p$ -hacking and publication bias in causal analysis in economics”. *American Economic Review* 110.11, pp. 3634–3660. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20190687.
- Brownback, Andy and Sally Sadoff (2020). “Improving college instruction through incentives”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.8, pp. 2925–2972. DOI: 10.1086/707025.
- Bryan, Gharad, James J. Choi, and Dean Karlan (2021). “Randomizing religion: The impact of Protestant evangelism on economic outcomes”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.1, pp. 293–380. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjaa023.
- Byrne, David P, Leslie A Martin, and Jia Sheen Nah (2022). “Price discrimination by negotiation: A field experiment in retail electricity”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.4, pp. 2499–2537. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac021.
- Campbell, Douglas L and Karsten Mau (2021). “On “Trade induced technical change: The impact of Chinese imports on innovation, IT, and productivity””. *The Review of Economic Studies* 88.5, pp. 2555–2559. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdab037.
- Caprettini, Bruno and Hans-Joachim Voth (2023). “New Deal, new patriots: How 1930s government spending boosted patriotism during World War II”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.1, pp. 465–513. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac028.
- Carlana, Michela, Eliana La Ferrara, and Paolo Pinotti (2022). “Goals and gaps: Educational careers of immigrant children”. *Econometrica* 90.1, pp. 1–29. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA17458.
- Carrera, Mariana et al. (2021). “Who chooses commitment? Evidence and welfare implications”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 89.3, pp. 1205–1244. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdab056.
- Chew, Soo Hong, Wei Huang, and Xiaojian Zhao (2020). “Motivated false memory”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.10, pp. 3913–3939. DOI: 10.1086/709971.

- Chodorow-Reich, Gabriel, Plamen T. Nenov, and Alp Simsek (2021). “Stock market wealth and the real economy: A local labor market approach”. *American Economic Review* 111.5, pp. 1613–1657. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20200208.
- Corno, Lucia, Eliana La Ferrara, and Justine Burns (2022). “Interaction, stereotypes, and performance: Evidence from South Africa”. *American Economic Review* 112.12, pp. 3848–3875. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20181805.
- DellaVigna, Stefano et al. (2022). “Estimating social preferences and gift exchange at work”. *American Economic Review* 112.3, pp. 1038–1074. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20190920.
- Derenoncourt, Ellora and Claire Montialoux (2021). “Minimum wages and racial inequality”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.1, pp. 169–228. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjaa031.
- Dhar, Diva, Tarun Jain, and Seema Jayachandran (2022). “Reshaping adolescents’ gender attitudes: Evidence from a school-based experiment in India”. *American Economic Review* 112.3, pp. 899–927. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20201112.
- Djourelouva, Milena (2023). “Persuasion through slanted language: Evidence from the media coverage of immigration”. *American Economic Review* 113.3, pp. 800–835. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20211537.
- Egger, Dennis et al. (2022). “General equilibrium effects of cash transfers: Experimental evidence from Kenya”. *Econometrica* 90.6, pp. 2603–2643. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA17945.
- Eichenbaum, M S, B K Johannsen, and S T Rebelo (2020). “Monetary policy and the predictability of nominal exchange rates”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 88.1, pp. 192–228. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdaa024.
- Enikolopov, Ruben, Alexey Makarin, and Maria Petrova (2020). “Social Media and protest participation: Evidence from Russia”. *Econometrica* 88.4, pp. 1479–1514. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA14281.

