Openness, Transparency, and Reproducibility Policy

Applied Psycholinguistics

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that studies published in Applied Psycholinguistics are reproducible. For additional information, please see the guidelines for Transparency and Openness Promotion. Authors must meet the journal's requirement that all study materials, data, and analysis code be made publicly and freely available by providing a Replication Package Statement as indicated in Step 5 of the submission process in ScholarOne.

This is usually accomplished by means of links to trusted repositories, and the default expectation is that access to all research materials, analysis code, and data will be publicly and freely available.

All submitted manuscripts are checked to ensure that this requirement is met. Missing, incomplete, or otherwise inadequate replication package information will result in automatic administrative rejection of the manuscript.

Author checklist

- Confirm that your replication package tells readers where public and free access to the complete (1) study materials, (2) analysis code, and (3) data can be found.
- All replication package materials are freely and publicly available. No registration, login, or request is required to access them.
- Confirm that all links provided in the replication package statement are functional.
- Confirm that you have reviewed all of the below information and suggestions for replication package language.
- Failure to meet the replication package requirement will result in automatic administrative rejection of your manuscript.

Definitions

Research materials

Research materials include participant recruitment materials, experimenter scripts, task instructions, questionnaires, information about data collection software information, data collection code, etc. The study should be directly replicable based on the information and

materials provided. All research materials must be accounted for in the replication package statement.

Data

Data refers to the full unaggregated data set(s) in .csv format. Data must be anonymized for participant privacy.

Analysis code

Analysis code includes complete instructions and code for conducting all analyses reported in the manuscript, and must be applicable to the raw data files described above.

Suggested language

Ideally, all research materials, data, and analysis code will be stored together in a single repository. In this case, the suggested language is:

> *All research materials, data, and analysis code are available at [insert link].*

FAQs

What is a trusted online repository?

Trusted online repositories include the Open Science Framework, Dataverse, a university repository, or other database on the Registry of Research Data Repositories.

How can I preserve author anonymity during the review process while sharing study materials, data, and analysis code?

To preserve author anonymity during the review process, authors must ensure that repositories do not reveal author identities (for instructions, see, e.g., OSF's review only link option). It is the author's responsibility to ensure appropriate anonymization in linked replication package materials.

What if I don't own the study materials, data, and/or analysis code?

In cases where authors do not own materials, code, and/or data, the replication package statement must tell readers where and how to access these elements. In cases where authors cannot share materials or data due to participant privacy concerns, the authors must provide a clear and detailed explanation of why the materials or data cannot be sufficiently anonymized for the purpose of responsible sharing, and/or why they are otherwise not shareable. Suggested language:

> *Some [study materials/data/analysis code], [describe], are available at [link]. The authors are secondary users of the following [name and*

*describe], which can be accessed by [describe precisely **where** and **how** readers can access these].*

Here is an example where the authors did not own the study materials (Byrd et al. 2023):

> *Replication data and materials for this article can be found at https://osf.io/w7jhs. Standardized assessments (PVT and DELV-ST) cannot be publicly shared because these materials are copyrighted by the publisher. The PVT can be accessed through the NIH Toolbox app, which can be purchased through the Apple App Store. More information on accessing the NIH Toolbox can be found at https://www.nihtoolbox.org/get-the-toolbox/. The DELV-ST can be purchased through Ventris Learning. More information on accessing the DELV-ST can be found at https://www.ventrislearning.com/delv/.*

What if my preferred repository requires prior article acceptance?

Some repositories allow posting only after formal acceptance of an article (e.g., IRIS). In these cases, authors may state the intention to post and the name of the repository ***in addition to*** providing and describing full and anonymous access during the review process via one of the repositories listed above.

What if my study is itself a replication of another study–do I still need a replication package?

Yes. The replication package is still required. Provide readers with all of the information they need to replicate what you did.

What if I believe I cannot share study materials, data, and/or analysis code?

In **extremely rare** cases, authors cannot share study materials, data, and/or analysis code. In these cases, the replication package must provide an **explanation** and **documentation** of why open sharing is not possible. Editors and reviewers will carefully evaluate these claims as part of the editorial and peer review process.

> *Some study materials [name the materials] cannot be publicly shared because [clear and detailed explanation].*

Can I make study materials, data, and/or analysis code “available on request”?

No. Offering to make materials "available on reasonable request" permits conscious and/or unconscious bias to control who has access to materials (Acciai et al., 2023), undermining the open scholarship principles that underly the journal’s Replication Package requirement. In addition, research has shown that authors commonly ignore or decline requests for data (see Tederoo et al. 2021 for discussion).