Participant cheat sheet: A guide to answering the questions

Important things to note:

- Sometimes the claim text (in bold) indicates a claim different from that reported in the inferential test results. In this case, all your answers should relate to the inferential test results, as the next stage of SCORE will be focusing on testing the replicability of the test results only.
- We are asking you about **direct replications** (i.e., they constitute reasonable tests of the original claim, despite minor changes that may have occurred in methods or procedure), not conceptual replications.
- If you need some help with statistical (or other) terms or concepts, check out the training materials document.

**Question 1: How well do you understand this claim?**

You are given a research claim from an article. A research claim is a single major finding from a published study (for example, a journal article), as well as details of the methods and results that support this finding. We know the clarity and comprehensibility of scientific papers varies. We are interested in your honest account of how well you understand (or not!) this claim, and the relevant terms or concepts. Writing down some brief notes may help you answer the subsequent questions.

**Question 2: What's your initial reaction: is the underlying effect or relationship plausible?**

We know this is a broad question. We’re trying to get a sense of your intuition about whether the effect or relationship underlying the claim is real, regardless of its exact operationalisation in this study. For example, would you give it a high prior probability? Don’t worry too much about exactly what ‘plausible’ means - just be consistent, and let us know if some claims are clearly more plausible (or implausible) than others.

**Question 3: What is the probability that direct replications of this study would find a statistically significant effect in the same direction as the original claim (0-100%)? 0 means that you think that a direct replication would never succeed, even by chance. 100 means that you think that a direct replication would never fail, even by chance.**

To answer this question, imagine 100 replications of the original study, combined to produce a single, overall replication estimate (e.g., a meta-analysis with no publication bias). How likely is it that the overall estimate will be similar to the original? Note that all replication studies are ‘direct’ replications, i.e., they constitute reasonable tests of the original claim, despite minor changes that may have occurred in methods or procedure. And all replication studies have high power (90% power to detect an effect 50-75% of the original effect size with alpha=0.05, two-sided).

In the text box, we also ask you to note what factors influenced your judgement about whether the claim would successfully replicate, or not. For each of the following, list some factors (dot points are fine):

- For your lower bound, think of factors that make successful replications unlikely.
- For your upper bound, think of factors that make successful replications likely.
- For your best estimate, consider the balance of factors.

**Question 4: Considering the major factors that influenced your thinking in making these judgements, please describe any important aspects that you have not covered above.**

We are interested in identifying what aspects most influenced your decision-making processes. Please share any aspects that were important, but which were not included in the comments above. Dot points are fine!

**Question 5: Were you an author of, or involved in any aspect of the writing, data collection or analysis, for this original study?**

Just a yes or no is fine!