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**Editor First Decision—Revise & Resubmit**

Dec 7, 2020

Dear Dr. Montoya,

I want to begin by apologizing for the delay in making a decision on your manuscript. Although you submitted it as a streamlined paper, I chose to send it out for external review because it did not go out for external review at the previous journal (and the revised version received a relatively short review from the editor). I have now received a review of your manuscript from a researcher with expertise in publication practices. I also independently read the manuscript before consulting this review. The reviewer and I both had mixed reactions to your manuscript.  We both felt that the manuscript has some promise but that there are some major issues that need to be addressed.  I therefore invite you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology, but I want to be honest that the revision would have to be quite substantial - much of the paper would have to be rewritten. Furthermore, I cannot make any guarantees about the outcome of the process.

The reviewer did an outstanding job in their review. I will not repeat their points here, but I think all of them are important. In your resubmission, please include a document with a point-by-point response to both the points I list here and the reviewer’s comments, outlining each change made in your manuscript or providing a suitable rebuttal.

My biggest concern is that there are quite a few errors throughout the manuscript.  This makes me worry abou how easy it will be for readers to understand the writing, and more importantly, it makes me nervous about the accuracy of the data and results reported here.  As just one example, on page 2 you write that “author blind review can disadvantage women…”.  You directly contradict this later (p. 13), and I believe you meant to write the opposite.  This is not a big deal, except that the editor at the previous journal pointed this out in their first decision letter, and yet the error remains (though in your cover letter in response to the editor’s first decision, you say that you have corrected it - I’m not sure what happened).  Another example is that you state on page 6 that “All analyses and results for journal impact factor and open science practices are described in the supplementary materials” but in fact you describe the results in the main text - this seems like a rather significant inconsistency.  A third example is that the language you use to describe Registered Reports is not always accurate.  The reviewer gives several examples of misstatements regarding Registered Reports in your manuscript.  Indeed, the first sentence of the manuscript states that “the decision about acceptance is based on the quality of the proposed methods, rather than statistical significance of the result” - but as you mention later, the decision can also be based on the importance of the research question, not just the method.  Thus, I fear that your opening sentence risks spreading a misconception about RRs.  Finally, there are some places where basic information is missing. For example, throughout the manuscript the reader never finds out whether the open science practices that were coded were policies that apply only to Registered Reports or to all submissions. This seems like a fundamental aspect of the method, and the fact that it is missing makes me worry about the comprehensiveness of the report.

I found myself very torn about what to do in response to this issue.  From what I can tell, I believe the data are valuable, and a report that presented this study thoroughly, accurately, and clearly, could be worth publishing. However, I feel the current manuscript is quite far from such a report, despite feedback from another editor that touched on some of these issues (though admittedly emphasized different factors). Normally, if I give a revise and resubmit decision, I want to give the authors a very straightforward list of what would need to be done to get an accept decision, so that they know ahead of time how to proceed and can decide if they want to make the requested changes.  In this case, however, it is not possible for me to give such guidance. To address the issues raised above and below, I think the manuscript would need to be rewritten with an eye towards using precise language and a clear structure throughout, defining all important concepts, providing details of all important aspects of the method, reporting the results in clear language, and proofreading and double-checking all details of the writing and statistical reporting.  The bulk of this work would require you to come up with a clear structure that allows you to walk the reader through all of the important steps in each section of the manuscript. Then, there are a few additional steps you could follow to take extra precautions in ensuring the clarity and comprehensiveness of your manuscript. For example, to make sure that all concepts are clearly explained, all important details of the method are reported, and the results are easy to understand, you could also ask some colleagues to read the manuscript and identify any parts that are still unclear or incomplete after you have done the bulk of the rewriting. Similarly, to reduce the chances of statistical reporting errors, you could have another researcher attempt to reproduce all of your results from the raw data and make sure they get the same results. Perhaps you have done this already, but in any case, I think more feedback from people unfamiliar with this manuscript would be useful.

Below I list some other issues I would want to see addressed in a revision, in addition to the points raised by the reviewer. These are rather specific points, but I want to emphasize that the revisions you would need to make for Collabra would go well beyond these specific issues.

Please provide the operational definitions you used for each coding response option (what counted as ‘present’ or ‘missing’ in Table 1, or as ‘yes’ or ‘no’ in Table 2?).

Please include columns for “no mention” in Tables 2 and 3 so that the rows add up to 100%, and readers can get a better sense of the denominator when interpreting each cell.  In your interpretations, please also make sure to place the results in the context of the full set of journals, not just those that provided a yes or no position on a given variable.

The “open science practices” and “author blind review” results sections are especially hard to follow.  In some cases, basic definitions are missing (e.g., “author blind” could mean the author is blind to the reviewers’ identities, or vice versa).  In other cases, the categories are too complex to follow (e.g., various combinations of replication/novel studies allowed/not allowed/not mentioned), and perhaps making less-fine-grained distinctions would be better (e.g., it doesn’t really make sense to me to report whether novel studies were mentioned/allowed - isn’t it safe to assume they are “allowed” unless the journal explicitly says it only publishes replications?).

Have you considered using the TOP factor scores for the journals that have them?

You currently do not mention the impact-related results in the discussion.  You should discuss them (while making sure not to draw any conclusions that aren’t well-grounded in evidence), even if just to say that it is not clear what can be made of these results.  Presumably you coded this for a reason, and it would be useful to hear your reflections on the results.

Please add a conclusion section to the end of the manuscript.

Smaller points (many of these may be irrelevant if you substantially rewrite the manuscript): Abstract: I’m not sure it makes sense to say misconceptions are “disconfirmed” - if they are misconceptions, by definition they are not true. p. 2 - the sentence beginning “Specifically, researchers may” does not flow quite right. p. 3 - I think you need to provide a bit more explanation of the Scheel findings, and the Hummer findings (you mention these twice in two different paragraphs). p. 5 - I’m not sure why footnote 1 is a footnote. p. 6 - “less specified fields” is awkward - I think you mean a field not listed in your categorization? p. 7 - It is not clear from the text that the 12 submission logistic variables are a subset of the 18 variables. p. 8 - If you categorized the variables into ones having to do with submission logistics vs. the rest, please present them that way in the table. p. 9 - “out there” sounds a bit too casual, in my opinion p. 9 - “there are still some restrictions to ensure the transparency of the final manuscript” - this seems like speculation about the purpose of the restrictions. I would suggest either elaborating to make it clear why you believe this is the purpose of the restrictions, or removing. p. 11 - “at slightly lower levels (46.91%)” isn’t 46.91 higher than 46.09 in the previous sentence?  Also, this seems very high for the proportion of journals that require pre-registration - I assume this is referring only to what’s required of RRs? p. 12 - Just checking - is it the case that 12 journals have “open review” where reviewers are revealed at publication?  I had not heard of this, and I know of many more journals that have “open review” where the content of the review is published but the identity of the reviewer is not revealed at publication unless they signed their review (in which case, the identity of the reviewer was already known to the author).  Could you double check that this is coded correctly? p. 13 - It seems like overkill to me to suggest that journals should explicitly state in their RR policy that RRs are not specific to a special issue - this seems like the kind of thing that only needs to be explicitly stated if the RR mechanism is specific to a special issue, right? p. 14 - I agree with you that keeping reviewers blind to authors’ identities likely makes the peer review process more objective, but I just wanted to flag that this is controversial, and the empirical evidence on this is quite messy.

