


Evidence-based decision making

The scientific method(s)

Rui Mata, FS 2023

Version: Feb 20th, 2023

Rui Mata: Education and Main Academic Positions



Cognitive and Decision Sciences



CDS Brown Bag FS23
Climate change: Adaptation and Mitigation

● ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ||


Cognitive and Decision Sciences

The Center for Cognitive and Decision Sciences (CDS) investigates how people of all ages make decisions. Our goal is to understand the mechanisms underlying decision making to ultimately help individuals and organizations make better, informed choices.

«Our Mission: To understand and improve human decision-making through the use and development of evidence-based practices»

<http://cds.unibas.ch>

You!




TRUST






What is your level of trust in [scientists] regarding information on coronavirus?


Abb. 21 Wie hoch ist Ihr Vertrauen in folgende Organisationen und Personengruppen hinsichtlich Informationen zum Coronavirus?



Basis: Anzahl Befragte in Klammern / Skala von «1» (= «Sehr geringes Vertrauen») bis «10» (= «Sehr hohes Vertrauen»)




the scientific **method(s)**




Albert Einstein

"STARLIGHT BENT BY THE SUN'S ATTRACTION": THE EINSTEIN THEORY.


DRAWN BY W. S. MORRISON FROM MATERIAL PROVIDED BY DR. EINSTEIN.




A black and white close-up portrait of Karl Popper. He is an elderly man with thinning hair, looking slightly to his left with a thoughtful expression. His right hand is resting near his chin, partially hidden by his fingers.

«It is part of my thesis that all our knowledge grows only through the correcting of our mistakes.»

Karl Popper




Charles Darwin





Induction // probability



Finding a white swan...

supports the hypothesis that “all swans are white”



Deduction // certainty




rejects the hypothesis that “all swans are white”




«The only principle that does not inhibit progress is: anything goes.»

Paul Feyerabend





The Ethos of Science (aka, the Mertonian norms):

- Universalism: it's not about who is doing the science
- Communism/Communality: scientists share!
- Disinterestedness: scientists don't have egos or financial interests, only thirst for knowledge (right!?)
- Organized skepticism: no claim is accepted at face value...



Objectivity has a history...

- **truth-to-nature:** aims to extract a universal truth
- **mechanical objectivity:** an automated reproduction of particulars (not universals) that is free of personal opinion
- **trained judgement:** expert identifies meaningful patterns and creates appropriate visualizations to generate insight



<https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9781890951795/objectivity>

More on scientific objectivity...

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-objectivity/>

“We have shown that it is hard to define scientific objectivity in terms of a view from nowhere, value freedom, or freedom from personal bias. It is a lot harder to say anything positive about the matter. Perhaps it is related to a thorough critical attitude concerning claims and findings, as Popper thought. Perhaps it is the fact that many voices are heard, equally respected and subjected to accepted standards, as Longino defends. Perhaps it is something else altogether, or a combination of several factors discussed in this article.(...) Work on this problem is an ongoing project, and so is the quest for understanding scientific objectivity.”



Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Medicine*, 2(8), e124–6.

<http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124>

Ioannidis, J. (2005). Contradicted and initially stronger effects in highly cited clinical research. *JAMA*, 294(2), 218–228. <http://doi.org/10.1001/jama.294.2.218>






Fig. 1. The cumulative impact of reporting and citation biases on the evidence base for antidepressants. (a) displays the initial, complete cohort of trials, while (b) through (e) show the cumulative effect of biases. Each circle indicates a trial, while the color indicates the results or the presence of spin. Circles connected by a grey line indicate trials that were published together in a pooled publication. In (e), the size of the circle indicates the (relative) number of citations received by that category of studies.

De Vries, Y. A., Roest, A. M., De Jonge, P., Cuijpers, P., Munafò, M. R., & Bastiaansen, J. A. (2018). The cumulative effect of reporting and citation biases on the apparent efficacy of treatments: The case of depression. *Psychological Medicine*, 48(15), 2453–2455. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291718001873> 22



- prop·a·gan·da

prä-pə-'gan-də noun 1. Derogatory information, especially of a biased or misleading nature, used to promote or publicize a particular political cause or point of view.



