Figure 1 caption:

Correlation between effect size estimates from multiple-laboratory replications and random effect meta-analytic estimates (Pearson’s *r*(13) = 0.72 [0.32, 0.9], *p* = 0.003). Each point corresponds to a phenomenon (N= 15), and ranges indicate 95% confidence intervals. The best fitting linear model is MLR\_ES = −0.18 + 0.80∗MA\_ES, shown here with a band corresponding to the standard error. The dashed reference line has a slope of 1.

Figure 2 caption:

The text values on the right represent estimated percentages and corresponding 95% CIs of true population effects in the naïve meta-analysis that are as small as, or smaller than, the MLR estimate. CIs are omitted when they were not estimable via bias-corrected and accelerated bootstrapping (M. B. Mathur & VanderWeele, 2020a). The left side of the figure shows estimates from sensitivity analyses representing worst-case publication bias (vertical tick marks) versus naïve meta-analysis estimates (triangles) and multi-lab replication estimates (MLR; circles). For orange-colored meta-analyses, the worst-case estimate exceeds the MLR estimate, indicating that no amount of publication bias that results could entirely explain the discrepancy between the naïve estimate and the MLR estimate.