In summary, I think this is a promising study and I believe it could warrant a revision if you believe you can address the issues raised above.  If you think this is possible, I hope you will consider revising this for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology.  I realize this may be more substantial revision than you are willing to conduct, but I hope you will consider it.

If you do submit a revision, please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at [editorialoffice@collabra.org](mailto:editorialoffice@collabra.org).

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks, but if you need more time, just let us know.

Sincerely,

Simine Vazire Editor in Chief Collabra: Psychology

**Reviewer 1**

**Open response questions**

Please write your review here. The author(s) will see this review. Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you also include your name (i.e., sign your review) in this box. It is up to you whether to reveal your identity or not, either is fine.

The authors posit that a lack of available complete information about Registered Reports at journal level may represent a barrier to author uptake. They go on to code journal guidelines on a range of information to supplement that currently available on the COS website.

The topic of the paper is certainly interesting and we need more research on a range of topics relating to Registered Reports. I like that two coders independently coded all variables for all journals, and that they transparently report a change to the coding scheme that occurred during coding. If the coding scheme had been preregistered it would have been even better!

**Major comments**

The manuscript sets out some aims that are not currently delivered and some claims that require substantiation. My main concern is that a core aim of the manuscript is to increase numbers of author submissions yet it does not investigate past and current submission levels.

1. In the abstract you state “…with the goal of documenting the early adoption of registered reports…” This sets up the expectation, especially because your focus is on informational barriers for authors, that the paper will report author adoption. Given your goal and the amount of information about RR journals already available on the COS website, I would like to see information about author uptake. Specifically, 1) for the number of (individual) stage 1 authors by year (are we seeing new authors submit or is it the same authors submitting again?) and, 2) the rate of stage 1 submissions, and stage 2 publications, by area/journal/year. Given how long it takes from stage 1 submission to stage 2 publication we might expect a lag of ~1.5 – 2 years between journal adoption and the first published RRs. Therefore information on stage 1 submissions is the best metric of author adoption. You cite work on journal submissions by DeHaven et al., 2019 and Hardwicke & Ioannidis, 2018, presumably they carried out this work in 2018 and 2017 respectively. Hence the information is ~2-3 years out of date. That’s a long time in RRs short life. The picture may look different in 2020. If researchers can’t collect data due the pandemic they might find it is the ideal time to submit a RR. The addition of author adoption information would improve the informational value of the manuscript and take it beyond coding new variables not currently collated on the COS website. It would also allow interesting comparisons between the number of journals from each scientific discipline/psychology research areas you coded, and the number of submissions.
2. The manuscript makes several claims about potential barriers: that authors are put off by lack of available information, that there is an “expectation that journals publishing registered reports are of low quality seems to persist”, that “another common critique of registered reports is that with unblinded review…” etc, but doesn’t provide any support for these claims. You need to be clear about the basis for these claims, particularly as you’re referring to them as common and persistent. If the premise of your research is that “Reducing informational barriers of entry for authors may increase the number of registered reports being submitted and accepted at journals across scientific disciplines” the reader needs convincing that lack of information creates a barrier in the first place. And if the barrier is at journal level, do journals that provide more complete information receive more submissions? Going back to my earlier point, if we want submissions to increase we need baseline information on current submissions (not just stage 2 publications).
3. “Understanding more about the current status of registered reports can assist researchers in adopting this new publication mechanism, suggest best practices for new journals adopting registered reports, and provide feedback to the journals that have already adopted registered reports.” To fulfil your aims, your Discussion could be much more structured to include clear sections, with subheadings, that relate to your aims: 1) best practice for journals adopting RRs and, 2) feedback to journals that already have.

**Minor comments**

**Abstract** • What is your definition of “missing data”? Are the submission policies “incomplete” based on the variables you coded or some other measure?

**Introduction** • Improve the accuracy of the description of Registered Reports in the opening paragraph: o “the decision about acceptance is based on the quality of proposed methods, rather than statistical significance of the results”. Drop “statistical significance” because it does not include Bayesian analysis, and there are now exploratory RRs. Same comment when significance is mentioned later in the manuscript. o Similarly drop “theoretical” from this sentence “…theoretical value of the research question”. There are other reasons that a research question is important, for example real world impact o At stage 2, rather than looking for “results are presented clearly and consistently” the emphasis is on whether the conclusions are justified given the data

• In the third paragraph, the second sentence repeats the first. • “Current estimates include approximately 250 journals accepting registered reports.” –> Add information on when “current” is. • There are several times where it is not clear whether you are talking about RRs specifically or publications more generally. For example the sentence about peer review and preprints (Klebel et al., 2020). • Please double check the figures quoted from Scheel et al. (2020) • “Registered reports have a higher impact than paired publications (Hummer et al., 2017).” –> What type of impact? • I found the mentions of blinding confusing. You use the term “author blind review” –> where the reviewers know who the authors are, and you code “author blinding” –> where the reviewers don’t know (I think that’s what is meant). Perhaps there is clearer terminology?

**Methods** • “The variables can be grouped into the following categories:” –> This is an abrupt start to the Methods section. Explain what “the” variables are and briefly explain how you went about selecting them. • “This included whether a journal was missing any information and what proportion of information was listed as “No mention”.” –> listed as no mention by whom/where?

Coding • “The coders met regularly with the first author to resolve disagreements in the coding.” –> Was the first author a coder? How did you decide when to meet (e.g. weekly? After every 20 journals?). Specifically how were disagreements resolved? Your double coding process is a strength of the paper – be clear about precisely how it worked and how robust it was.  
• What type of interrater reliability are you reporting? Cohen’s kappa? The formatting of the statistics has also gone a bit wonky here. • “After coding was complete, a final dataset was compiled by the second author, which combined the information from the two coders” –> describe the process by which the datasets were combined. If disagreements were resolved while coding was in progress, and both coders coded everything, it’s not clear why the two datasets differed and required combining.