A FILM BY
ROBERT KENNER

MERCHANTS OF DOUBT

FROM THE DIRECTOR OF "FOOD, INC."

Sony Pictures Classics in association with Participant Media and OMDIAR Network present a Robert Kehner film "MERCHANTS OF DOUBT" music by Mark Adler music supervisor Bruce Gilbert
Inspired by the book "MERCHANTS OF DOUBT" by Naomi Oreskes and Erik M. Conway edited by Kim Roberts, A.C.E. director of photography Don Lenzer Barry Berzon Jay Redmond
Co-producers Brian Pearce Tom Dulham Dylan Nelson youth on set Jeff Skoll Pierre Omidyar Diane Weyermann produced by Melissa Robledo
Produced by Mark Achbar and Jennifer Abbott written by Jennifer Abbott and Mark Achbar directed by Robert Kehner
Music by Mark Adler
Cinematography by Don Lenzer
Edited by Kim Roberts
Production Design by Barry Berzon
Costume Design by Jay Redmond
Visual Effects by Jeff Skoll
Production Office by Diane Weyermann
Sound混音 by Michael H. Ross
Production Sound混音 by Michael H. Ross
Production Office by Diane Weyermann
Montage by Michael H. Ross
Montage by Michael H. Ross

MERCHANTSOFOURTMOVIE.COM — LEARN MORE AND TAKE ACTION AT TAKEPART.COM/DOURT — SONYCLASSICS.COM

<https://www.merchantsofdoubt.org>

Jahrzehntelange wissenschaftliche Forschung zeigt, dass der Grossteil der schädlichen chemischen Bestandteile, die in Zigarettenrauch nachgewiesen wurden, bei der Verbrennung des Tabaks entsteht. Deshalb ist es unser Ziel, rauchfreie Alternativen anzubieten, die das Potenzial haben, das Risiko von Erkrankungen in Folge regelmässigen Zigarettenkonsums zu reduzieren.

Die neuesten wissenschaftlichen Fortschritte haben zur Entwicklung bahnbrechender Technologien geführt. Jetzt haben erwachsene Raucherinnen und Raucher bessere Alternativen zu Zigaretten. Zum Beispiel Tabakerhitzer. Der Tabak wird erhitzt statt verbrannt, und es entsteht ein nikotinhaltiger Tabakdampf, jedoch kein Rauch.

Und genau so funktionieren die rauchfreien Produkte, in die wir die Forschungsarbeit investiert haben. Sowohl unsere eigene umfangreiche Forschung als auch unabhängige Studien belegen, dass IQOS, wenn auch nicht risikofrei, deutlich weniger schädliche Bestandteile erzeugt als Zigaretten. Dies dank Eliminierung des Verbrennungsprozesses.

Erfahren Sie mehr über Wissenschaft auf
www.philipmorris.ch

WARUM WISSEN- SCHAFT FÜR RAUCHER- *INNEN VON BEDEUTUNG IST.



PHILIP MORRIS S.A.

Ausschliesslich für erwachsene Raucher bestimmt.

≡  YouTube CH

naomi oreskes



The image shows a TED talk video on YouTube. The speaker, Naomi Oreskes, is a woman with short dark hair, wearing a yellow sleeveless dress, standing on a stage with a wooden panel background. She is gesturing with her hands while speaking. To her right is a large screen displaying the text "Why believe in science?". Below the stage, the TED logo is visible, along with the name "NAOMI ORESKES" in large white letters. The video player interface at the bottom includes a play button, volume control, and a progress bar showing 0:14 / 19:14. Below the video, the title "Naomi Oreskes: Why we should trust scientists" is displayed, along with the view count "153,209 views" and the upload date "Jun 25, 2014". The YouTube navigation bar is visible at the top.

Naomi Oreskes: Why we should trust scientists

153,209 views • Jun 25, 2014

2.6K 278 SHARE SAVE ...


WHY TRUST SCIENCE ? NAOMI ORESKES

There is no (singular) scientific method...

