

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND FINANCE
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY
CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND

**Paving the Road for Replications:
Experimental Results from an Online Research Repository**

**Tom Coupé
W. Robert Reed
Christian Zimmerman**

WORKING PAPER

No. 9/2021

**Department of Economics and Finance
School of Business
University of Canterbury
Private Bag 4800, Christchurch
New Zealand**

WORKING PAPER No. 9/2021

Paving the Road for Replications: Experimental Results from an Online Research Repository

Tom Coupé^{1†}
W. Robert Reed¹
Christian Zimmerman²

October 2021

Abstract: Are users of a bibliographic database interested in learning about replications? Can we motivate them to learn? To answer these questions, we performed an experiment on a RePEc (Research Papers in Economics) website: Using randomized stratification, we allocated 324 replications and their corresponding original studies to clusters; we then drew from those clusters to select treatment and control groups. We added brightly colored tabs to the relevant webpages to alert visitors to the existence of a replication study or to the original study of a replication. We monitored traffic over three phases lasting several months: a) no treatment, b) treatment on one group, c) treatment on both groups. We find a statistically significant increase in visits to replication pages, but the effect is small: Click-throughs to the replications occurred only 1% to 1.6% of the time.

Keywords: Replications, RePEc, Experiment, Online Research Repository, Webpages, Click-throughs

JEL Classifications: A11, B41, Z00

Acknowledgements: The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Federal Reserve System, the Board of Governors, or the regional Federal Reserve Banks. We acknowledge helpful feedback from participants at MetaScience2021 Conference.

¹ Department of Economics and Finance & UCMeta, University of Canterbury, NEW ZEALAND

² Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, USA

† Corresponding author: Tom Coupé. Email: tom.coupe@canterbury.ac.nz

I. Introduction

There is accumulating evidence that many published articles in scientific disciplines do not replicate well. Some have called this a “replication crisis” (Pashler & Wagenmakers, 2012). Probably the best-known test of replicability is the Reproducibility Project: Psychology (RPP), the results of which were published in *Science* (Open Science Collaboration, 2015). RPP attempted to replicate 100 prominent experiments in psychology. While statistically significant estimates were reported for 97% of the original experiments, only 36% of the estimates from the replicated experiments were significant.

While the field of psychology provides some of the most prominent examples of failure to replicate, examples are readily found in other disciplines, such as medicine (Ioannidis, 2005; Begley & Ellis, 2012), economics (Camerer et al., 2016; Duvendack et al., 2015, 2017), management (Hubbard, 2015), and nutrition science (Sorkin et al., 2016). To be fair, there is debate about how to interpret these findings, with some arguing that seemingly low rates of replication do not necessarily indicate scientific failings (Gilbert et al., 2016). Nevertheless, there is a general consensus that replication is good for science and should be done more frequently (Fidler & Wilcox, 2018).

One of the reasons given for why journals don't publish more replications is that replications do not generate sufficient citations to make them attractive enough for researchers to invest in (Duvendack et al, 2017). This claim, while widely believed, is difficult to prove. There is evidence, however, that the market for replicable results is not well-functioning. Focusing on the 100 studies included in the RPP, Yang et al. (2020) found virtually no difference between studies that passed replication and those that failed replication in how often they were cited. Serra-Garcia & Gneezy (2021), using a larger sample that included studies in psychology, economics, and general science journals, reported that nonreplicable publications were cited more than replicable ones. And Bar-Ilan & Halevi (2018) showed that papers

continued to be cited even after they were retracted. This suggests that the problem may be lack of information: Researchers who cite flawed studies may be unaware of subsequent research that undermines the original findings.

In this paper, we describe the results of an online experiment aimed at providing information about the existence of replication studies. Motivating this experiment is the conjecture that greater awareness of replications could lead to greater citation rates. This, in turn, could open the publication market for replication studies. Thus, as a first step in increasing replications, we need to identify effective strategies for increasing awareness of them. Our experiment consisted of an intervention in the online research repository, RePEc (Research Papers in Economics). RePEc is the main research repository for both working papers and published papers in economics, providing links to over 2,400,000 full-text articles. We modified some of the pages in IDEAS, which is one of the most popular RePEc websites, by inserting a prominent link alerting researchers to the existence of a replication.