- Exley, Christine L and Judd B Kessler (2022). “The gender gap in self-promotion”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.3, pp. 1345–1381. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac003.
- Exley, Christine L., Muriel Niederle, and Lise Vesterlund (2020). “Knowing when to ask: The cost of leaning in”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.3, pp. 816–854. DOI: 10.1086/704616.
- Fajgelbaum, Pablo D et al. (2020). “The return to protectionism”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135.1, pp. 1–55. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjz036.
- Fé, Eduardo, David Gill, and Victoria Prowse (2022). “Cognitive skills, strategic sophistication, and life outcomes”. *Journal of Political Economy* 130.10, pp. 2643–2704. DOI: 10.1086/720460.
- Fehr, Dietmar, Günther Fink, and B. Kelsey Jack (2022). “Poor and rational: Decision-making under scarcity”. *Journal of Political Economy* 130.11, pp. 2862–2897. DOI: 10.1086/720466.
- Flückiger, Matthias et al. (2022). “Roman transport network connectivity and economic integration”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 89.2, pp. 774–810. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdab036.
- Fuster, Andreas, Greg Kaplan, and Basit Zafar (2021). “What would you do with 500?*spendingresponsestogains, losses, news, andloans*”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 88.4, pp. 1760–1795. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdaa076.
- Gertler, Mark, Christopher Huckfeldt, and Antonella Trigari (2020). “Unemployment fluctuations, match quality, and the wage cyclicality of new hires”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 87.4, pp. 1876–1914. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdaa004.
- Giorcelli, Michela and Petra Moser (2020). “Copyrights and creativity: Evidence from Italian opera in the napoleonic age”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.11, pp. 4163–4210. DOI: 10.1086/710534.



- Grosjean, Pauline, Federico Masera, and Hasin Yousaf (2023). “Inflammatory political campaigns and racial bias in policing”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.1, pp. 413–463. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac037.
- Guarnieri, Eleonora and Ana Tur-Prats (2023). “Cultural distance and conflict-related sexual violence”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.3, pp. 1817–1861. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjad015.
- Hartley, Robert Paul, Carlos Lamarche, and James P. Ziliak (2022). “Welfare reform and the intergenerational transmission of dependence”. *Journal of Political Economy* 130.3, pp. 523–565. DOI: 10.1086/717893.
- Hau, Harald, Yi Huang, and Gewei Wang (2020). “Firm response to competitive shocks: Evidence from China’s minimum wage policy”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 87.6, pp. 2639–2671. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdz058.
- Hazell, Jonathon et al. (2022). “The slope of the Phillips curve: Evidence from U.S. states”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.3, pp. 1299–1344. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac010.
- He, Guojun, Shaoda Wang, and Bing Zhang (2020). “Watering down environmental regulation in China”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135.4, pp. 2135–2185. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjaa024.
- Huber, Kilian (2021). “Are bigger banks better? Firm-level evidence from Germany”. *Journal of Political Economy* 129.7, pp. 2023–2066. DOI: 10.1086/714120.
- Jack, William et al. (2023). “Credit access, selection, and incentives in a market for asset-collateralized loans: Evidence from Kenya”. *Review of Economic Studies* 90.6, pp. 3153–3185. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdad026.
- Jordà, Òscar et al. (2021). “Bank capital redux: Solvency, liquidity, and crisis”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 88.1, pp. 260–286. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdaa040.
- Kelly, Morgan, Joel Mokyr, and Cormac Gráda (2023). “The mechanics of the Industrial Revolution”. *Journal of Political Economy* 131.1, pp. 59–94. DOI: 10.1086/720890.

- Kline, Patrick, Evan K Rose, and Christopher R Walters (2022). “Systemic discrimination among large U.S. employers”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.4, pp. 1963–2036. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac024.
- Kosse, Fabian et al. (2020). “The formation of prosociality: Causal evidence on the role of social environment”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.2, pp. 434–467. DOI: 10.1086/704386.
- Kranz, Sebastian and Peter Pütz (2022). “Methods matter: p-hacking and publication bias in causal analysis in economics: Comment”. *American Economic Review* 112.9, pp. 3124–3136. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20210121.
- Le Pennec, Caroline and Vincent Pons (2023). “How do campaigns shape vote choice? Multicountry evidence from 62 elections and 56 TV debates”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.2, pp. 703–767. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjad002.
- Lee, Kenneth, Edward Miguel, and Catherine Wolfram (2020). “Experimental evidence on the economics of rural electrification”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.4, pp. 1523–1565. DOI: 10.1086/705417.
- Li, Xiaomin and Colin F Camerer (2022). “Predictable effects of visual salience in experimental decisions and games”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137.3, pp. 1849–1900. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac025.
- Mayshar, Joram, Omer Moav, and Luigi Pascali (2022). “The origin of the state: Land productivity or appropriability?” *Journal of Political Economy* 130.4, pp. 1091–1144. DOI: 10.1086/718372.
- Moscona, Jacob and Karthik A Sastry (2023). “Does directed innovation mitigate climate damage? Evidence from U.S. agriculture”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138.2, pp. 637–701. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjac039.
- Mueller, Andreas I., Johannes Spinnewijn, and Giorgio Topa (2021). “Job seekers’ perceptions and employment prospects: Heterogeneity, duration dependence, and bias”. *American Economic Review* 111.1, pp. 324–363. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20190808.