**Results** • The numbers of journals that haven’t yet published a RR, by year, are not reported in the manuscript and can only be roughly estimated from the current presentation of the information in Figure 1. • “There is not enough information yet to know if authors are opting into this new publication mechanism and whether it has the staying power to become a staple publication mechanism or rather it serves as a passing fad.” –> Agree but information on author uptake would at least give us idea of trends from 2013 to present. • How is the Zotero database maintained? Is it definitely the complete set of all published RRs? If not, a footnote is warranted. • “Missing information” –> implies that journals did not complete all details but in fact you determined which information was required. It’s also confusing given that you later refer to the OSF template with missing information. • Should “replication by journal” be a “Submission Logistics Variable”? • “Overall, few to no journals restrict exploratory analyses (0%), multiple studies (0%), secondary analysis (0.41%), or preliminary studies (1.23%).” –> “Few to no” is unclear. Restructure sentence to say “no journals restrict exploratory analyses (0%)… and few restrict secondary analysis (0.41%)…” • “For example, the 166 journals that allow exploratory analyses specify that they must be included in a separate subsection to be differentiated from confirmatory analyses.” –> I was confused that you state that no journals restrict exploratory analyses but only 166 allow them. In the section before you’re talking about the entire population of journals. Here make is clear that the 0% etc refers to those that reported information. And Table 2 may be clearer by adding a “not reported” column. Think about this point throughout the paper and clarify whether you’re talking about all journals that offer RRs or those you have coded information for. For example, in the Abstract “all journals allow exploratory analysis” implies 243 journals, not the 166 I think you mean. • Journal impact factor seems like an area where a comparison group would add value and context. Perhaps you already did that work for the original manuscript. • Open science practices –> do these relate to RRs specifically or are they journal requirements more generally. It’s not clear. • Open science practices –> again make it clear that the percentages you report are based on the information you could code (and add “not reported” to Table 3).  
• Earlier in the manuscript for open science practices you state that “if journal’s had policies which applied to all papers submitted to that journal (e.g., all papers must have open data) these were also coded.” Would this method not also be appropriate for author blind review? I may be wrong but this seems like a policy set at journal, rather than RR, level.

**Discussion** • When you discuss power report how many journals do not have power requirements for completeness. • You mention low levels of requiring external preregistration. Some journals make this request to authors in the stage 1 IPA letter. It might be nice to add that information, especially since it’s not information that potential authors would need up front and an unlikely barrier. • If potential RRs authors would like the information you coded where’s the best place for them to go? Will it be integrated with the information on the COS website?

**References** • The link for Scott (2013) does not seem to work. (I haven’t check them all!)

**Rating scale questions**

|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong construct validity (good measures and/or manipulations of the constructs the authors wish to study). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong statistical validity (appropriate statistical tests, assumptions are clear and reasonable, no statistical errors, appropriate statistical inferences, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong internal validity (any causal claims or implications are well-justified, alternative explanations are thoroughly considered, etc.). (Choose “Neutral” if this is not an empirical manuscript, or no causal claims are made or even vaguely implied.) |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| The study/studies in this manuscript have strong external validity (authors appropriately constrain their conclusions based on the limits of the generalizability of their findings to other contexts (including from lab to real world), other populations, other stimuli or measures, etc.) |  |  |  | ✔ |  |

**Author Response**

**Mar 21, 2021**

Dear Dr. Vazire,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to revise our manuscript now titled "Opening the Door to Registered Reports: Census of Journals Publishing Registered Reports (2013 - 2020)". This manuscript is not under review at any other journals. All authors have approved the submitted manuscript. We have read the Transparency and Openness policy of your Editorial Policies. We are very thankful for your comments and the comments of the reviewer. While we submitted for the streamlined paper process, we were not sure if that was completely appropriate, so we appreciate your flexibility and effort in finding a reviewer for our paper.

We have made revisions to the manuscript in line with the suggestions from yourself and from the reviewer. In particular, we've done quite a bit of rewriting of the content in order to ensure accurate and clear representation of the results of the research, as well as previous research. I believe much of the lack-of-clarity resulted from combining versions of the paper without sufficient editing, and I hope that you'll see the current version of the manuscript as much improved in clarity. Additionally, we have collected information from 35 more journals which adopted registered reports between April 21, 2020 and January 13, 2021.

I believe that these revisions have met your requests and demonstrate a clear step toward publication in *Collabra: Psychology*; however, we are open to additional feedback and rounds of revision.

On the following pages are short responses to your revision requests. The reviewer comments are in normal text, and the responses are in bold. I look forward to your response.

Amanda K. Montoya

University of California, Los Angeles

502 Portola Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90095 USA  
  
email: akmontoya@ucla.edu  
phone: (310)794-5069

Dear Dr. Montoya,

I want to begin by apologizing for the delay in making a decision on your manuscript. Although you submitted it as a streamlined paper, I chose to send it out for external review because it did not go out for external review at the previous journal (and the revised version received a relatively short review from the editor). I have now received a review of your manuscript from a researcher with expertise in publication practices. I also independently read the manuscript before consulting this review. The reviewer and I both had mixed reactions to your manuscript. We both felt that the manuscript has some promise but that there are some major issues that need to be addressed. I therefore invite you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology, but I want to be honest that the revision would have to be quite substantial - much of the paper would have to be rewritten. Furthermore, I cannot make any guarantees about the outcome of the process.

The reviewer did an outstanding job in their review. I will not repeat their points here, but I think all of them are important. In your resubmission, please include a document with a point-by-point response to both the points I list here and the reviewer’s comments, outlining each change made in your manuscript or providing a suitable rebuttal.

My biggest concern is that there are quite a few errors throughout the manuscript. This makes me worry abou how easy it will be for readers to understand the writing, and more importantly, it makes me nervous about the accuracy of the data and results reported here. As just one example, on page 2 you write that “author blind review can disadvantage women…”. You directly contradict this later (p. 13), and I believe you meant to write the opposite. This is not a big deal, except that the editor at the previous journal pointed this out in their first decision letter, and yet the error remains (though in your cover letter in response to the editor’s first decision, you say that you have corrected it - I’m not sure what happened).

**Thank you for noting this issue. I think this is the outcome of in some ways Frankensteining together the manuscript, which was a combination of our first submission to *AMPPS* and our second submission to *AMPPS*. In our first submission to *AMPPS* the author blinding sections were part of the primary manuscript, but after our first round of review, we moved it to supplementary materials. For the submission to *Collabra* we wanted to bring it back to the main article, but this inadvertently pulled in the errors that were in the first submission. This issue has been corrected in the manuscript. Additionally, we've done a number of read throughs to ensure the clarity of the writing as well as the accuracy of the information provided.**

Another example is that you state on page 6 that “All analyses and results for journal impact factor and open science practices are described in the supplementary materials” but in fact you describe the results in the main text - this seems like a rather significant inconsistency.

**Again, this was an issue of trying to combine previous drafts without going through and ensuring consistency throughout. This issue has been fixed. All analyses for open science practices, impact factor, and peer review blinding are reported in the main text.**

A third example is that the language you use to describe Registered Reports is not always accurate. The reviewer gives several examples of misstatements regarding Registered Reports in your manuscript. Indeed, the first sentence of the manuscript states that “the decision about acceptance is based on the quality of the proposed methods, rather than statistical significance of the result” - but as you mention later, the decision can also be based on the importance of the research question, not just the method. Thus, I fear that your opening sentence risks spreading a misconception about RRs.

