LMU LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN

Reproducibility Report

Information about project

Article Title: _____

_____

DOI: _____

Authors: _____

_____

Link to project for reproduction: _____

Information about reproducer

Name: _____

Computing environment**:** _____

Instructions:

Please **check all requirements**, **rate how each requirement is met** and **specify what is missing**, if necessary:

a) For the reproduction of the authors' figures and results (requirements 1.2., 1.3., 1.4) use the following rating system:

- Green: Perfect reproducibility (no differences/errors at all)
- Yellow: Inconsequential errors (slight differences/errors, but they would not change the general interpretation of the results*)
- Red: Gross errors (differences/errors that would change the general interpretation of the results*)
- Unclear: totally unsure what to choose here, e.g. because it is unclear whether differences are inconsequential or gross errors
- Not Checked: criterion was not checked, e.g. because code could not be executed completely

*** interpretation according to authors' own threshold, e.g. p-value changed to ≥0.05 instead of <0.05 and 0.05 was the chosen significance level**

b) For all other requirements use the following rating system:

- Green: Complete, nothing must be changed.
- Yellow: Present, but incomplete or needs improvement (specify what is missing or what changes you suggest)
- Red: Missing completely (no additional details necessary about what is missing)
- Unclear: totally unsure what to choose here, e.g. criterion is unclear
- Not Checked: criterion not checked, e.g. reproducibility test stopped because a) reproduction of the results already failed

Please complete the verification report (signature, name) on the end of this document to confirm that you have tried to reproduce the computational steps of the paper and filled out this document independently from the authors (no help/communication about how to reproduce analyses). This verification report might be used in published manuscript to describe your independent reproducibility test.

	Requirement	What is missing or could not be reproduced?	Rating
0.	**Manageable downloading process (e.g. all data and scripts can be easily found in a single place)**		Not checked
1.	**Code check**		
1.1.	**All scripts run without any errors**	*Make a note of the errors and the scripts which produced them!*	Not checked

1.2.	**All tables from manuscript could be reproduced**	*Make a note here and SAVE file (screen-shot/jpg) if any table looks different!*	Not checked
1.3.	**All figures from manuscript could be reproduced**	*Make a note here and SAVE file (screen-shot/jpg) if any figure looks different!*	Not checked
1.4.	**All in-text-numbers from manuscript could be reproduced**	*Make a note of the numbers here if any in-text-number is different!*	Not checked
1.5.	Codes or README identify which tables, figures and in-text numbers are produced by what program		Not checked
1.6.	All scripts are named in a reasonable way so you can infer what they are about and when they should be run (e.g. “1_Preprocessing”)		Not checked
1.7.	Project contains a "master" file (sometimes called “MAKE”) which calls all other scripts and programs		Not checked
1.8.	All code within scripts is described understandably (e.g. comments in R like “Import data”, “Removal of outliers”, “Estimate parameter XY”)		Not checked

2.	**ReadMe (TEMPLATE available at https://social-science-data-editors.github.io/guidance/template-README.html)**		Not checked
2.1.	Meta-data of the project (e.g. name of the paper, authors, date)		Not checked
2.2.	Overview of all files (data, scripts) including their source and availability		Not checked
2.3.	Sufficient instructions for necessary steps to reproduce the analysis (description of code/programs)		Not checked
2.4.	Computational requirements are described correctly (e.g. software like R version, set.seed necessary (see https://r-coder.com/set-seed-r/) , memory and runtime requirements).		Not checked
3.	**Data check**		
3.1.	Meta-Data (e.g. collection dates, data type, data source, geographic coverage)		Not checked
3.2.	Data source (e.g. link provided in paper)		Not checked
3.3.	Codebooks for all raw data (data necessary to reproduce analysis)		Not checked
3.4.	Summary statistics for all raw data		Not checked
3.5.	Data citation (should be provided *within the paper* if external data are used or *within ReadMe/paper/project folder* to reuse data if they were produced within the same project)		Not checked
3.6.	All Data are in archive-ready formats (.csv) and can be read		Not checked
3.7.	All Data have variable labels		Not checked
3.8.	All Data are anonymized sufficiently		Not checked

Additional Comments:

Verification report:
This verification attempt was independently conducted by _____.

_____ _____

Place, date Signature