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Dear Rickard Carlsson,

I am writing to you on behalf of myself, Anna van ‘t Veer and Daniël Lakens with a pre-submission inquiry concerning our article titled “Replication value as a function of citation impact and sample size”. The abstract is provided below, and the full preprint of the article can be found on MetaArxiv: [https://osf.io/preprints/metaarxiv/knjea/](https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fosf.io%2Fpreprints%2Fmetaarxiv%2Fknjea%2F&data=04%7C01%7C%7C7e0a4352e1744b2abeef08d972b3dbef%7Ccc7df24760ce4a0f9d75704cf60efc64%7C1%7C0%7C637666939082517681%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=iMQ7X4wp8nKCEAY5LDbkHr9oujgRunTK8g%2Bntb90UYs%3D&reserved=0)

**Article abstract:**

*Researchers seeking to replicate original research often need to decide which of several relevant candidates to select for replication. Several strategies for study selection have been proposed, utilizing a variety of observed indicators as criteria for selection. However, few strategies clearly specify the goal of study selection and how that goal is related to the indicators that are utilized. We have previously formalized a decision model of replication study selection in which the goal of study selection is to maximize the expected utility gain of the replication effort. We further define the concept of replication value as a proxy for expected utility gain (Isager et al., 2020). In this article, we propose a quantitative operationalization of replication value. We first discuss how value and uncertainty - the two concepts used to determine replication value – could be estimated via information about citation count and sample size. Second, we propose an equation for combining these indicators into an overall estimate of replication value, which we denote RVCn. Third, we suggest how RVCn could be implemented as part of a broader study selection procedure. Finally, we provide preliminary data suggesting that studies that were in fact selected for replication tend to have relatively high RVCn estimates. The goal of this article is to explain how RVCn is intended to work and, in doing so, demonstrate the many assumptions that should be explicit in any replication study selection strategy.*

We believe Metapsychology would be a natural fit for this article given the scope of the journal. Though our article is not targeted at researchers in psychology specifically, we believe it would be of substantial interest to Meta-psychology’s audience given the significance of replication research to metascience in psychology, and due to the promotion of this research practice by Metapsychology itself. We hope you will agree with this assessment.

Assuming you agree, and assuming the article passes rigorous peer review, we were wondering if it might be possible to experiment with the *evolving papers* structure of Metapsychology and invite independent researchers to write commentaries on our article that could be published alongside (in the same issue as) the main manuscript. In our view, it would be very useful for an article discussing the \*value\* of a scientific practice, to receive criticism, feedback, and viewpoints from people who are interested in this topic. We believe there is much room for critical discussion of the study selection strategy we propose, and have already seen some differing viewpoints, including about the technical aspects of the measurement model that supports *RVCn,* the underlying theoretical model we utilize, potential alternative operationalizations of *replication value*, etc. We would like to jump-start this discussion by inviting a range of people with interesting viewpoints to give comments on our proposal. Ideally, the invitees would include stakeholders with a vested interest in the problem we tackle (which studies should be prioritized for replication?) but with no vested interest in the particular solution we offer. This way, shortcomings of, improvements upon, and alternatives to our proposed study selection strategy can be brought to the fore as quickly as possible.

**Would Meta-psychology be interested in helping us organize such an invited commentary submission type?** We know it is not formally part of the publications formats offered by the journal, but the format seems to fit the journal perfectly given your focus on open and critical discussion, the *evolving papers* structure of submissions, the already existing *Commentary* format, the openly available peer review reports (which could be considered commentaries in and of themselves), etc.

If there is in principle interest, we would be happy to discuss the details of how such a submission should be organized. At the moment we are imagining a smaller scale version of the BBS article format, but we are open to alternative approaches. We have some ideas for stakeholders who would be interesting to invite to write commentaries, and we have reached out to a handful of potential commentators and confirmed their interest in writing a commentary should the option be available. However, we welcome your suggestions for commentators or for an open call, though a deadline may be needed if we want to incorporate commentaries (and/or replies to commentaries) in the main manuscript itself.

We look forward to hearing your thoughts on our inquiry.

Kind regards,

Peder Mortvedt Isager, Daniël Lakens, and Anna van ‘t Veer

Hi Rick and Lucija (I am sending this from my new work email, which has changed since I spoke with Rick last)

What follows is my preliminary idea for how an invited commentary format might be set up at Meta-psychology. I am very much inspired by the invited commentary format over at BBS (<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/behavioral-and-brain-sciences/information/instructions-contributors>) though I believe we could improve on certain elements of it (most importantly, how commentators are included). Please keep in mind that I have no editorial experience. What I am about to propose does not consider the editorial challenges involved but I am of course mindful that those exist, and I am very much open to designing a format that will accommodate your editorial vision and resource restrictions. Treat this as a first unstructured idea dump and let me know if you need me to clarify any aspect of what I propose.

