

### Reward Scheme Version 3

Criterion	Content
	<p><b>General Instruction: Try to be as objective as possible. That is, judge the applicability of each criterion separately, and to the best of your ability. Most published research articles will only meet a few criteria, if any. Sometimes the nature of a paper results in non-applicability of some criteria (e.g., sample size planning for a solely theoretical paper). In that case the criterion should be rated with "does not apply".</b></p> <p><b>Some criteria (1, 2, 3, 4 and 10) refer to so-called "consensus". Note that this means explicit attempts at documenting what many researchers in the respective field agree on. Consensus of this kind may be achieved by means of structured group processes (e.g., polling) which should be described in some detail in the respective paper, including the (groups of) people that were involved. Articles using or challenging previously established consensus should refer to a previous article (a "consensus document") describing the consensus and how it was achieved.</b></p>
0	Paper gets published in a peer reviewed journal.
1a	Documents explicit consensus regarding important research goals.
1b	Addresses important research goals that were outlined in a consensus document.
1c	Provides empirical / theoretical results that fundamentally challenge documented consensus regarding research goals.
2a	Documents explicit consensus regarding terminology.
2b	Uses terminology from a consensus document.
2c	Provides empirical / theoretical results that fundamentally challenge documented consensus regarding terminology.
3a	Documents explicit consensus regarding measurement practices.
3b	Includes standard measurement practices from a type 3a consensus document. Note that this does not preclude the additional use of other measures in the same study.
3c	Provides empirical/theoretical results that fundamentally challenge documented consensus regarding measurement practices.
4a	Documents explicit consensus regarding data pre-processing and/or analysis.
4b	Uses consensus practices regarding data pre-processing and/or analysis.
4c	Provides empirical/theoretical results that fundamentally challenge documented consensus regarding data pre-processing / analysis.

5a	Specifies a theory in a mathematical or formal-logic manner (as opposed to a "narrative" theory that is expressed only in natural language terms). By "formal-logic", we mean explications of IF-THEN relationships.
5b	Includes an account of how a newly specified formal theory relates to previous formulations of the same or related theories (theory integration).
5c	Includes a full account of how the measured variables used in a theory test relate to the parameters of the tested formal model.
6a	Explicitly distinguishes explorative from confirmatory analyses, with the latter having been pre-registered at the same level of specificity at which the results are reported. Judging this requires a comparison of the article with the actual pre-registration(s).
6b	All of the tested hypotheses were pre-registered.
6c	All operationalizations of relevant theoretical concepts were pre-registered (i.e., what will be measured how).
6d	All statistical procedures used in hypothesis tests were pre-registered.
6e	Article contains information on exact timelines as to when pre-registrations took place and when data was collected and analysed.
6f	All relevant deviations from the pre-registration are made explicit.
6g	Is a registered report (i.e., received "in principle acceptance" from an academic journal based on the planned research design, before the data was collected).
7a	Includes at least one direct replication attempt (of others' or one's own results), with a new sample. This includes "split sample" studies in which at least one part of the data ("hold-out sample(s)") is deliberately set aside for later replication attempts.
7b	The replication attempt had at least the same statistical power as the original study that it refers to.
7c	The replication attempt was explicitly pre-registered as a replication attempt.
8a	Includes a pre-registered a priori power analysis / sample size planning based on specific and realistic estimate of expected effect size(s).
8b	Has an expected type I error rate of $\leq .05$ and type II error rate of $\leq .20$ , based on realistic effect size estimates.
8c	Demonstrates representativeness of participant samples(s) in regard to the population of interest (e.g., by using a random sampling method).
8d	Demonstrates representativeness of stimuli in regard to the environmental conditions of interest (i.e., the type and range of stimuli that are presented in the study are shown to resemble those of the relevant variable in real life).

9a	Data is made openly available. Judging this requires checking whether a link provided in the article to an online repository actually works.
9b	Open data is accompanied by meta-data that (at least) documents all variables in the dataset in a manner that enables new analyses without requiring further interactions with the people who collected the data.
9c	Analysis code (e.g., an R-script or SPSS syntax) is made openly available. Judging this requires checking whether a link provided in the article to an online repository actually works.
9d	Materials (e.g., questionnaire items) are made openly available. Judging this requires checking whether a link provided in the article to an online repository actually works.
9e	All data, materials and code from a project are found in the same "place" online (e.g., a project folder).
10a	Documents explicit consensus regarding the state of knowledge and/or theory development in a research area.
10b	Builds directly on a consensus document regarding the state of knowledge and/or theory development in a research area.
10c	Provides empirical / theoretical results that fundamentally challenge a documented consensus regarding the state of knowledge and/ or theory development in a research area.