



## Guidelines for reviewers

*Registered Reports* at CRSP are a form of empirical article in which the theorizing, methods and proposed analyses are pre-registered and reviewed prior to research being conducted.

What is different compared to the typical review process you are familiar with?

- The review process for *Registered Reports* is divided into two stages. In Stage 1, reviewers assess study proposals **before** data is collected. In Stage 2, reviewers consider the full study, including results and interpretation.
- By default CRSP has an **open review**, or non-blind reviewing process. First, CRSP endorses a collaborative scientific effort, and second, intellectual ownership of the submitting authors needs to be protected. Given special circumstances, reviewers may ask the Action Editor to include their review as blinded.

Following **Stage 1 peer review**, manuscripts will be accepted, offered the opportunity to revise, or rejected outright.

Manuscripts that pass peer review will be issued an in principle acceptance (IPA), indicating that the article will be published pending successful completion of the study according to the exact methods and analytic procedures outlined, as well as a defensible and evidence-bound interpretation of the results.

Stage 1 manuscripts will include only an Introduction, Methods (including proposed analyses), and Pilot Data (where applicable). In considering papers at Stage 1, you will be asked to assess:

- The significance of the research question(s) and the quality of the theoretical reasoning. Note that it is acceptable for authors to set up conditions likely to yield important and interesting findings even if multiple theories may predict different outcomes or if no known theory can predict an outcome, if the significance of such a test can be justified.
- The logic, rationale, and plausibility of the proposed hypotheses
- The soundness and feasibility of the methodology and analysis pipeline (including statistical power analysis where applicable)
- Whether the clarity and degree of methodological detail provided by the author would be sufficient for another researcher to replicate exactly the experimental procedures and analyses
- Whether the authors provide a sufficiently clear and detailed description of the methods to prevent undisclosed flexibility in the experimental procedures or analysis pipeline
- Whether the methods proposed are the best available to address the theoretical question, including whether the authors have considered sufficient outcome-neutral conditions (e.g. absence of floor or ceiling effects; positive controls) for ensuring that the results obtained are able to test the stated hypotheses

**Stage 2 manuscripts:** Authors will conduct the approved research and complete the manuscript, including Results and Discussion sections. These Stage 2 manuscripts will more closely resemble a regular article format. Authors may add additional analyses and extra studies that have to be clearly marked as exploratory. The manuscript will then be returned to some of the reviewers, who will be asked to appraise:

- Whether the data are able to test the authors' proposed hypotheses by passing the approved outcome-neutral criteria (such as absence of floor and ceiling effects or success of positive controls)
- Whether the Introduction, rationale and stated hypotheses are the same as the approved Stage 1 submission (required)
- Whether the authors adhered precisely to the registered experimental procedures
- Whether the authors' conclusions are justified given the data
- In case of exploratory analysis and extra studies a regular assessment of their quality and fit within the paper. Please do also evaluate if they significantly add to the pre-registered content.

Please note that editorial decisions will not be based on the perceived importance, novelty, or clarity of the results.