repliCATS reasonWAgg Categories Summary

Nodes\\reasonWAgg V5

* Nodes with first term capitalised are reasonWAgg categories that reconcile with one or more Level 2 nodes in CodebookV10
* Nodes that are italicised are reasonWAgg Categories that reconcile with one or more Level 3 nodes in CodebookV10

| Name | Description |
| --- | --- |
| RW01 Plausibility | References to the plausibility (or implausibility) of the claim or effect. This can be both personal 'intuitive' plausibility or expectations of plausibility based of knowledge of the domain or relevant expertise. |
| *RW02 availability of original materials or data* | References to the ease (or difficulty) of sourcing the materials used in the original study and or the original data affecting the participant’s assessment. |
| *RW03 detail & transparency of documentation* | References to how clear and/or detailed (or not) is the description of design, methods & analysis of the claim, especially as these relate to the transparency of the experimental process and/or the repeatability of the experiment. |
| *RW04 inconsistencies in the reported methods or analysis* | References to inconsistencies and/or errors in the reported methods or analysis, including unintended errors where they affect the interpretation and/or assessment of the claim. |
| *RW05 power analysis reporting* | References to statistical power calculations within the article, or other discussion within the article of sample size planning. For the definition of statistical power given to participants see the 'Additional Information' column of codebook |
| RW06 Appropriateness of statistical technique type | References to the reliability or validity of a specific type of statistical analysis that was performed as part of the study, including statistical models, calculations, tests, etc. as well as to alternative approaches to the statistical analyses. |
| RW07 Constructs & Operationalisation & Measurement | Combines 3 nodes for: references to the appropriateness, reliability, or validity of any concepts, constructs, instruments, or measurements used in the study - including references to operationalisation. See reference categories for details. |
| RW08 Confounding variables | References to any consideration of the possibility that confounding variables were/were not accounted for in the design, methods, or analysis. This includes references to whether variables were (in)adequately addressed by the experimental design as well as any discussion about blinding of conditions, blinding of experimenters, and appropriateness of the control variables. |
| *RW09 blinding (single or double)* | References to blinding of participants to which condition they were in (single blinding) or blinding of both the participants and the experimenters to the conditions (double blinding). |
| RW10 Design of study NEC | References to the study design or methods that are either: a) not specific enough to be captured by another node, including vague references to how well or poorly the study was designed or methods implemented; or, b) specify an aspect of the design or implementation not categorised elsewhere (NEC), including references to specific alternative approaches to designing or implementing the study. NOTE: if the reference specifically mentions statistical analyses without any other aspects of the design or method |
| RW11 Effect size | Any references to the effect size that indicate that the participant considered the size of the effect when assessing the claim. Don’t use if the term "effect size" is used in unrelated ways, but err on the side of considering statements as relevant to the participant’s assessment. See 'Additional Information' column of codebook for further detail |
| RW12 Interaction effect | References to when the effect was an interaction effect (rather than a direct effect). |
| RW13 Interval or range measure for statistical uncertainty (CI, SD, etc.) | References to the inclusion, absence, or size of the uncertainty measure for a given effect. For information about 'confidence intervals' given to participants see the 'Additional Information' column of codebook. |
| RW14 Population or subject characteristics (sampling practices) | References to the characteristics of the sample population or subjects used in a study that affect the participant’s assessment of the claim, including references to low response rate and any other questions or appreciation of the sampling practices. |
| *RW15 power adequacy and or sample size* | Combines 2 nodes for references to the adequacy (or not) of the statistical power of the study &/or sample size. See reference categories for details. |
| RW16 Significance, statistical (p-value etc.) | References to a test of statistical significance for the claim as it impacts on the participant’s assessment. This explicitly includes p-values, t-values, critical alpha and p-rep. If unsure of name of another test used ALSO code for 'Statistical practices and analysis NEC' and 'Review codes in this text' and write a note describing the unknown test. Ensure that both note and specific reference are easily findable. For information on 'p-values' given to participants see the 'Additional Information' column |
| *RW17 QRPs implied* | References where QRPs are implied but not specified. This includes references to research practices that inflate the false positive rate and/or lead to a less reproducible research literature, without being described as QRPs. See 'Additional Information' column of codebook for further detail and examples |
| *RW18 QRPs specified* | References to QRPs, 'questionable research practices', any explicit variation of these terms, or for any specific type of QRP mentioned by name (e.g. cherry-picking, HARKing, and p-hacking). Also include any QRP mentioned by name that is not specified above - in such case ALSO code for QRPs NEC and consider writing a note describing the QRP, especially if turning up repeatedly. Ensure that both note and specific reference are easily findable, e.g. by coding under ‘review codes in this text’. |
| RW19 Date of publication | References to the date of publication, for example in relation to something being published prior to the 'replication crisis' within the relevant discipline, or a study being difficult to re-run now because of changes in social expectations. |
| *RW20 inside area of expertise and or existing literature* | Combines 2 nodes: references to literature (in support or conflict with the claim or unspecified) and/or references to an aspect of the paper that the participant regarded as within their areas of expertise. Construe expertise broadly. See reference categories for details. |
| RW21 Private knowledge | References to participant knowledge that is not contained within the public literature and would not generally be appropriate to disclose in a public forum, such as knowledge from personal experiences and unsubstantiated rumours. |
| *RW22 author or institutional reputation* | Combines 2 nodes for references to the reputation of the authors and/or institutions involved in the original study. See reference categories for details. |
| *RW23 discipline and 'area of research' reputation* | References to specific discipline or sub-discipline reputation, e.g., “in light of failed priming effect studies” and/or comparisons between disciplines. For information about 'replication rates given to participants see the 'Additional Information' column of codebook |
| *RW24 journal reputation* | References to the reputation of the institutions involved in the study. |