We collected information on how often people visited the original page, how often they clicked on the link to the replication, and how frequently they visited the replication page. In this way, we were able to assess the efficacy of our webpage modification in making researchers aware of replication studies relevant to their online searches. If the problem is lack of awareness of replication studies, interventions such as this one could solve that problem.

Unfortunately, adding information about the existence of replications had an economically small impact: only 1% to 1.6% of all visits to the original papers' pages were followed by a visit to the webpage of the replication, increasing the replications' page visit counts by 3% to 7%.

In section II of this paper, we explain our intervention. In section III, we discuss results. Section IV concludes.

II. The Treatment

Overall description. We obtained replication studies from two websites that collect data on published replications in economics, [The Replication Network](#) and [ReplicationWiki](#). With the assistance of two research assistants, we then identified the RePEc handles for (i) the replication paper and (ii) the original paper replicated by the replication study. We excluded replication papers that replicated more than one original paper and original papers that were replicated by more than one replication paper. This gave us 324 (original study-replication) pairs that were not associated with any other replications or original papers.

As described in more detail below, these pairs were grouped into 68 clusters. Pairs within each cluster were closely matched. The pairs in each cluster were randomly assigned to one of two groups. Both groups received treatments, but at different stages of the intervention. The treatment consisted of a modification to the RePEc webpage of an original study that alerted the reader to the existence of its replication. We then used [LogEc](#) to obtain information on the number of visits to the respective papers' webpages.¹

Our experiment was conducted over eighteen months in 2020 and 2021 and consisted of three stages. Stage I was a six-month, pre-treatment period from February 2020 to July 2020. Page visit statistics from this period were used to create clusters of papers based on the number of visits to replication and original papers. Stage II lasted from August 2020 to February 2021. In this stage, webpages of studies in the first group were treated, while webpages of studies in the second group were left unchanged. We recorded visits and clicks on all the associated RePEc webpages, allowing us to compare online traffic for the two groups. Note that we omitted August in the subsequent analysis because treatments were not all applied at the same

¹ LogEc tries to weed out traffic from anything that seems automated (that is, traffic from web scrapers and bots such as Googlebot, Bingbot, and Baidu) as well as repeat visits.

time, but were spread throughout the month. As a result, not all the studies in the first group received the treatment for the full month in August.

In Stage III, the webpages of studies in the second group were also treated. This period lasted from March 2021 to July 2021. We again recorded visits and clicks on all the associated RePEc webpages. As in Stage II, we excluded the first month of treatment (March) because treatments were introduced piecemeal over the month.²

Assignment of studies to groups. To assign the pairs of original and replication papers to the two groups, we applied a procedure of stratified randomization.³ Original study-replication pairs were scored based on (i) the 6-month count of visits to the original study and (ii) the 6-month count of visits to the replication study during the pre-treatment period. We then followed an iterative procedure to match similar pairs.

The first step used hierarchical clustering (Euclidean distance, Ward variance) on the overall sample to find clusters that had at least 4 pairs in them and had a maximum distance of zero (i.e., exact matches). We removed these clusters from the overall sample and repeated hierarchical clustering on the remaining pairs, increasing the maximum distance between clusters in a stepwise manner until all study pairs were allocated to a cluster. This led to a total of 68 clusters, with an average of 5 pairs per cluster.⁴

For each cluster, we randomly allocated half of the pairs to the first group and half to the second group. If a cluster had an uneven number of pairs, the odd pair was randomly assigned to a group. This resulted in 161 pairs assigned to Group 1 and 163 pairs to Group 2.⁵

² We exclude from the click counts the clicks that come from visitors clicking on the back button, that is, visitors who return immediately to the page they started from.

³ Athey and Imbens (2016) recommend stratifying before the experiment and using at least 4 observations in each cluster.

⁴ We also experimented with a purely random allocation and a k-nearest neighbor algorithm, but in our sample, the iterative hierarchical clustering method showed better matching results – see the annex. See also <http://jmonlong.github.io/Hippocampus/2018/06/09/cluster-same-size/>

⁵ One pair has been excluded from the analysis because LogEc visitor statistics are no longer available for the original paper in the pair.