- Okeke, Edward N. (2023). “When a doctor falls from the sky: The impact of easing doctor supply constraints on mortality”. *American Economic Review* 113.3, pp. 585–627. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20210701.
- Romero, Mauricio, Justin Sandefur, and Wayne Aaron Sandholtz (Feb. 2020). “Outsourcing education: Experimental evidence from Liberia”. *American Economic Review* 110.2, pp. 364–400. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20181478.
- Sadoff, Sally, Anya Samek, and Charles Sprenger (2020). “Dynamic inconsistency in food choice: Experimental evidence from two food deserts”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 87.4, pp. 1954–1988. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdz030.
- Sánchez de la Sierra, Raúl (2021). “Whither formal contracts?” *Econometrica* 89.5, pp. 2341–2373. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA16083.
- Sarsons, Heather et al. (2021). “Gender differences in recognition for group work”. *Journal of Political Economy* 129.1, pp. 101–147. DOI: 10.1086/711401.
- Stantcheva, Stefanie (2021). “Understanding tax policy: How do people reason?” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.4, pp. 2309–2369. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjab033.
- Tabellini, Marco (2020). “Gifts of the immigrants, woes of the natives: Lessons from the age of mass migration”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 87.1, pp. 454–486. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdz027.
- Weidmann, Ben and David J. Deming (2021). “Team players: How social skills improve team performance”. *Econometrica* 89.6, pp. 2637–2657. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA18461.

## D SSPP Data

The SSPP survey was posted publicly to the SSPP website, and any interested participant was free to take the survey. The survey was also publicly disseminated on Twitter/X by the SSPP. 58 of the 62 survey participants (93.5%) are members of the SSPP’s Superforecaster Panel, which is a sample of participants that are pre-selected by SSPP and are paid a semi-annual flat rate for completing a sufficient proportion of the surveys that are posted to the SSPP website each month. The remaining four participants are not part of the Superforecaster Panel, and are not incentivized to take the survey.

My SSPP sample is relatively young, with the median participant being 32.5 years of age (mean = 34.6, SD = 10.8). Though much of the sample has ample experience with making predictions for social science research questions by virtue of being part of the Superforecaster Panel, my sample is relatively unconfident in their predictions for this particular survey, rating their five-point Likert confidence in their predictions at a median of 2.5 (mean = 2.4, SD = 1). This is reflected by the fact that only nine participants (14.5%) report conducting prior research on the topics discussed in my survey. The sample is male-dominated, with 53 participants (85.5%) reporting a masculine gender identity. The SSPP sample also predominantly originates from WEIRD countries (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan 2010) – 42 participants (67.7%) spent the majority of their time prior to starting university education in OECD member states, and 48 participants (77.4%) have spent the majority of their time since starting university education in OECD member states.

## E Effect Size Benchmarking

Table A1 shows the values of  $\sigma$  and  $r$  for a selected sample of ten highly-cited and recent results from the economics literature that represent plausibly large effects. I term this the *benchmarking sample*. All articles in this sample have publicly-available replication repositories and are published between 2015-2020. I isolate one main claim of each article and the primary model used to defend this claim. The benchmarking sample thus consists of ten articles, each with one claim and one model defending that claim. Appendix F provides citations for all articles in the benchmarking sample, along with associated replication repositories (when applicable).

Two features of Table A1 are worth noting. First, though  $\sigma$  and  $r$  are quite positively correlated and always share the same sign, they do not necessarily monotonically correspond, as  $\sigma$  is a measure of magnitude whereas  $r$  is a measure of fit. Second, though the estimates in this benchmarking sample are all statistically significant under the standard NHST framework, their effect sizes are also quite small in general. Even amongst a benchmark sample of articles advertising plausibly large economic effects, six of ten estimates are either smaller than  $\sigma = 0.2$  or  $r = 0.1$ .

