

# Pre-Reviewing and Carrots Instead of Sticks

Kevin M. Esterling (UC – Riverside)

Presentation to CEGA Meeting on Preregistration for the Social Sciences

December 7, 2012

## **EGAP makes a direct analogy to the heavily regulated (FDAAA-style) medical model for registration**

- Regulation as a “stick”
  - Failing to preregister reduces your chances of publishing in leading journals
  - Deviating from your plan requires a narrative of shame to be appended to your manuscript
- Regulation of behavior ⇒
  - Underproduction of inductive and descriptive research
  - Creates incentives to neglect data problems
  - Barriers to entry for resource poor and junior scholars

## Instead focus on carrots instead of sticks

Use the registration system to create incentives to produce higher quality research instead of as a shaming mechanism for researchers who don't conform to textbook standards for deductive research

## **Carrot: Use the registration system to create a new mechanism to textbf“pre-review” research designs**

- Pre-review as “carrot”
  - Reviews at the design stage would have the highest marginal benefit
  - Pre-review has the highest benefit to scholars who don't have resources or extensive colleague networks
  - The quality of criticism is much higher in peer review than from informally circulating papers (“accountability”)
- There is currently no mechanism for peer review of research designs
- Design the system so pre-reviewing is incentivized and not too time consuming

## A mechanism for pre-reviewing

- Must preregister to be eligible for pre-reviews of your PAP.
- To begin create an account in the system and submit your PAP
- The system randomly assigns two PAPs into your account from the queue (one cannot choose which studies to review).
- Must complete two reviews of other studies in order for your PAP to be placed in the queue for peer review.
- In return you get two reviews of your study.
- Reviews are non-anonymous.

## Pre-reviewing creates carrot-like incentives to participate in the preregistration system

- (I realize the most reviews are stupid, but you can usually find some constructive points even in the bad ones)
- Pre-reviewing:
  - Improves the quality of research designs at a point of highest benefit
  - Creates incentives to spend more time on the front end of research
  - Improves the credibility of research and of any subsequent null findings

⇒ Registration reduces fishing from these positive incentives rather than from directly regulating behavior and shaming