Webpages of Group 1 received the treatment during the month of August 2020. Webpages of Group 2 were unchanged until February 2021, but then they too received the treatment starting in March. As reported in Table 1 below, this assignment procedure resulted in a well-balanced sample as measured by pre-treatment page visits.

Table 1:

Balance in Pre-Treatment Page Visits between Groups 1 and 2

	Group 1	Group 2
Mean Monthly Page Visits of Replication Papers	10.2	10.0
Mean Monthly Page Visits of Original Papers	42.0	44.0
Median Monthly Page Visits of Replication Papers	5	5
Median Monthly Page Visits of Original Papers	17	17

As seen in the table, original studies generally received substantially more page visits than replications. The median monthly number of page visits to original studies in the 6-month period, February 2020 to July 2020 was 17, compared with only 5 page visits for their replications. While the numbers in the table show close agreement in mean and median visits between Groups 1 and 2, a better assessment of balance is provided in Figure 1. The two panels in this figure display histograms for original and replication studies over number of page visits. While there are differences, overall there is a substantial overlap between the distribution of visits to the replications' pages and the distribution of visits to the original papers' pages.

Description of treatment. The treatment consisted of two changes to a paper's RePEc webpage. This is best understood via an illustration. Panel A of Figure 2 depicts a typical RePEc webpage. The page opens up to the first tab, which reports author and abstract information. Active tabs are indicated by bright blue coloring. Note that the second tab is colored bright red to alert the webpage visitor to the option of downloading the paper.

Panel B of Figure 2 depicts how the RePEc page was altered for papers in the treatment group. First, an asterisk was added to the title to indicate that “* *This paper has been replicated.*” Second, a bright yellow tab titled “Replication” was added, providing an additional option to the webpage visitor. Clicking on this Replication tab took the visitor to the RePEc webpage with bibliographic information about and a link to the RePEc page of the replication study (see Figure 3). We count how many people clicked on the link to the RePEc page of the replication paper.⁶

A similar modification was made to the webpages of replication papers. To those, a note was added that the paper replicated an original paper, and a bright yellow tab with a link to the original paper was added.

III. Results

Measure #1: Click-throughs as a percent of total page views (original study). For our first measure of treatment effect, we focused on monthly click-throughs from the webpages of the original studies to the webpages of the replications. The vertical axis of Figure 4 reports monthly click-throughs as a percent of total page views for each group. The horizontal axis reports the calendar month. The three stages of the experiment are identified in the figure.

In Stage I, the pre-treatment stage (February 2020 to July 2020), page visitors to the original studies occasionally, but rarely, clicked through to the replication study. This would happen only if a reader found the replication study listed on the citations of the original study and clicked on the live link there.

Stage II ran from September 2020 until February 2021 and covered the first of our two interventions. Visitors to webpages of original studies in Group 1 were presented with an option to click on the link to the replication study. The red dotted line shows the percent of click-

⁶ Such clicks are unlikely to be caused by robots. Note we did find some instances where LogEc did not record any hits even though clicks were recorded.

throughs for this group. Webpages for original studies in Group 2 were left unaltered. The green dotted line represents percent of click-throughs for this group.

While there is a clear treatment effect, the size of the effect is small. Click-throughs ranged from 1.2% to 2.6% per month for the treated pages. In total over this period, treated original papers were visited 6793 times from other sources, but the link to the replication page was clicked only 107 times, giving an average monthly click-through rate of about 1.6%.⁷

Stage III (April 2021 to July 2021) covered the period of the second intervention. During this stage webpages for original studies in Group 2 also received the treatment. Similar to Stage II, there was an immediate uptick in the number of click-throughs for the newly treated studies. However, also similar to Stage II, the size of the effect was small. Click-throughs for the newly treated studies ranged between 1% and 2.1%.

Click-throughs were quite similar for both groups of treated studies in Stage III. Group 1 studies were visited 3932 times, with 42 clicks on the link to the replication study, producing an average monthly click-through rate of 1.1%. Group 2 studies received 3995 visits, with 63 of those visits leading to clicks on the links to the replication, for a click-through rate of 1.6%.

Measure #2: Clicks-throughs as a percent of total page views (replication study). Since many more people visit original studies than replications (cf. Table 1), even a small percent of click-throughs could represent a sizable impact on total page views for replication studies. For this reason, Figure 5 reports click-throughs as a percent of total page views of replication studies from other sources. As expected, the treatment effects using this alternative measure are larger.