Article	Setting	Outcome Variable	Exposure Variable	Initial p-Value	$\sigma$	$r$	Location
Acmoglu & Restrepo (2020)	Difference-in-differences analysis of U.S. commuting zones, 1990-2007	Employment rates (continuous)	Industrial robot exposure (continuous)	0.000	-0.206	-0.16	Table 7, Panel A, US exposure to robots, Model 3
Acmoglu et al. (2019)	Difference-in-differences analysis of countries, 1960-2010	Short-run log GDP levels (continuous)	Democratization (binary)	0.001	0.005	0.044	Table 2, Democracy, Model 3
Berman et al. (2017)	African $0.5 \times 0.5$ longitude-latitude cells with mineral mines, 1997-2010	Conflict incidence (binary)	Log price of main mineral (continuous)	0.012	0.521	0.007	Table 2, In price x mines > 0, Model 1
Deschênes, Greenstone, & Shapiro (2017)	Difference-in-differences analysis of U.S. counties, 2001-2007	Nitrogen dioxide emissions (continuous)	Nitrogen dioxide cap-and-trade participation (binary)	0.000	-0.134	-0.02	Table 2, Panel A, NOx, Model 3
Haushofer & Shapiro (2016)	Experiment with low-income Kenyan households, 2011-2013	Non-durable consumption (continuous)	Unconditional cash transfer (binary)	0.000	0.376	0.195	Table V, Non-durable expenditure, Model 1
Benhassine et al. (2015)	Experiment with families of Moroccan primary school-aged students, 2008-2010	School attendance (binary)	Educational cash transfer to fathers (binary)	0.000	0.18	0.044	Table 5, Panel A, Attending school by end of year 2, among those 6-15 at baseline, Impact of LCT to fathers
Bloom et al. (2015)	Field experiment with Chinese workers, 2010-2011	Attrition (binary)	Voluntarily working from home (binary)	0.002	-0.397	-0.196	Table VIII, Treatment, Model 1
Duflo, Dupas, & Kremer (2015)	Experiment with Kenyan primary school-aged girls, 2003-2010	Reaching eighth grade (binary)	Education subsidy (binary)	0.023	0.1	0.031	Table 3, Panel A, Stand-alone education subsidy, Model 1
Hansheek et al. (2015)	OECD adult workers, 2011-2012	Log hourly wages (continuous)	Numeracy skills (continuous)	0.000	0.091	0.316	Table 5, Numeracy, Model 1
Oswald, Proto, & Sgroi (2015)	UK students, piece-rate laboratory task	Productivity (continuous)	Happiness (continuous)	0.018	0.753	0.242	Table 2, Change in happiness, Model 4

*Note:* Effect sizes and initial  $p$ -values of each model are reported. The original estimate of each model can be found in its respective article at the specified location. Some articles are reproduced using data from repositories (Hansheek 2016; Benhassine et al. 2019; Berman et al. 2019; Deschênes, Greenstone, & Shapiro 2019; Duflo, Dupas, & Kremer 2019), whereas others are reproduced using files linked to the online versions of their submissions.

Table A1: Effect Size Benchmarking

## F Benchmarking Sample

All articles and associated replication repositories (when applicable) of the benchmarking sample are provided here.

## References

- Acemoglu, Daron, Suresh Naidu, et al. (2019). “Democracy does cause growth”. *Journal of Political Economy* 127.1, pp. 47–100. DOI: 10.1086/700936.
- Acemoglu, Daron and Pascual Restrepo (2020). “Robots and jobs: Evidence from US labor markets”. *Journal of Political Economy* 128.6, pp. 2188–2244. DOI: 10.1086/705716.
- Benhassine, Najy et al. (2015). “Turning a shove into a nudge? A “labeled cash transfer” for education”. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 7.3, pp. 86–125. DOI: 10.1257/pol.20130225.
- (2019). *Replication data for: Turning a shove into a nudge? A “labeled cash transfer” for education*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E114579V1.
- Berman, Nicolas et al. (2017). “This mine is mine! How minerals fuel conflicts in Africa”. *American Economic Review* 107.6, pp. 1564–1610. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20150774.
- (2019). *Replication data for: This mine is mine! How minerals fuel conflicts in Africa*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E113068V1.
- Bloom, Nicholas et al. (2015). “Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 130.1, pp. 165–218. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qju032.
- Deschênes, Olivier, Michael Greenstone, and Joseph S. Shapiro (2017). “Defensive investments and the demand for air quality: Evidence from the NOx Budget Pro-