With all that said, here is what I propose:

**Goal**

The goal of the invited commentary format is to help facilitate open and critical discussion of our proposed method for prioritizing studies for replication. While we believe our method is sound, it is by no means perfects, and it is certainly open to critical scrutiny and suggestions for improvement, just like any other proposal to change research practice (see the debates surrounding preregistration, Plan S, redefine/justify/abandon statistical significance, etc.). To the extent that we believe our proposed method can impact the way researchers work and spend public funds, it is our moral obligation to make sure that our proposal has received a fair shake by independent experts so that any potential flaws and errors in the rationale can be brought to light.

**Process**

1. Our manuscript should be submitted and subject to peer review. There is no point reaching out to prospective commentators before you are confident that our manuscript meets the standards of quality set by Meta-psychology. As per the guidelines of Meta-psychology, the peer reviewers could also consider expanding their peer review into a fully fledged *Commentaries on published research*, which we could then respond to along with other submitted commentaries. Assuming our manuscript passes peer review, it is published, and the commentary process can begin.
2. I propose (but at this point I am highly open to suggestions) a mixed approach of invited and open commentaries. I have included a list of people at the end of this email that I believe would have a deep and nuanced perspective to offer on our proposal. However, to ensure due process, the power to invite commentators should reside with the editor and not the author team. In BBS, the only way to submit a commentary is via invitation. However, in principle I think anyone with a perspective to offer should be allowed to submit a commentary, not just the people we can think of. I would therefore propose to advertise the call for commentaries openly on social media platforms. Whatever strategy we go for, the call for submission should have a set end date. All commentaries submitted should of course be subject to peer review.
3. After the set end date of the call, we in the original author team consider all commentaries that have been submitted and write a response to these, reflecting on the criticism and suggested alternative approaches. It is of course possible to submit a commentary after this point as well, but our initial response letter will only consider those commentaries published before the end date. Our response letter should also be vetted by the editor before it is published.

**Logistics**

The way I see it, we can make use of the existing infrastructure of Meta-psychology for every element of this call. Our original manuscript can be made public as an article for all prospective commentators to see. Commentaries can simply be submitted as *Commentaries on published research* to the journal. Once accepted, these can then be link to the web page of our main manuscript. Our response to commentaries can itself be submitted as a *Commentaries on published research* and can be linked to both our main manuscript web page, and all commentary web pages. We could also consider updating our manuscript file after the call has ended by adding all commentaries published at that point to the main manuscript text, and add our response at the end, just as they do at BBS. The advantage of this is that new readers can find the critical perspectives offered on our approach right there in the original manuscript PDF.

**List of possible commentary invitees/stakeholders to reach out to**

* Sarahanne Field/Merle Pittelkow/Don van Ravenswaaij.
  + Current co-authors on a project related to our manuscript.
  + Have written several independent articles relevant to the subject, including <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.218> and <https://psycnet.apa.org/fulltext/2021-72420-014.html>.
* Youyou Wu/Yang Yang/Brian Uzzi
  + Currently working on a machine-learning method for estimating *uncertainty*, which offers an alternative to the sample-size based method we proposed.
* Previous collaborators on a joint effort to create replication value indicators: <https://osf.io/83yan/>.
  + Collaborators disagreed substantially about how replication value should be operationalized. I therefore expect
  + Some but not all collaborators ended up as co-authors on the theoretical paper that our current manuscript is based on: <https://osf.io/preprints/metaarxiv/2gurz/>
* Aurélien Allard/Simine Vazire.
  + Authors of commentary relevant to the subject: <https://psyarxiv.com/wusdr/>
* Gilad Feldman.
  + Has expressed interest in writing a commentary.
  + Expert on running and organizing replication efforts. He has been quite sceptical of our previous work on this topic, and I am fairly sure he would offer a critical view on our current proposal.
* Rob Heirene
  + Has written article on replication study selection in addiction research: <https://doi.org/10.1080/16066359.2020.1751130>
* Jordan Wagge (or someone from CREP).
  + Has expressed interest in writing a commentary.
  + Expert on running and organizing replication efforts.
  + Relevant since CREP is exactly the kind of organization that may find itself in need of choosing which of several proposed replication studies to focus available resources on.
  + Importantly, CREP has already implemented procedures for prioritizing studies for replication. As far as I know, this has happend completely independently of our own work.
* Fiona Fidler (or someone from the RepliCATS project).
  + Experts on researchers' assessment of uncertainty/replicability.
* Someone from the Psychological Science Accelerator.
  + Relevant since the PSA is exactly the kind of organization that may find itself in need of choosing which of several proposed replication studies to focus available resources on.
* Someone from the SCORE project: <https://www.cos.io/score>
* Rolf Zwaan and coauthors from BBS article “Making replication mainstream”: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X17001972>
* Add people from relevant commentaries to Zwaan et al. BBS article