**We have gone through and clarified the language about registered reports, leaving the decision criteria more ambiguous, because that is up to individual journals to decide, but making clear that the decision to publish a registered report is made prior to data collection and data analysis. This part of the opening sentence now reads "registered reports are a new publication workflow where the decision about acceptance at the journal occurs before data is collected, or in the case of secondary data, before researchers have analyzed the data."**

Finally, there are some places where basic information is missing. For example, throughout the manuscript the reader never finds out whether the open science practices that were coded were policies that apply only to Registered Reports or to all submissions. This seems like a fundamental aspect of the method, and the fact that it is missing makes me worry about the comprehensiveness of the report.

**We have now added this information on page 8: "Information on these policies was pulled specifically from the registered report guidelines; however, if journals had policies which applied to all papers submitted to that journal (e.g., all papers must have open data) these were also coded. In these cases, coders did not differentiate between journal-wide and registered report specific policies in the coding." Additionally, we note in the future directions section (Page 20) the potential of future research to more closely examine the interrelation between journal-wide policies and registered report specific policies, time of adoption, and whether these have implications for submissions to the journals.**

I found myself very torn about what to do in response to this issue. From what I can tell, I believe the data are valuable, and a report that presented this study thoroughly, accurately, and clearly, could be worth publishing. However, I feel the current manuscript is quite far from such a report, despite feedback from another editor that touched on some of these issues (though admittedly emphasized different factors). Normally, if I give a revise and resubmit decision, I want to give the authors a very straightforward list of what would need to be done to get an accept decision, so that they know ahead of time how to proceed and can decide if they want to make the requested changes. In this case, however, it is not possible for me to give such guidance. To address the issues raised above and below, I think the manuscript would need to be rewritten with an eye towards using precise language and a clear structure throughout, defining all important concepts, providing details of all important aspects of the method, reporting the results in clear language, and proofreading and double-checking all details of the writing and statistical reporting. The bulk of this work would require you to come up with a clear structure that allows you to walk the reader through all of the important steps in each section of the manuscript. Then, there are a few additional steps you could follow to take extra precautions in ensuring the clarity and comprehensiveness of your manuscript. For example, to make sure that all concepts are clearly explained, all important details of the method are reported, and the results are easy to understand, you could also ask some colleagues to read the manuscript and identify any parts that are still unclear or incomplete after you have done the bulk of the rewriting.

**We have indeed done quite a bit of rewriting throughout the manuscript. We have aligned the structure of the research questions, methods, and results to provide a clear structure throughout. The research questions now have headings, which are then used to denote the measures used to address those questions in the methods section, and the results section is now organized in the same order and with the same headings to clarify which results speak to which research questions.**

Similarly, to reduce the chances of statistical reporting errors, you could have another researcher attempt to reproduce all of your results from the raw data and make sure they get the same results. Perhaps you have done this already, but in any case, I think more feedback from people unfamiliar with this manuscript would be useful.

**As we did previously, two researchers on our team independently verified out analyses, so we feel confident about the reproducibility of the results. Additionally, all data and code is openly available on OSF (**<https://osf.io/4yvu9/>**), in case any if the reviewers, editors, or future readers would like to verify our results. We also believe that making this code openly available will allow future research to be able to include new journals and analyze them using the same methods presented here, expanding the potential impact of the paper.**

Below I list some other issues I would want to see addressed in a revision, in addition to the points raised by the reviewer. These are rather specific points, but I want to emphasize that the revisions you would need to make for Collabra would go well beyond these specific issues.

Please provide the operational definitions you used for each coding response option (what counted as ‘present’ or ‘missing’ in Table 1, or as ‘yes’ or ‘no’ in Table 2?).

**We have gone through and made more explicit what these labels mean for each table, and expanded the descriptions in the methods sections to clarify what coders examined for each variable.**

Please include columns for “no mention” in Tables 2 and 3 so that the rows add up to 100%, and readers can get a better sense of the denominator when interpreting each cell. In your interpretations, please also make sure to place the results in the context of the full set of journals, not just those that provided a yes or no position on a given variable.

**We have added the "no mention" columns to Tables 2 and 3. We've also changed our interpretations to include percentages from the entire dataset.**

The “open science practices” and “author blind review” results sections are especially hard to follow. In some cases, basic definitions are missing (e.g., “author blind” could mean the author is blind to the reviewers’ identities, or vice versa). In other cases, the categories are too complex to follow (e.g., various combinations of replication/novel studies allowed/not allowed/not mentioned), and perhaps making less-fine-grained distinctions would be better (e.g., it doesn’t really make sense to me to report whether novel studies were mentioned/allowed - isn’t it safe to assume they are “allowed” unless the journal explicitly says it only publishes replications?).

**We've rewritten these two sections to be more focused on the "big picture" and provided more concrete numerical information in the tables. The language in the peer review blinding section has been made more explicit; however, we want to acknowledge that the language provided by journals is often very ambiguous. As you mentioned "author blind" could be the authors are blind to the reviewers' identities or the reviewers are blind to the authors' identities. We categorized the journal policies to try to make explicit what we thought was intended, but also provided the Supplementary Materials with the exact language and how it was mapped to the categories reported in the manuscript.**

**Regarding novel vs. replication studies, in my personal experience many researchers I've talked to about registered reports thought that it was only for replication studies (i.e., registered replication reports). I personally agree, that if I read the policy and it didn't say explicitly that only replications are allowed, it should be safe to assume that novel studies are allowed. However, not everyone might have that reaction. We've tried to explicate this potential confusion more in the manuscript (Page 16).**

Have you considered using the TOP factor scores for the journals that have them?

**We had previously looked at the TOP factor scores, but were concerned about how few of the journals on our list were included. Looking now, the list seems to have been updated with more journals. We've added TOP factor signatories, TOP factor total scores, and TOP factor Registered Reports & Publication Bias scores to the Open Science section of the methods and results.**

You currently do not mention the impact-related results in the discussion. You should discuss them (while making sure not to draw any conclusions that aren’t well-grounded in evidence), even if just to say that it is not clear what can be made of these results. Presumably you coded this for a reason, and it would be useful to hear your reflections on the results.

**We have added some discussion of impact factors in the discussion section (Page 17). We agree that this information on it's own likely can't be interpreted broadly. However, we hope that seeing the distribution would be informative for researchers, as each one internally may hold their own threshold for what it means to be "high impact." Additionally, this information could be useful for comparison to future distributions**

Please add a conclusion section to the end of the manuscript.

**A conclusion section has been added (Page 21).**

Smaller points (many of these may be irrelevant if you substantially rewrite the manuscript):

Abstract: I’m not sure it makes sense to say misconceptions are “disconfirmed” - if they are misconceptions, by definition they are not true.

**We have removed all language surrounding the idea of "misconceptions." We have added more material in the introduction to support the policies that we coded as areas where researchers may have concerns about registered reports. Additionally, we refer to these as concerns throughout, and rather than "disconfirm" the concerns, we demonstrate that, of the journals which have concrete policies, many of these practices are allowed but restricted in some way.**

p. 2 - the sentence beginning “Specifically, researchers may” does not flow quite right.

**This sentence is no longer in the manuscript.**

p. 3 - I think you need to provide a bit more explanation of the Scheel findings, and the Hummer findings (you mention these twice in two different paragraphs).