- scientific practice consists of communities of people, making decisions for reasons that are both empirical and social, using diverse methods
- Two reasons to trust science:
 - 1) its sustained engagement with the world;
 - 2) its social character

ipcc

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON
climate change



<https://www.ipcc.ch>




«Seht Ihr nicht, welchen Schaden diese Art von Streitigkeiten uns in der Welt zufügen? Und ist es nicht genug, dass die Gelehrten die Ärgernisse und Meinungsverschiedenheiten zwischen unseren Autoren und unseren alten Meistern sehen, ohne dass das Volk durch unsere Debatten und Streitigkeiten die Fälschung unserer Kunst entdeckt?»

We need evidence-based practices to...

- 1 fix (psychological) science.**
- 2 tackle societal challenges.**
- 3 be ready for the jobs of the future.**
- 4 do our work right.**

1

Replicability Crisis in Psychology vs Economics



Original study effect size versus replication effect size (correlation coefficients). Diagonal line represents replication effect size equal to original effect size. Dotted line represents replication effect size of 0. Points below the dotted line were effects in the opposite direction of the original. Density plots are separated by significant (blue) and nonsignificant (red) effects.

Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251), aac4716–aac4716. <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716>

Replicability Crisis in Psychology vs Economics




Fig. 4. A comparison of replicability indicators in experimental economics (this study) and psychological sciences (RPP). The graph shows means \pm SE for replicability indicators. All six replicability indicators are higher for experimental economics; this difference is significant for three of the replicability indicators. The average difference in replicability across the six indicators is 19 percentage points. Details about the statistical tests are included in the supplementary materials. * $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$.

Camerer, C. F., Dreber, A., Forsell, E., Ho, T.-H., Huber, J., Johannesson, M., et al. (2016). Evaluating replicability of laboratory experiments in economics. *Science*, 351(6280), 1433–1436. <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf0918>

A manifesto for reproducible science

Marcus R. Munafò^{1,2*}, Brian A. Nosek^{3,4}, Dorothy V. M. Bishop⁵, Katherine S. Button⁶, Christopher D. Chambers⁷, Nathalie Percie du Sert⁸, Uri Simonsohn⁹, Eric-Jan Wagenmakers¹⁰, Jennifer J. Ware¹¹ and John P. A. Ioannidis^{12,13,14}

Improving the reliability and efficiency of scientific research will increase the credibility of the published scientific literature and accelerate discovery. Here we argue for the adoption of measures to optimize key elements of the scientific process: methods, reporting and dissemination, reproducibility, evaluation and incentives. There is some evidence from both simulations and empirical studies supporting the likely effectiveness of these measures, but their broad adoption by researchers, institutions, funders and journals will require iterative evaluation and improvement. We discuss the goals of these measures, and how they can be implemented, in the hope that this will facilitate action toward improving the transparency, reproducibility and efficiency of scientific research.

Munafò, M. R., Nosek, B. A., Bishop, D. V. M., Button, K. S., Chambers, C. D., Sert, du, N. P., et al. (2017). A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1, 1–9. <http://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-016-0021>


Table 1 | A manifesto for reproducible science.

Theme	Proposal	Examples of initiatives/potential solutions (extent of current adoption)	Stakeholder(s)
Methods	Protecting against cognitive biases	All of the initiatives listed below (* to ****) Blinding (**)	J, F
	Improving methodological training	Rigorous training in statistics and research methods for future researchers (*) Rigorous continuing education in statistics and methods for researchers (*)	I, F
	Independent methodological support	Involvement of methodologists in research (**) Independent oversight (*)	F
	Collaboration and team science	Multi-site studies/distributed data collection (*) Team-science consortia (*)	I, F
Reporting and dissemination	Promoting study pre-registration	Registered Reports (*) Open Science Framework (*)	J, F
	Improving the quality of reporting	Use of reporting checklists (**) Protocol checklists (*)	J
	Protecting against conflicts of interest	Disclosure of conflicts of interest (***) Exclusion/containment of financial and non-financial conflicts of interest (*)	J
Reproducibility	Encouraging transparency and open science	Open data, materials, software and so on (* to **) Pre-registration (**** for clinical trials, * for other studies)	J, F, R
Evaluation	Diversifying peer review	Preprints (* in biomedical/behavioural sciences, **** in physical sciences) Pre- and post-publication peer review, for example, Publons, PubMed Commons (*)	J
Incentives	Rewarding open and reproducible practices	Badges (*) Registered Reports (*) Transparency and Openness Promotion guidelines (*) Funding replication studies (*) Open science practices in hiring and promotion (*)	J, I, F