For Group 1 during Stage II, the click-throughs ranged from 5% to 11.2% as a share of total visits to replication pages from other sources. The treated replications received a total of

⁷ By "from other sources" we mean that we subtract, from the total views to pages of original papers, the views related to the clicks from the replication page. Or, vice versa, we subtract, from the total views to pages of replication papers, the views related to the clicks from the original page.

107 visits via the links from the original studies, compared with a total of 1587 visits from other sources. Assuming no crowding out (i.e., visitors who would have visited the replication even if they had not seen the link on the original study's webpage), our intervention increased the number of visits to replication pages by 6.7%.

During Stage III (April to July 2021), Group 1 replication studies received a total of 42 visits via links from treated original studies, compared to a total of 1102 visits from other sources, for an overall treatment effect of 3.8%. The treatment effect for Group 2, the newly treated group, was 6.2% (63/1019).

Measure #3: Total page visits to replication pages. A final measure of treatment effect compares total page visits to replication pages for Groups 1 and 2 across all three stages of our experiment. The associated results are reported in Figure 6. During the pre-treatment period (Stage I), both groups received roughly the same number of page visits, with Group 1 receiving slightly (1%) more. In Stage II, webpages for replication studies in Group 1 received 12.3% more visits than Group 2. In Stage III, during which both groups received treatments, page visits at first rose for both groups, then declined. The fall in page visits in the last month of our experiment provides a reminder that seasonal effects, such as reduced online traffic during summer months, are also at play in our experiment.

Estimates of treatment effects. The previous analysis reported monthly averages for the two groups of studies across the three stages of our experiment. In this section we estimate treatment effects on the two main outcomes of interest: click-throughs and visits to replication pages. Our estimation exploits the matching process used to assign papers to clusters.

Our analysis focuses on Stage II. In Stage I, none of the papers in our study were treated. In Stage III, all the papers were treated. In Stage II, each cluster contained both treated and untreated papers, matched on the basis of page visits during the pre-treatment period. We take the difference in the monthly averages of either (i) click-throughs or (ii) visits to replication

pages between treated and untreated papers in the same cluster. Our estimated treatment effect consists of the mean/median of these average differences. There were 68 clusters and 6 months of observations, producing a total of 408 observations. Table 2 reports the results.

The top panel of Table 2 reports differences in average monthly click-throughs between treated and untreated original studies. Rows 1) and 3) show mean and median differences of 0.11 and 0, respectively. These compare to mean and median monthly page visits of 7.1 and 3 (cf. Rows 5 and 6). Using the mean value, our estimated treatment effect amounts to a 1.6% increase in click-throughs. While small in practical terms, the estimate is statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Row 7) addresses the concern that perhaps the reason for the small effect was because many of the original treated studies did not have any visitors. In fact, over 80% of the monthly observations of treated original pages received at least one visit.

Our experimental design also allowed us to calculate an ex-post test of balance. In Stage III, all the papers in our experiment were treated. We performed the same test of differences for these studies that we did in Stage II. If assignment to Groups 1 and 2 was random and treatment effects were homogenous, we would expect to see no difference in click-throughs between these two groups. Rows 2) and 4) report that that was what we found. The mean “treatment effect” for Stage III is much smaller at -0.039 and is insignificant at the 5% significance level. The median “treatment effect” is 0. This provides further evidence supporting the validity of our random assignment of studies to groups.

The bottom panel of Table 2 repeats the previous analysis for page visits to replication studies. We estimate mean and median differences in average monthly page visits for treated and untreated replication pages of 0.6 and 0. These compare to mean and median values of overall monthly visits of 1.65 and 1. In the case of the mean value, the effect is statistically significant and represents a 35% increase in page visits. The seemingly large effect is an artifact of the small number of visits that replication pages receive, so that almost any increase in page

visits would represent a large percentage increase. In fact, approximately 45% of the monthly observations of replication pages received no visits at all. Note further that the balance tests suggest that when all pairs were treated, the pairs from Group 1 still had about 0.5 visits more, suggesting the real causal effect of the treatment is small (cf. Rows 9 and 11).

