



Supplementary Materials for **Promoting Transparency in Social Science Research**

E. Miguel,* C. Camerer, K. Casey, J. Cohen, K. M. Esterling, A. Gerber, R. Glennerster,
D. P. Green, M. Humphreys, G. Imbens, D. Laitin, T. Madon, L. Nelson, B. A. Nosek,
M. Petersen, R. Sedlmayr, J. P. Simmons, U. Simonsohn, M. Van der Laan

*Corresponding author. E-mail: emiguel@berkeley.edu

Published 3 January 2014, *Science* **343**, 30 (2014)
DOI: 10.1126/science.1245317

This PDF file includes

Supplementary Text
References

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Text

Interested readers can refer to the following Web sites for further information on the various research transparency initiatives, centers and activities described in the main text:

- CONSORT reporting standards: www.consort-statement.org
- STROBE reporting standards: www.strobe-statement.org/
- Psychological disclosure standards: psychdisclosure.org
- U.S. clinical trials registry: clinicaltrials.gov
- American Political Science Association ethics guide: www.apsanet.org/content_2483.cfm
- Open Science Framework: openscienceframework.org
- Center for Open Science: centerforopenscience.org
- Catalogue of data repositories: re3data.org
- American Economic Association online registry: www.socialscienceregistry.org
- Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab: www.povertyactionlab.org
- Center for Effective Global Action (based at U.C. Berkeley): cega.berkeley.edu
- Experiments in Governance and Politics network, online site for preregistering research designs: e-gap.org/design-registration

References

1. M. F. Castro *et al.*, “Mexico’s M&E system: Scaling up from the sectoral to the national level” (IEG ECD Working paper 20, World Bank, Washington, DC, 2009).
2. Office of Management and Budget, “Use of evidence and evaluation in the 2014 budget” (Memo M-12-14, Office of the President, Washington, DC, 2012).
3. B. A. Nosek, J. R. Spies, M. Motyl, Scientific utopia: II. Restructuring incentives and practices to promote truth over publishability. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* **7**, 615–631 (2012). [doi:10.1177/1745691612459058](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612459058)
4. A. S. Gerber, N. Malhotra, Do statistical reporting standards affect what is published? Publication bias in two leading political science journals. *Q. J. Polit. Sci.* **3**, 313–326 (2008). [doi:10.1561/100.00008024](https://doi.org/10.1561/100.00008024)
5. K. Casey, R. Glennerster, E. Miguel, Reshaping institutions: Evidence on aid impacts using a preanalysis plan. *Q. J. Econ.* **127**, 1755–1812 (2012). [doi:10.1093/qje/qje027](https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qje027)
6. J. P. Simmons, L. D. Nelson, U. Simonsohn, False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychol. Sci.* **22**, 1359–1366 (2011). [doi:10.1177/0956797611417632](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632)
[Medline](#)
7. J. P. A. Ioannidis, Why most published research findings are false. *PLOS Med.* **2**, e124 (2005). [doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124) [Medline](#)
8. W. Stroebe, T. Postmes, R. Spears, Scientific misconduct and the myth of self-correction in science. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* **7**, 670–688 (2012). [doi:10.1177/1745691612460687](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612460687)

9. M. Humphreys, R. Sanchez de la Sierra, P. van der Windt, Fishing, commitment, and communication: A proposal for comprehensive nonbinding research registration. *Polit. Anal.* **21**, 1–20 (2013). [doi:10.1093/pan/mps021](https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mps021)
10. D. M. Lane, W. P. Dunlap, Estimating effect size: Bias resulting from the significance criterion in editorial decisions. *Br. J. Math. Stat. Psychol.* **31**, 107–112 (1978). [doi:10.1111/j.2044-8317.1978.tb00578.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1978.tb00578.x)
11. M. Rosenblum, M. J. Van der Laan, Optimizing randomized trial designs to distinguish which subpopulations benefit from treatment. *Biometrika* **98**, 845–860 (2011). [doi:10.1093/biomet/asr055](https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asr055) [Medline](#)
12. D. Rubin, For objective causal inference, design trumps analysis. *Ann. Appl. Statist.* **2**, 808–840 (2008). [doi:10.1214/08-AOAS187](https://doi.org/10.1214/08-AOAS187)
13. Open Science Collaboration, An open, large-scale, collaborative effort to estimate the reproducibility of psychological science. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* **7**, 657–660 (2012). [doi:10.1177/1745691612462588](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612462588)
14. A. S. Gerber, D. P. Green, D. Nickerson, Testing for publication bias in political science. *Polit. Anal.* **9**, 385–392 (2001). [doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.pan.a004877](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.pan.a004877)
15. U. Simonsohn, L. D. Nelson, J. P. Simmons, *J. Exp. Psychol.* 10.1037/a0033242 (2013).
16. S. Mathieu, I. Boutron, D. Moher, D. G. Altman, P. Ravaut, Comparison of registered and published primary outcomes in randomized controlled trials. *JAMA* **302**, 977–984 (2009). [doi:10.1001/jama.2009.1242](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2009.1242) [Medline](#)
17. D. A. Zarin, T. Tse, Moving toward transparency of clinical trials. *Science* **319**, 1340–1342 (2008). [doi:10.1126/science.1153632](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1153632) [Medline](#)
18. D. Neumark, The employment effects of minimum wages: Evidence from a prespecified research design the employment effects of minimum wages. *Industr. Relat.* **40**, 121 (2001).