**Additionally details about these studies have been added, and the information is more centrally located in the "Registered Reports So Far" section (Page 2-3).**

p. 5 - I’m not sure why footnote 1 is a footnote.

**Footnote 1 has been removed.**

p. 6 - “less specified fields” is awkward - I think you mean a field not listed in your categorization?

**This language has been changed.**

p. 7 - It is not clear from the text that the 12 submission logistic variables are a subset of the 18 variables.

**We've removed the language around "submission logistic" variables, to remove the implication that these policies would be "required" to submit, as this may vary author to author and depend on many other factors. We now explicitly state that the policy variables are a subset of the total 18 variables.**

p. 8 - If you categorized the variables into ones having to do with submission logistics vs. the rest, please present them that way in the table.

**As previously mentioned, we've changed the language around submission logistics to policy variables. Asterisks in Table 1 indicate policy variables (as noted at the bottom of the table).**

p. 9 - “out there” sounds a bit too casual, in my opinion

**This language has been removed.**

p. 9 - “there are still some restrictions to ensure the transparency of the final manuscript” - this seems like speculation about the purpose of the restrictions. I would suggest either elaborating to make it clear why you believe this is the purpose of the restrictions, or removing.

**Speculative language around transparency has been removed.**

p. 11 - “at slightly lower levels (46.91%)” isn’t 46.91 higher than 46.09 in the previous sentence? Also, this seems very high for the proportion of journals that require pre-registration - I assume this is referring only to what’s required of RRs?

**We've corrected the language around this comparison. Additionally, we have clarified that these rates are only for registered reports (not necessarily journal-wide policies).**

p. 12 - Just checking - is it the case that 12 journals have “open review” where reviewers are revealed at publication? I had not heard of this, and I know of many more journals that have “open review” where the content of the review is published but the identity of the reviewer is not revealed at publication unless they signed their review (in which case, the identity of the reviewer was already known to the author). Could you double check that this is coded correctly?

**We double-checked this issue and resolved it. This group of 12 journals was the JMIR journals, which publish the names of reviewers with each article, but do not publish the actual reviews. Both coders misunderstood this as being the same as open review, and so the issue was not caught during the resolution meetings. The issue has now been resolved, and this group of journals is no longer included in the open review category.**

p. 13 - It seems like overkill to me to suggest that journals should explicitly state in their RR policy that RRs are not specific to a special issue - this seems like the kind of thing that only needs to be explicitly stated if the RR mechanism is specific to a special issue, right?

**We've removed Special Issue as a journal policy, and included it in the Adoption section to examine what mechanism journals use for registered report submissions. We agree that journals should not need to explicitly state that the RR mechanism is not for special issues, but rather state when it is only for special issues. However as registered reports get more popular, journals may need to make explicit rules about whether they would be allowed for special issues (which are not focused on registered reports).**

p. 14 - I agree with you that keeping reviewers blind to authors’ identities likely makes the peer review process more objective, but I just wanted to flag that this is controversial, and the empirical evidence on this is quite messy.

**We've included additional literature on this topic, to try to represent the controversy rather than depict the issue as one sided. Thank you for the feedback!**

In summary, I think this is a promising study and I believe it could warrant a revision if you believe you can address the issues raised above. If you think this is possible, I hope you will consider revising this for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology. I realize this may be more substantial revision than you are willing to conduct, but I hope you will consider it.

If you do submit a revision, please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at editorialoffice@collabra.org.

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks, but if you need more time, just let us know.

Sincerely,

Simine Vazire Editor in Chief Collabra: Psychology

**Reviewer #1**

The authors posit that a lack of available complete information about Registered Reports at journal level may represent a barrier to author uptake. They go on to code journal guidelines on a range of information to supplement that currently available on the COS website.

The topic of the paper is certainly interesting and we need more research on a range of topics relating to Registered Reports. I like that two coders independently coded all variables for all journals, and that they transparently report a change to the coding scheme that occurred during coding. If the coding scheme had been preregistered it would have been even better!

**Major comments**

The manuscript sets out some aims that are not currently delivered and some claims that require substantiation. My main concern is that a core aim of the manuscript is to increase numbers of author submissions yet it does not investigate past and current submission levels.

1. In the abstract you state “…with the goal of documenting the early adoption of registered reports…” This sets up the expectation, especially because your focus is on informational barriers for authors, that the paper will report author adoption. Given your goal and the amount of information about RR journals already available on the COS website, I would like to see information about author uptake. Specifically, 1) for the number of (individual) stage 1 authors by year (are we seeing new authors submit or is it the same authors submitting again?) and, 2) the rate of stage 1 submissions, and stage 2 publications, by area/journal/year. Given how long it takes from stage 1 submission to stage 2 publication we might expect a lag of ~1.5 – 2 years between journal adoption and the first published RRs. Therefore information on stage 1 submissions is the best metric of author adoption. You cite work on journal submissions by DeHaven et al., 2019 and Hardwicke & Ioannidis, 2018, presumably they carried out this work in 2018 and 2017 respectively. Hence the information is ~2-3 years out of date. That’s a long time in RRs short life. The picture may look different in 2020. If researchers can’t collect data due the pandemic they might find it is the ideal time to submit a RR. The addition of author adoption information would improve the informational value of the manuscript and take it beyond coding new variables not currently collated on the COS website. It would also allow interesting comparisons between the number of journals from each scientific discipline/psychology research areas you coded, and the number of submissions.

**We have tried to rewrite the manuscript so that the goals of the current research are more clearly delineated from the *potential* outcomes of the current research. As the reviewer notes, we do not document submission rates, and have rewritten the manuscript to more clearly describe our goals as entirely focused on documenting early adoption of registered reports *by journals*, with potential future directions to evaluate the impact of journal policies on adoption *by authors*. Additionally, we have rewritten the introduction to shift the focus from author adoption to journal adoption, while still emphasizing common concerns that authors may have about registered reports.**

**Additionally, we would like to emphasize the unique contribution of this research compared to the current OSF table. First, the source of the data on the OSF table is ambiguous and researchers aiming to corroborate the information on that table using submission guidelines are likely to be disappointed. We are currently working with OSF to integrate our information and theirs together into an easier to use database; however much of the information is conflicting or not aligned. OSF uses direct contact with the editors of the journals to generate the information on the table, whereas we use the journals' publicly available submission guidelines. We are now working to encourage journal editors to include this information explicitly in the submission guidelines. Additional information that we provide which is not available through the OSF table include journal impact (2-year IF, 5-year IF, h-index), scientific discipline and area of psychology, whether open materials are required, whether changes to the introduction are allowed (and if so what kind), word limits, and peer review blinding policies.**

1. The manuscript makes several claims about potential barriers: that authors are put off by lack of available information, that there is an “expectation that journals publishing registered reports are of low quality seems to persist”, that “another common critique of registered reports is that with unblinded review…” etc, but doesn’t provide any support for these claims. You need to be clear about the basis for these claims, particularly as you’re referring to them as common and persistent. If the premise of your research is that “Reducing informational barriers of entry for authors may increase the number of registered reports being submitted and accepted at journals across scientific disciplines” the reader needs convincing that lack of information creates a barrier in the first place. And if the barrier is at journal level, do journals that provide more complete information receive more submissions? Going back to my earlier point, if we want submissions to increase we need baseline information on current submissions (not just stage 2 publications).