IV. Conclusions

This study investigated the effects of an online experiment. We modified the webpages of an online research repository to encourage visitors to the webpages of original studies to visit the associated webpages of the replications of those studies. While we found a positive impact from our intervention, the practical size of the estimated effects was very small. Approximately 1% of the visitors to our treated webpages were induced to click through to the replication pages.

Possible explanations for our findings. One possible reason for the relatively small effect of our treatment was that it was not sufficiently visible to online visitors of the original studies (cf. Figure 2). We could have chosen more obtrusive indicators and discussed the use of pop-ups. However, it was decided this would cross the line from informative to annoying. We identified no other possible methods, especially since the intent of this experiment was to test an idea that, if successful, could be implemented on other research platforms.

Another possible reason for the small impact is that visitors may have already been familiar with the replication studies and therefore had no need to click through to the replication study. This hypothesis, however, does not address why overall visits to originals are so much higher than visits to replications (cf. Table 1).

A third possibility is the obvious one: that researchers were not interested in the replications. Although they clearly showed some interest in the subject by clicking to the page of the original study, they may have not had enough interest to view the replication. This line of inquiry leads to many further conjectures. Online readers of the original studies may have

merely wanted to get the “lay of the land” with respect to prominent papers in the field. They may have already decided to cite the paper in their own research, but wanted to be more familiar with it before doing so. Alternatively, they may not have had confidence, for any number of reasons, that they could learn much from replications. A last possibility, uncomfortable as it is to say, is that researchers may not have cared whether the published findings from the original papers were accurate.

Implications. Assuming our findings are externally valid for other research platforms, they suggest that online interventions to alert readers of replication studies are unlikely to have much impact.

If online interventions to increase awareness are unlikely to be effective, what then? It really depends on the reasons why our interventions were ineffective. If researchers are already familiar with the existence of replication studies, there is no reason to try to increase awareness. If researchers lack confidence in replications, then efforts to improve the quality/reliability of replications could be helpful. If most researchers don’t care whether empirical findings from other studies are true, then changing academic incentives to induce them to care could be effective.

This last effort could be achieved, for example, if leading professional societies publish journals solely devoted to replications or require researchers to publish replications to receive tenure or other promotions. Regardless of the underlying factors, one implication of this study is that it is important to find out why researchers are not more motivated to learn about replications. We hope this study stimulates initiatives in this direction.

Limitations. Our sample size was ultimately limited by the number of replication studies we could identify: 324 matched (original studies/replication) pairs may seem like a large number, but the effective size was somewhat diminished by the fact that some of the webpages of the original studies were not heavily trafficked. As indicated in Table 2, about

17% of the originals did not get any visit in a specific month. Another limitation of the current study concerns external validity. It is uncertain how the results from this study would extrapolate to other online research repositories such as arXiv, bioRxiv, medRxiv, and PsyArXiv.

References

- Athey, Susan and Guido W. Imbens (2016). The Econometrics of Randomized Experiments. ArXiv 1607.00698, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1607.00698.pdf>
- Bar-Ilan, J., Halevi, G. (2018) Temporal characteristics of retracted articles. *Scientometrics*, 116(3): 1771–1783
- Begley, C. G., & Ellis, L. M. (2012). Raise standards for preclinical cancer research. *Nature*, 483(7391), 531-533.
- Camerer, C. F., Dreber, A., Forsell, E., Ho, T. H., Huber, J., Johannesson, M., ... & Wu, H. (2016). Evaluating replicability of laboratory experiments in economics. *Science*, 351(6280), 1433-1436.
- Duvendack, M., Palmer-Jones, R. W., & Reed, W. R. (2015). Replications in economics: A progress report. *Econ Journal Watch*, 12(2), 164-191.
- Duvendack, M., Palmer-Jones, R., & Reed, W. R. (2017). What is meant by "replication" and why does it encounter resistance in economics?. *American Economic Review*, 107(5), 46-51.
- Fidler, F. & Wilcox, J. (2018). Reproducibility of scientific results. In Zalta, E. N. (Eds.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* The Metaphysics Research Lab Center for the Study of Language and Information Stanford University.
- Gilbert, D. T., King, G., Pettigrew, S., & Wilson, T. D. (2016). Comment on “Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science”. *Science*, 351(6277), 1037-1037.
- Hubbard, R. (2015). *Corrupt research: The case for reconceptualizing empirical management and social science*. Sage Publications.
- Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). Contradicted and initially stronger effects in highly cited clinical research. *JAMA*, 294(2), 218-228.
- Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251).
- Pashler, H., & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2012). Editors’ introduction to the special section on replicability in psychological science: A crisis of confidence? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(6), 528-530.
- Serra-Garcia, M., & Gneezy, U. (2021). Nonreplicable publications are cited more than replicable ones. *Science advances*, 7(21), eabd1705.
- Sorkin, B. C., Kuszak, A. J., Williamson, J. S., Hopp, D. C., & Betz, J. M. (2016). The challenge of reproducibility and accuracy in nutrition research: resources and pitfalls. *Advances in Nutrition*, 7(2), 383-389.