Estimated extent of current adoption: *, <5%; **, 5–30%; ***, 30–60%; ****, >60%. Abbreviations for key stakeholders: J, journals/publishers; F, funders; I, institutions; R, regulators.


Munafò, M. R., Nosek, B. A., Bishop, D. V. M., Button, K. S., Chambers, C. D., Sert, du, N. P., et al. (2017). A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1, 1–9. <http://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-016-002133>

2



<https://www.gapminder.org/ignorance/>

Food: greenhouse gas emissions across the supply chain



Note: Greenhouse gas emissions are given as global average values based on data across 38,700 commercially viable farms in 119 countries.

Data source: Poore and Nemecek (2018). Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and consumers. *Science*. Images sourced from the Noun Project.

OurWorldInData.org – Research and data to make progress against the world's largest problems.

Licensed under CC-BY by the author Hannah Ritchie.

<https://ourworldindata.org/food-choice-vs-eating-local>





Figure 1. The ecological rationality of the recognition heuristic. An inaccessible criterion (e.g., the endowment of an institution) is reflected by a mediator variable (e.g., the number of times the institution is mentioned in the news), and the mediator influences the probability of recognition. The mind, in turn, uses recognition to infer the criterion.

Goldstein, D. G., & Gigerenzer, G. (2002). Models of ecological rationality: The recognition heuristic. *Psychological Review*, 109(1), 75–90. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.109.1.75>

Causes of death in the US

What Americans die from, what they search on Google, and what the media reports on



*This represents each cause's share of the top ten causes of death in the US plus homicides, drug overdoses and terrorism. Collectively these 13 causes accounted for approximately 88% of deaths in the US in 2016. Full breakdown of causes of death can be found at the CDC's WONDER public health database: <https://wonder.cdc.gov/>

Based on data from Shen et al (2018) – Death: reality vs. reported. All data available at: <https://owenishen24.github.io/charts-death>

All data refers to 2016.

Not all causes of death are shown: Shown is the data on the ten leading causes of death in the United States plus drug overdoses, homicides and terrorism.

All values are normalized to 100% so they represent their relative share of the top causes, rather than absolute counts (e.g. 'deaths' represents each cause's share of deaths within the 13 categories shown rather than total deaths). The causes of death shown here account for approximately 88% of total deaths in the United States in 2016.

This is a visualization from OurWorldInData.org, where you find data and research on how the world is changing.

Licensed under CC-BY by the authors Hannah Ritchie and Max Roser.

<https://ourworldindata.org/does-the-news-reflect-what-we-die-from>

3

The Economist

MAY 6TH-12TH 2017

Crunch time in France

Ten years on: banking after the crisis

South Korea's unfinished revolution

Biology, but without the cells

The world's most valuable resource

Data and the new rules
of competition



Data scientists missing

emerging
roles,
global
change
by 2022



declining
roles,
global
change
by 2022



Top 10 Emerging


1. Data Analysts and Scientists
2. AI and Machine Learning Specialists
3. General and Operations Managers
4. Software and Applications Developers and Analysts
5. Sales and Marketing Professionals
6. Big Data Specialists
7. Digital Transformation Specialists
8. New Technology Specialists
9. Organisational Development Specialists
10. Information Technology Services

Top 10 Declining

1. Data Entry Clerks
2. Accounting, Bookkeeping and Payroll Clerks
3. Administrative and Executive Secretaries
4. Assembly and Factory Workers
5. Client Information and Customer Service Workers
6. Business Services and Administration Managers
7. Accountants and Auditors
8. Material-Recording and Stock-Keeping Clerks
9. General and Operations Managers
10. Postal Service Clerks

https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Data_Science_In_the_New_Economy.pdf

Data science is not (only) machine learning and AI



Policy Statement on Evidence-Based Practice in Psychology

The following statement was approved as policy of the American Psychological Association (APA) by the APA Council of Representatives during its August, 2005 meeting.