- gram”. *American Economic Review* 107.10, pp. 2958–2989. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20131002.
- Deschênes, Olivier, Michael Greenstone, and Joseph S. Shapiro (2019). *Replication data for: Defensive investments and the demand for air quality: Evidence from the NOx Budget Program*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E112938V1.
- Duflo, Esther, Pascaline Dupas, and Michael Kremer (2015). “Education, HIV, and early fertility: Experimental evidence from Kenya”. *American Economic Review* 105.9, pp. 2757–2797. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20121607.
- (2019). *Replication data for: Education, HIV, and early fertility: Experimental evidence from Kenya*. Dataset V1. Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. DOI: 10.3886/E112899V1.
- Hanushek, Eric A. (2016). *Data for: Returns to skills around the world: Evidence from PIAAC*. Dataset V1. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Mendeley Data. DOI: 10.17632/nmsxzyjfk.1.
- Hanushek, Eric A. et al. (2015). “Returns to skills around the world: Evidence from PIAAC”. *European Economic Review* 73, pp. 103–130. DOI: 10.1016/j.eurocorev.2014.10.006.
- Haushofer, Johannes and Jeremy Shapiro (2016). “The short-term impact of unconditional cash transfers to the Poor: Experimental evidence from Kenya”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 131.4, pp. 1973–2042. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qjw025.
- Oswald, Andrew J., Eugenio Proto, and Daniel Sgroi (2015). “Happiness and productivity”. *Journal of Labor Economics* 33.4, pp. 789–822. DOI: 10.1086/681096.



## G Failure Measures

Let  $j$  be an individual partition,<sup>3</sup> and let  $i$  index an individual model. Each model  $i$  belongs to exactly one partition  $j$ . Because all failure rates in this paper are calculated for symmetric ROPEs, it is sufficient to define failure rate  $R(\epsilon, \tau, L)$  as a function of ROPE length  $\epsilon > 0$ , effect size measure  $\tau \in \{\sigma, r\}$ , and aggregation level  $L$ . Further, because the ECI approach described in Definition 3.3 yields identical results to the standard TOST procedure described in Definition 3.2, I approach failure rate calculation by defining exact values for the 95% ECI outer bound  $\text{ECIOB}_{i,j}(\tau)$  for each effect size measure  $\tau$  of every model  $i$  belonging to every partition  $j$ . Let  $M_j$  represent the number of models  $i$  belonging to partition  $j$ , and let  $M$  be the total number of partitions  $j$ . One can then calculate the failure rate as

$$R(\epsilon, \tau, L) = \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{M_j} \frac{\mathbb{1}[|\text{ECIOB}_{i,j}(\tau)| > \epsilon]}{M_j M}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

I also calculate claim-level failure rates that apply an inverse weighting approach ensuring that each article receives the same weight in the sample. Let  $U$  be a partition clustered in exactly one partition level  $H$ , and let  $M^{\{U\}}$  be the total number of partitions  $U$  in the data. Then

$$W_{j,k} = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^{M^{\{U\}}} \mathbb{1}[U_{j,k} \in H_k]}$$

is the inverse weight of partition  $U_{j,k}$ . In this setting,  $U_{j,k}$  is claim  $j$  belonging to article  $k$  ( $H_k$ ), so  $W_{j,k}$  is simply one divided by the number of claims that belong to

---

<sup>3</sup> $j$  represents an individual claim when calculating claim-level failure rates, whereas  $j$  represents an entire article when calculating article-level failure rates.

claim  $j$ 's article. Then the inverse-weighted claim-level failure rate can be written as

$$R_{\text{Wgt.}}(\epsilon, \tau, H, U) = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^{M^{\{U\}}} W_{j,k}} \sum_{j=1}^{M^{\{U\}}} W_{j,k} \sum_{i=1}^{M_{j,k}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[|\text{ECIOB}_{i,j,k}(\tau)| > \epsilon]}{M_{j,k}}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where  $M_{j,k}$  is now the number of models belonging to clustered partition  $U_{j,k}$  – in this setting, this is simply the number of models belonging to claim  $j$  in article  $k$ .