Yang, Y., Youyou, W., & Uzzi, B. (2020). Estimating the deep replicability of scientific findings using human and artificial intelligence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(20), 10762-10768.

TABLE 2:
Estimates of Treatment Effects

	Estimate	95% Confidence Interval
<u>Estimate of Treatment Effect: Clicks^a</u> <i>(Dependent variable = Difference in Monthly Clicks)</i>		
1) ATE – <i>Mean Difference</i>	0.1146	(0.089, 0.140)
2) Stage III Balance Test: ^c <i>Mean Difference</i>	-0.039	(-0.085, 0.007)
3) ATE – <i>Median Difference</i>	0	(0, 0) ^d
4) Stage III Balance Test: ^c <i>Median Difference</i>	0	(0, 0) ^d
5) Mean Number of Monthly Page Visits (Treated Originals/Stage II) = 7.1 ^e		
6) Median Number of Monthly Page Visits (Treated Originals/Stage II) = 3 ^e		
7) Percent of Treated Originals with Positive Page Visits (Stage II) = 83.4% ^e		
<u>Estimate of Treatment Effect: Page Visits to Replication Studies^b</u> <i>(Dependent variable = Difference in Monthly Page Visits)</i>		
8) ATET – <i>Mean Difference</i>	0.645	(0.073, 1.217)
9) Stage III Balance Test: ^c <i>Mean Difference</i>	0.498	(-0.164, 1.159)
10) ATET – <i>Median Difference</i>	0.009	(0, 0.08) ^d
11) Stage III Balance Test: ^c <i>Median Difference</i>	-0.012	(-0.167, 0) ^d
12) Mean Number of Monthly Page Visits (Treated Replications/Stage II) = 1.65 ^e		
13) Median Number of Monthly Page Visits (Treated Replications/Stage II) = 1 ^e		
14) Percent of Treated Replications with No Page Visits (Stage II) = 48% ^e		

NOTE: The data consist of cluster-level observations. There are a total of 408 observations (68 clusters × 6 months) in Stage II, and 272 observations in Stage III (68 clusters × 4 months). There is an average of approximately 5 studies in each cluster, with half allocated to

Group 1 and half to Group 2. In Stage II, only Group 1 studies are treated. In Stage III, both groups are treated.

^a For the top panel, an individual observation consists of the difference in the average number of clicks for treated studies minus the average number of clicks for untreated studies in the same cluster. Note that untreated, original studies can have a click-through if the researcher finds the replication included on the Citations tab of the original study. However, this rarely happens.

^b For the bottom panel, an individual observation consists of the difference in the average number of page visits to treated replication studies minus the average number of page visits to untreated replications in the same cluster.


^c In Stage III, all studies are treated. If our stratified randomization procedure is effective, there should be no difference between Group 1 and 2 studies with respect to clicks/page visits. The balancing test consists of performing the same statistical analysis for Stage III as we did for Stage II.

^d A 95% confidence interval was constructed by bootstrapping the sample of differences 10,000 times, each time taking the median of the bootstrapped sample. The 10,000 bootstrapped, median values were then rank ordered, with the lower and upper bounds constructed by taking the 250th and 9750th values.