**We have shifted the focus of the manuscript away from authors, and more directed at journal adoption. However, we've continued to include information about potential barriers, as these largely motivated the fields we collected from the journals. However, we have bolstered this section with additional citations which document these concerns (Page 4 - 5). We have also weakened the language around these potential barriers so as not to overclaim their potential impact.**

1. “Understanding more about the current status of registered reports can assist researchers in adopting this new publication mechanism, suggest best practices for new journals adopting registered reports, and provide feedback to the journals that have already adopted registered reports.” To fulfil your aims, your Discussion could be much more structured to include clear sections, with subheadings, that relate to your aims: 1) best practice for journals adopting RRs and, 2) feedback to journals that already have.

**We have included a section in the Discussion titled "A Call for Clearer Journal Policies" (Page 15) which includes recommendations for new journals and journals that have already adopted registered reports. In addition we have created Table S2 which includes excerpts from journal policies to provide some additional recommendations for language above and beyond the OSF template which may not include language for journals that don't want to allow different practices. Please note that we intended for Table S2 to be included in the full text, but based on the *Collabra: Psychology* submission criteria, tables which are more than a page long should be in supplemental materials.**

**Minor comments**

**Abstract** • What is your definition of “missing data”? Are the submission policies “incomplete” based on the variables you coded or some other measure?

**We have clarified the description in the abstract and clarified the use of "missing data" throughout the manuscript.**

**Introduction** • Improve the accuracy of the description of Registered Reports in the opening paragraph: o “the decision about acceptance is based on the quality of proposed methods, rather than statistical significance of the results”. Drop “statistical significance” because it does not include Bayesian analysis, and there are now exploratory RRs. Same comment when significance is mentioned later in the manuscript. o Similarly drop “theoretical” from this sentence “…theoretical value of the research question”. There are other reasons that a research question is important, for example real world impact o At stage 2, rather than looking for “results are presented clearly and consistently” the emphasis is on whether the conclusions are justified given the data

**We have gone through and clarified the language about registered reports, leaving the decision criteria more ambiguous, because that is up to individual journals to decide, but making clear that the decision to publish a registered report is made prior to data collection and data analysis. This part of the opening sentence now reads "registered reports are a new publication workflow where the decision about acceptance at the journal occurs before data is collected, or in the case of secondary data, before researchers have analyzed the data."**

• In the third paragraph, the second sentence repeats the first. • “Current estimates include approximately 250 journals accepting registered reports.” –> Add information on when “current” is.

**The sentence now reads "By early 2021, estimates include approximately 280 journals accepting registered reports." (Page 2)**

• There are several times where it is not clear whether you are talking about RRs specifically or publications more generally. For example the sentence about peer review and preprints (Klebel et al., 2020).

**We have clarified the language in the paper to be more explicit when we are discussing registered reports and non-registered reports.**

• Please double check the figures quoted from Scheel et al. (2020) • “Registered reports have a higher impact than paired publications (Hummer et al., 2017).” –> What type of impact?

**We have fixed the numerical error in reporting the statistics from Scheel et al. (2020) and clarified that Hummer et al. (2017) compare registered reports and non-registered reports based on citation rate and Altmetric attention scores.**

• I found the mentions of blinding confusing. You use the term “author blind review” –> where the reviewers know who the authors are, and you code “author blinding” –> where the reviewers don’t know (I think that’s what is meant). Perhaps there is clearer terminology?

**We have adjusted the language in the author blinding section to make clear whose identity is anonymous during the review process. Additionally, to improve transparency, we provide Table S1 which includes the exact language from the journals and how we combined them into different categories.**

**Methods** • “The variables can be grouped into the following categories:” –> This is an abrupt start to the Methods section. Explain what “the” variables are and briefly explain how you went about selecting them.

**A brief introduction to the study variables has been added (Page 7).**

• “This included whether a journal was missing any information and what proportion of information was listed as “No mention”.” –> listed as no mention by whom/where?

**We have clarified the language around "no mention" and missing data throughout.**

Coding

• “The coders met regularly with the first author to resolve disagreements in the coding.” –> Was the first author a coder? How did you decide when to meet (e.g. weekly? After every 20 journals?). Specifically how were disagreements resolved? Your double coding process is a strength of the paper – be clear about precisely how it worked and how robust it was.

**We've added the following statement to the coding section: "The two coders met approximately on a weekly basis (about every 15-20 journals) with the first author to resolve disagreements in the coding. Disagreements were resolved by returning to the journal pages, evaluating the information as a group, and unanimous consensus. The most common disagreements were when one coder did not find relevant information, and so listed a field as "missing" whereas the other coder found the information." (Page 5)**

• What type of interrater reliability are you reporting? Cohen’s kappa? The formatting of the statistics has also gone a bit wonky here.

**We are reporting Cohen's kappa, and now include a citation and reasoning for not using percent agreement. We will double check that the statistics compile correctly in the PDF submission.**

• “After coding was complete, a final dataset was compiled by the second author, which combined the information from the two coders” –> describe the process by which the datasets were combined. If disagreements were resolved while coding was in progress, and both coders coded everything, it’s not clear why the two datasets differed and required combining.

**We have now included the following statement in the coding section: "After coding was complete, a final dataset was compiled by combining the responses of the two coders and recording them in a consistent way across all entries (e.g., resolving the difference between 5000 words vs 5,000 words). This was done because while the coders responses may have had the same meaning, their responses were not always the same (e.g., 5000 words vs 5,000 words). Preference was given to responses that were more in-depth. For example, "allows multiple studies" vs "allows multiple studies and uses incremental registration", the latter would be retained as the final response."**

**Results**

• The numbers of journals that haven’t yet published a RR, by year, are not reported in the manuscript and can only be roughly estimated from the current presentation of the information in Figure 1.

**We now include in the results section the percentage of journals that have adopted registered reports but have yet to publish one, 71.58% of journals. (Page 11)**

• “There is not enough information yet to know if authors are opting into this new publication mechanism and whether it has the staying power to become a staple publication mechanism or rather it serves as a passing fad.” –> Agree but information on author uptake would at least give us idea of trends from 2013 to present.

**This statement has been removed, as the focus of the paper has shifted to journal adoption.**

• How is the Zotero database maintained? Is it definitely the complete set of all published RRs? If not, a footnote is warranted.

**We want to thank the reviewer for this astute question. The list is largely maintained by staff at the Open Science Framework, but it is also a public list and so others can add to it. We contacted OSF and the individual who maintains the list, to learn that it has largely not been updated since March 2020. For this reason we contacted other colleagues who focus on registered reports, including Aoife O'Mahoney, a graduate student working with Chris Chambers on creating a comprehensive list of all registered reports. While her list is not public yet, she gave us access to it, and it included more than 200 published registered reports in addition to those on the Zotero list. We were then able to use this list to more comprehensively examine the first publication from each journal. However, the results on aggregate are very similar to our results using the Zotero list.**

• “Missing information” –> implies that journals did not complete all details but in fact you determined which information was required. It’s also confusing given that you later refer to the OSF template with missing information.