I measure precision using standard errors of the mean for the unweighted failure rates in Equation A1 and standard errors of the weighted mean for the weighted failure rates in Equation A2. The standard error of the mean for a failure rate is

$$\text{SE}[R(\epsilon, \tau, L)] = \frac{\text{SD}[R(\epsilon, \tau, L)]}{\sqrt{M}}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where  $\text{SD}[R(\epsilon, \tau, L)]$  is just the within-sample standard deviation of the  $R(\epsilon, \tau, L)$  vector. Let the failure rate for claim  $j$  in article  $k$  be defined as

$$R_{j,k}(\epsilon, \tau, L) = \sum_{i=1}^{M_{j,k}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[|\text{ECIOB}_{i,j,k}(\tau)| > \epsilon]}{M_{j,k}}.$$

Though Gatz & Smith (1995) note that there is no universally-agreed definition for the standard error of the weighted mean, they find that one formulation produces closer estimates to the bootstrap than other competing formulas. In this setting, the square of that optimal formula can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{SE}[R_{\text{Wgt.}}(\cdot)])^2 &= \frac{M^{\{U\}}}{(1 - M^{\{U\}})(M^{\{U\}})^2} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{M^{\{U\}}} \left\{ [W_{j,k} R_{j,k}(\cdot) - \overline{W}_{j,k} R_{\text{Wgt.}}(\cdot)]^2 \right\} - \right. \\ &\quad 2R_{\text{Wgt.}}(\cdot) \sum_{j=1}^{M^{\{U\}}} \left\{ (W_{j,k} - \overline{W}_{j,k}) [W_{j,k} R_{j,k}(\cdot) - \overline{W}_{j,k} R_{\text{Wgt.}}(\cdot)] \right\} + \\ &\quad \left. [R_{\text{Wgt.}}(\cdot)]^2 \sum_{j=1}^{M^{\{U\}}} \left\{ [W_{j,k} - \overline{W}_{j,k}]^2 \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\overline{W}_{j,k}$  is the mean inverse weight across all claims. The results in Section 6.2 show

that this standard error derivation corresponds quite closely with simple standard errors for unweighted failure rates as derived in Equation A3.

## H Appendix Tables

This appendix provides table versions of two main figures in Section 6.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$\gamma_j$	-0.046 (0.016)	$\cdot$ ( $\cdot$ )	-0.02 (0.017)	0.002 (0.02)	0.214 (0.023)	0.228 (0.028)
Type Rate	Judgment Type I Error	Judgment Type II Error	Judgment TOST/ECI Failure	Judgment TOST/ECI Failure	Prediction TOST/ECI Failure	Prediction TOST/ECI Failure
Effect Size Measure			$\sigma$	$r$	$\sigma$	$r$

*Note:* This table provides the numerical estimates displayed in Figure 3.

Table A2: Within-Researcher Estimates of Differences in Predictions/Judgments

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Failure Rate	0.376 (0.036)	0.393 (0.041)	0.387 (0.044)	0.292 (0.036)	0.272 (0.04)	0.268 (0.045)
Effect Size Measure	$\sigma$	$\sigma$	$\sigma$	$r$	$r$	$r$
SSPP Tolerance	0.1065	0.1065	0.1065	0.1295	0.1295	0.1295
Aggregation Level	Claim	Claim	Article	Claim	Claim	Article
Inverse Weighting		x			x	

*Note:* This table provides the numerical estimates displayed in Figure 4.

Table A3: Main Failure Rate Estimates

# I Robustness Checks

This appendix reports extended robustness checks on the main results in Section 6.2.