^e Sample statistics are calculated by aggregating monthly values for all treated studies during the Stage II period

FIGURE 1:
Balance Check: Density Plots of Page Visits to Group 1 and Group 2 studies

A. Page Visits to Original Studies



B. Page Visits to Replication Studies



**FIGURE 2:
Depiction of the Treatment (Original Study)**

A. No Treatment

The screenshot shows the IDEAS website interface for a paper titled "On the Need for a Replication Journal" by Christian Zimmermann. The navigation bar includes "Economic literature", "Authors", "Institutions", "Rankings", "Help/FAQ", and "MyIDEAS". Below the title, there are buttons for "Author & abstract", "Download", "11 References", "7 Citations", "Most related", and "Related works & more". A "Corrections" button is also present. The author information shows "Listed: Christian Zimmermann" and "Registered: Christian Zimmermann". The abstract text discusses the need for replication studies in economics. A "Suggested Citation" box contains the citation: "Christian Zimmermann, 2015. 'On the Need for a Replication Journal,' Working Papers 2015-16, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis." The right sidebar features a search bar, "Browse Econ Literature" categories (Working papers, Journals, Software components, Books, Book chapters, JEL classification), and "More features" (Subscribe to new research, RePEc Biblio, Author registration, Economics Virtual Seminar Calendar NEW!, FRED data).

B. Treatment

The screenshot shows the IDEAS website interface for a paper titled "Predicting the Present with Google Trends*" by Hyunyoung Choi and Hal Varian. The navigation bar is identical to the previous screenshot. Below the title, there is a note: "* This paper has been replicated". The navigation buttons include "Author & abstract", "Download", "313 Citations", "Replication" (highlighted in yellow), "Related works & more", and "Corrections". The author information shows "Listed: HYUNYOUNG CHOI, HAL VARIAN" and "Registered: Hal Ronald Varian". The abstract text states: "No abstract is available for this item." The "Suggested Citation" box contains the citation: "Hyunyoung Choi & Hal Varian, 2012. 'Predicting the Present with Google Trends,' The Economic Record, The Economic Society of Australia, vol. 88(s1), pages 2-9, June." The right sidebar is identical to the previous screenshot.

FIGURE 3:
Depiction of the Treatment (Replication Study)

The screenshot displays the top portion of an academic article page. At the top left, there are social media sharing icons for Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, and Email. To the right, there are links for 'Save this article' and 'My bibliography'. A search bar labeled 'Search econ literature' is positioned in the top right corner. The main title of the article is 'Predicting the Present with Google Trends*', with a sub-note below it stating '* This paper has been replicated'. Below the title is a horizontal navigation bar with buttons for 'Author & abstract', 'Download', '313 Citations', 'Replication', 'Related works & more', and 'Corrections'. The 'Replication' button is highlighted in blue. Under the 'Replication' section, it states 'This item has been replicated by:' followed by a list of replication studies. The first entry is: 'Coupé, Tom, 2018. "Replicating "Predicting the present with Google trends" by Hyunyoung Choi and Hal Varian (The Economic Record, 2012)," Economics - The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal, Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW), vol. 12, pages 1-8.' On the right side of the page, there is a sidebar with a search bar, a 'Browse Econ Literature' section listing categories like 'Working papers', 'Journals', 'Software components', 'Books', 'Book chapters', and 'JEL classification', and a 'More features' section listing options like 'Subscribe to new research', 'RePEc Biblio', 'Author registration', 'Economics Virtual Seminar Calendar NEW!', and 'FRED data'.

Twitter Facebook LinkedIn Email

Save this article My bibliography

Search econ literature

Predicting the Present with Google Trends*

* This paper has been replicated

Author & abstract Download 313 Citations Replication Related works & more Corrections

Replication

This item has been replicated by:

Coupé, Tom, 2018. "Replicating "Predicting the present with Google trends" by Hyunyoung Choi and Hal Varian (The Economic Record, 2012)," Economics - The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal, Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW), vol. 12, pages 1-8.

Advanced (and improved) search

Browse Econ Literature

Working papers
Journals
Software components
Books
Book chapters
JEL classification

More features

Subscribe to new research
RePEc Biblio
Author registration
Economics Virtual Seminar Calendar NEW!
FRED data

FIGURE 4:
Click-Throughs as a Percent of Total Page Visits (Original Study)




FIGURE 5:
Click-Throughs as a Percent of Total Page Visits (Replication Study)




FIGURE 6:
Total Page Visits (Replication Studies)