**We have adjusted the language around missing information. In particular, we changed the language around what was previously called "submission logistics" as we felt the language was too prescriptive. We now call these "journal policies" and note that while this information may be useful to authors, for reasons described in the introduction, these fields are themselves arbitrary. We've tried to be more clear about why the OSF template has "missing" information (because there would be journal specific policies that the template should not prescribe). Overall, we've tried to loosen our language to make it clear that these policies are recommended based on common concerns around registered reports.**

• Should “replication by journal” be a “Submission Logistics Variable”?

**Replication by journal is now included in the "policy variables" (previously called submission logistics).**

• “Overall, few to no journals restrict exploratory analyses (0%), multiple studies (0%), secondary analysis (0.41%), or preliminary studies (1.23%).” –> “Few to no” is unclear. Restructure sentence to say “no journals restrict exploratory analyses (0%)… and few restrict secondary analysis (0.41%)…”

**We have rewritten this section to improve the clarity.**

• “For example, the 166 journals that allow exploratory analyses specify that they must be included in a separate subsection to be differentiated from confirmatory analyses.” –> I was confused that you state that no journals restrict exploratory analyses but only 166 allow them. In the section before you’re talking about the entire population of journals. Here make is clear that the 0% etc refers to those that reported information. And Table 2 may be clearer by adding a “not reported” column. Think about this point throughout the paper and clarify whether you’re talking about all journals that offer RRs or those you have coded information for. For example, in the Abstract “all journals allow exploratory analysis” implies 243 journals, not the 166 I think you mean.

**We have rewritten this section to make it more clear what group of journals we are referring to in any given section. Additionally, we've included a missing column in Table 2 and Table 3.**

• Journal impact factor seems like an area where a comparison group would add value and context. Perhaps you already did that work for the original manuscript.

**In a previous version of this manuscript we compared the subset of journals in psychology to APA journals. Previously reviewers felt it was not a sufficient comparison group, and suggested we remove this section. I've included excerpts from that version of the manuscript below; however, these have not been updated with the most recent sample. If the reviewer and editor believe this would add value to the manuscript, we could update the results and include them.**

**The previous analysis includes both psychology and non-psychology journals, and thus the impact factors can be quite variable. Table 2 provides summaries solely for psychology journals (N = 80). The proportion of missing information is slightly lower for psychology journals (See Table 2). Generally, impact factors are similar or slightly lower than the entire set of journals. For comparison, the American Psychological Association published 59 journals which were assigned 2-year and 5-year Impact factors during the same time period, 2017 (APA, 2018). Only 3 journals published by the APA include registered reports. Comparing the two types of journals on 2-year impact factor suggests no significant difference between the two groups *t*(122) = -0.73, *p* = .47, 95% CI = (-0.84, 0.39). Similarly, there are no significant differences between the two groups on 5-year impact factor, *t*(76) = 0.39, *p* = .70, 95% CI = (-1.25, 1.86). Lastly, there was no significant difference between the two groups on *h*-index, *t*(120) = -1.578, *p* = .117, 95% CI = (-41.98, 4.76). Overall, these results suggest that there is not strong evidence that journals publishing registered reports differ significantly from mainstream psychology journals, such as those published by the American Psychological Association.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: Impact Factor Summary Statistics, Psychology Only** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Journals Publishing Registered Reports** | | | | | **APA Journals** | | |
| **Impact Measure** | **Included N** | **Included %** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Median** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Median** |
| **2-Year IF** | **65** | **81.25** | **2.45** | **1.45** | **2.1** | **2.68** | **1.98** | **2.23** |
| **5 Year IF** | **20** | **25** | **3.97** | **2.57** | **3.25** | **3.66** | **3.14** | **2.85** |
| **h-index** | **65** | **81.25** | **76.09** | **59.09** | **70** |  |  |  |

• Open science practices –> do these relate to RRs specifically or are they journal requirements more generally. It’s not clear.

**We have provided more information about whether the policies are specific to RRs or the general more broadly. We included both types of policies, where policies specific to registered reports or journal-wide policies were both included in the coding. We now note in the discussion section how future research might explore these patterns more in-depth.**

• Open science practices –> again make it clear that the percentages you report are based on the information you could code (and add “not reported” to Table 3).

**We changed the language to be more precise with the percentages associated with the open science practice variables that we are reporting on. Additionally, we have added columns to Table 3 so that “No Mention” is reported, ensuring that we are accounting for all journals in the data set.**

• Earlier in the manuscript for open science practices you state that “if journal’s had policies which applied to all papers submitted to that journal (e.g., all papers must have open data) these were also coded.” Would this method not also be appropriate for author blind review? I may be wrong but this seems like a policy set at journal, rather than RR, level.

**We have clarified that this approach was used for all fields that were coded. Peer review blinding in particular was one where most of the information came from journal wide policies, rather than registered report specific policies. However, if a journal had a policy in the registered report submission guidelines which conflicted with journal wide policies, the RR policy was given priority.**

**Discussion**

• When you discuss power report how many journals do not have power requirements for completeness.

**Information about how many journals did not have power requirements is now included in Table 2.**

• You mention low levels of requiring external preregistration. Some journals make this request to authors in the stage 1 IPA letter. It might be nice to add that information, especially since it’s not information that potential authors would need up front and an unlikely barrier.

**We have added this into the discussion.**

• If potential RRs authors would like the information you coded where’s the best place for them to go? Will it be integrated with the information on the COS website?

**The data is completely available through our OSF page. We are also working directly with the COS team to integrate our information and theirs together into a filterable database. This is currently in beta form, but can be viewed here (**[**https://datastudio.google.com/s/tOtcWlNAqQg**](https://datastudio.google.com/s/tOtcWlNAqQg)**). We are working to resolve the ambiguous information, where our information and COS's information disagree. Additionally, we're adding in new information about open access and APCs. Ultimately this will replace the list of Participating Journals on the COS webpage as well as the google sheet table (**[**https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1D4\_k-8C\_UENTRtbPzXfhjEyu3BfLxdOsn9j-otrO870/edit#gid=0**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1D4_k-8C_UENTRtbPzXfhjEyu3BfLxdOsn9j-otrO870/edit#gid=0)**) that is currently provided.**

**References**

• The link for Scott (2013) does not seem to work. (I haven’t check them all!)

**All links to articles in the reference section have been double checked and any and all errors have been addressed. Additionally, DOI numbers have been added for all articles.**

**Editor Second Decision**

**Apr 11, 2021**

Dear Amanda,

I have now read your revised manuscript. I am very, very impressed - this manuscript is clear, well-structured, and extremely informative. Thank you very much for your responsiveness to the points raised by me and the reviewer. I am delighted to provisionally accept your manuscript for submission. I just found a few small things I would like you to address.