	Models	Claims	Articles	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<b>Panel A: Initially Insignificant Models</b>	789	132	80	0.345 (0.036)	0.36 (0.041)	0.355 (0.044)	0.263 (0.036)	0.244 (0.04)	0.244 (0.044)
<b>Panel B: Initially Significant Models</b>	87	34	27	0.601 (0.084)	0.639 (0.085)	0.636 (0.089)	0.449 (0.086)	0.46 (0.09)	0.451 (0.093)
Effect Size Measure				$\sigma$	$\sigma$	$\sigma$	$r$	$r$	$r$
SSPP Tolerance				0.1065	0.1065	0.1065	0.1295	0.1295	0.1295
Aggregation Level				Claim	Claim	Article	Claim	Claim	Article
Inverse Weighting					x			x	

*Note:* Models are deemed initially (in)significant if the standard NHST  $p$ -value of initial model estimate (before conformability changes, if applicable) is less than (greater than or equal to) 0.05. ROPEs are  $[-0.2\sigma, 0.2\sigma]$  and  $[-0.1r, 0.1r]$ .

Table A4: Failure Rate Robustness: Initial Model Significance

	Models	Claims	Articles	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<b>Panel A: CYCD Removed</b>	675	105	63	0.341 (0.04)	0.362 (0.046)	0.355 (0.049)	0.22 (0.037)	0.241 (0.045)	0.238 (0.049)
<b>Panel B: CYBD Removed</b>	563	91	59	0.36 (0.045)	0.37 (0.049)	0.369 (0.054)	0.297 (0.045)	0.247 (0.045)	0.247 (0.05)
<b>Panel C: BYCD Removed</b>	563	124	74	0.398 (0.038)	0.416 (0.043)	0.408 (0.047)	0.301 (0.039)	0.276 (0.042)	0.271 (0.047)
<b>Panel D: BYBD Removed</b>	653	119	73	0.365 (0.038)	0.39 (0.043)	0.386 (0.046)	0.292 (0.039)	0.281 (0.044)	0.274 (0.048)
Effect Size Measure				$\sigma$	$\sigma$	$\sigma$	$r$	$r$	$r$
SSPP Tolerance				0.1065	0.1065	0.1065	0.1295	0.1295	0.1295
Aggregation Level				Claim	Claim	Article	Claim	Claim	Article
Inverse Weighting					x			x	

*Note:* Panels denote whether models with continuous/binary outcome/exposure variables (respectively) are removed from the sample. For example, ‘CYBD removed’ implies that models with a continuous outcome variable and a binary exposure variable are removed from the sample. ROPEs are  $[-0.2\sigma, 0.2\sigma]$  and  $[-0.1r, 0.1r]$ .

Table A5: Failure Rate Robustness: Regressor Type Combination

	Models	Claims	Articles	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<b>Panel A: Non-Replicable Models Removed</b>	803	123	74	0.387 (0.038)	0.406 (0.043)	0.399 (0.047)	0.294 (0.038)	0.28 (0.043)	0.274 (0.047)
<b>Panel B: Non-Conformable Models Removed</b>	808	131	78	0.371 (0.036)	0.374 (0.041)	0.368 (0.044)	0.301 (0.038)	0.275 (0.041)	0.271 (0.046)
Effect Size Measure				$\sigma$	$\sigma$	$\sigma$	$r$	$r$	$r$
SSPP Tolerance				0.1065	0.1065	0.1065	0.1295	0.1295	0.1295
Aggregation Level				Claim	Claim	Article	Claim	Claim	Article
Inverse Weighting					x			x	

*Note:* Models are non-replicable if my best attempts to replicate the exact published estimates using the article's replication repository do not succeed. Models are 'non-conformable' if they require conformability modifications before inclusion in the final sample. ROPEs are  $[-0.2\sigma, 0.2\sigma]$  and  $[-0.1r, 0.1r]$ .

Table A6: Failure Rate Robustness: Replicability/Conformability

## References

- Gatz, Donald F. and Luther Smith (1995). “The standard error of a weighted mean concentration—I. Bootstrapping vs other methods”. *Atmospheric Environment* 29.11, pp. 1185–1193. DOI: 10.1016/1352-2310(94)00210-c.
- Henrich, Joseph, Steven J. Heine, and Ara Norenzayan (2010). “The weirdest people in the world?” *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 33.2–3, pp. 61–83. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x0999152x.
- van de Schoot, Rens et al. (2021). “An open source machine learning framework for efficient and transparent systematic reviews”. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 3.2, pp. 125–133. DOI: 10.1038/s42256-020-00287-7.