Evidence-based practice in psychology (EBPP) is the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture, and preferences. This definition of EBPP closely parallels the definition of evidence-based practice adopted by the Institute of Medicine (2001, p. 147) as adapted from Sackett and colleagues (2000): "**Evidence-based practice is the integration of best research evidence with clinical expertise and patient values.**" The purpose of EBPP is to promote effective psychological practice and enhance public health by applying empirically supported principles of psychological assessment, case formulation, therapeutic relationship, and intervention.



Best research evidence refers to scientific results related to intervention strategies, assessment, clinical problems, and patient populations in laboratory and field settings as well as to clinically relevant results of basic research in psychology and related fields. A sizeable body of evidence drawn from a variety of research designs and methodologies attests to the effectiveness of psychological practices. Generally, evidence derived from clinically relevant research on psychological practices should be based on systematic reviews, reasonable effect sizes, statistical and clinical significance, and a body of supporting evidence. The validity of conclusions from research on interventions is based on a general progression from clinical observation through systematic reviews of randomized clinical trials, while also recognizing gaps and limitations in the existing literature and its applicability to the specific case at hand (APA, 2002). Health policy and practice are also informed by research using a variety of methods in such areas as public health, epidemiology, human development, social relations, and neuroscience.

Researchers and practitioners should join together to ensure that the research available on psychological practice is both clinically relevant and internally valid. It is important not to assume that interventions that have not yet been studied in controlled trials are ineffective. However, widely used psychological practices as well as innovations developed in the field or laboratory should be rigorously evaluated and barriers to conducting this research should be identified and addressed.

We need evidence-based practices to...

- 1 fix (psychological) science.**
- 2 tackle societal challenges.**
- 3 be ready for the jobs of the future.**
- 4 do our work right.**

Learn more




EBDM

Welcome to the website for *Evidence-based decision making* FS23 ([11230-01](#))

Instructor: [Rui Mata](#), University of Basel


WEBSITE UNDER CONSTRUCTION: Last updated Wed Feb 15 11:19:53 2023



Very much like a spread of tools, science offers a plethora of strategies...

photo by [Cesar Carlevarino Aragon](#) on [Unsplash](#)

<https://matarui.github.io/ebdm/>



https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hierarchy_of_evidence

Summary

- **No such thing as THE scientific method:** It's perhaps a bit too much to say that, in science, "anything goes" (cf. Feyerabend). And yet, there is no such thing as THE scientific method. There is always a debate between induction (e.g., Darwin!) and deduction (e.g., Einstein!), with many ways of producing knowledge...
- **Science as mutable but self—correcting method:** The changes in the meaning of objectivity are a good example of how the scientific enterprise is mutable. Further, scientists make mistakes and, on occasion, even mislead; the scientific discourse and methods can also be co-opted by industry and other interests. As a consequence, science can get it wrong (phlogiston) or be confusing (climate change debates) which can lead to an erosion of trust.
- **Fighting (bad) science with science:** Yet science has a track-record of developing systems to ensure adequacy of principles and explanations such as new theories (e.g., relativity), practices (e.g., pre-registration), and forms of organization (e.g., team science). For all its flaws, as a whole, and in the long-run, the scientific enterprise tends to come up with new ideas that provide better accounts of real-world phenomena and produce useful technology (e.g., lasers, vaccines).
- **Evidence-based decision making:** One useful metaphor is that of science as a set of tools – toolbox – each with a certain function and some strengths (and weaknesses) for understanding and interacting with the world – I propose we can profit from having an overview of these tools to be able to apply each and, ultimately, make better, informed decisions both as individuals and institutions...