1. I wonder if you would consider changing the word “blinding” to “masking” throughout the manuscript? I recently became aware that “blinding” can be perceived as ableist (implying that blindness comes with an impoverished epistemic state). Some organizations have switched to calling it “masked review” or “anonymous review” or simply spelling out the policy (e.g., reviewers’ identities are not known to authors, authors’ identities are not know to reviewers, etc.).
2. The only section that I still struggled to understand was the “Peer review blinding” results section on page 16. It was not clear to me whether the percentages should add up to 100%, for example, or if all categories are reported in the text. In addition, I didn’t understand the sentence “We found that the majority of journals (36.69%) offer anonymous review for both…” - 36.69% seems to be less than a majority. I wonder if a table or figure for these results would help? That might not be necessary, but if you can find a way to communicate which categories are mutually exclusive, whether they should add up to 100%, etc., that would help a lot. Please also move the sentence beginning “Open review, where the reviewer comments” to the end of the section, as it introduces a new concept. I actually would suggest making this point its own paragraph, but you would then need to add at lesat one more sentence (which I think is a good idea anyway, as you are introducing a variable you haven’t mentioned yet, and that is quite different from the rest of the results reported in this section and even different from what the section heading says this section is about, so that it might be good to flag this slight tangent).
3. For Tables 2 and 3, please add a table note explaining more about what is presented. For example, it should be clear to readers, without reading the text (just the table and table note), what “Yes” and “No” mean, and the variable that require extra explanation (e.g., “power” in Table 2 and “replications from journal only” in Table 3) should also be explained in the table note (as well as the text).

Minor points

p. 2 “towards the methods and the theoretical importance of the research question” - I would suggest cutting “theoretical” as a journal could have other criteria for importance (e.g., practical importance).

p. 3 “replications of previous work allow science to self-correct” - to avoid common misrepresentations of claims about the value of replications, I would suggest changing this to “replications of previous work are one mechanism by which science can self-correct” or something like that.

p. 4 “show that there is approximately a two-year lag” maybe change "is " to “was” to highlight that this was based on a previous study (I found myself confusing this result with your slightly different result).

p. 6 I would cut the parenthetical beginning “(e.g., resolving the difference…” as you have a very similar parenthetical in the next sentence.

p. 17 “allow the authors identities to be known” should be “authors’ identities”

Thanks again for taking on such an extensive revision, I really think this is a fanstastic manuscript. I look forward to receiving your final revision and accepting it for publication in Collabra: Psychology.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at [editorialoffice@collabra.org](mailto:editorialoffice@collabra.org).

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Sincerely,

Simine Vazire Editor in Chief Collabra: Psychology

**Author Response**

Apr 29, 2021

Dear Dr. Vazire,

Thank you so much for your helpful comments and the conditional acceptance of our manuscript titled "Opening the Door to Registered Reports: Census of Journals Publishing Registered Reports (2013 - 2020)". We are very thankful for your comments and those of our reviewer and believe the manuscript has improved quite a lot through this process. I believe that we have addressed your comments from your previous review and they have improved the clarity of the manuscript.

On the following pages are short responses to your revision requests. This manuscript is not under review at any other journals. All authors have approved the submitted manuscript. We have read the Transparency and Openness policy of your Editorial Policies.

Amanda K. Montoya

University of California, Los Angeles

502 Portola Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90095 USA  
  
email: akmontoya@ucla.edu  
phone: (310)794-5069

Dear Amanda,

I have now read your revised manuscript. I am very, very impressed - this manuscript is clear, well-structured, and extremely informative. Thank you very much for your responsiveness to the points raised by me and the reviewer. I am delighted to provisionally accept your manuscript for submission. I just found a few small things I would like you to address.

1. I wonder if you would consider changing the word "blinding" to "masking" throughout the manuscript? I recently became aware that "blinding" can be perceived as ableist (implying that blindness comes with an impoverished epistemic state). Some organizations have switched to calling it "masked review" or "anonymous review" or simply spelling out the policy (e.g., reviewers' identities are not known to authors, authors' identities are not know to reviewers, etc.).

**The term “blinding” has been changed to “masking” throughout. A few instances of the word “blinding” remain in the manuscript when we are quoting directly from guidelines or journal policies. Below are the instances of the word “blinding” that remain in the manuscript:**

* **The word “blinding” still remains in the paragraph describing TOP criteria in a direct quote from the TOP Factor Rubric (**[**https://osf.io/t2yu5/**](https://osf.io/t2yu5/)**).**
* **Table S1 has the coders original categories directly from the journal policies, and we kept that language as-is. We did update the title of the table and our grouped categories, which is how we refer to the policies throughout the manuscript (e.g., the category in manuscript “options for blinding” is updated to be “options for masking”, but still includes the original journal language category of “Author’s optional blind review”.**

**I appreciate you making us aware of that perception. The variable name in the dataset is also updated to PeerReviewPolicy from AuthorBlindedReviewPolicy.**

1. The only section that I still struggled to understand was the "Peer review blinding" results section on page 16. It was not clear to me whether the percentages should add up to 100%, for example, or if all categories are reported in the text. In addition, I didn't understand the sentence "We found that the majority of journals (36.69%) offer anonymous review for both..." - 36.69% seems to be less than a majority. I wonder if a table or figure for these results would help? That might not be necessary, but if you can find a way to communicate which categories are mutually exclusive, whether they should add up to 100%, etc., that would help a lot. Please also move the sentence beginning "Open review, where the reviewer comments" to the end of the section, as it introduces a new concept. I actually would suggest making this point its own paragraph, but you would then need to add at lesat one more sentence (which I think is a good idea anyway, as you are introducing a variable you haven't mentioned yet, and that is quite different from the rest of the results reported in this section and even different from what the section heading says this section is about, so that it might be good to flag this slight tangent).

**Thank you for suggesting this distinction. We have now teased apart the masking policies and open review policies and believe this will help clarify this section. Additions to the methods and results help to introduce the concept of an open review, and the paragraph about open review in the results section is separated out. The section heading is updated to “Peer Review”, and the masked review policy is separate from open review and each journal is accounted for in both variables since they are not mutually exclusive processes.**

1. For Tables 2 and 3, please add a table note explaining more about what is presented. For example, it should be clear to readers, without reading the text (just the table and table note), what "Yes" and "No" mean, and the variable that require extra explanation (e.g., "power" in Table 2 and "replications from journal only" in Table 3) should also be explained in the table note (as well as the text).

**Notes are added for Tables 2 and 3, such that from just the table and table note it should be clear what each response means. Variables that require extra explanation are addressed in the note as well (for Table 2, “multiple studies” and “power”; for Table 3, “replication from journal only”).**

Minor points

p. 2 "towards the methods and the theoretical importance of the research question" - I would suggest cutting "theoretical" as a journal could have other criteria for importance (e.g., practical importance).

**The word “theoretical” has been cut from this sentence.**

p. 3 "replications of previous work allow science to self-correct" - to avoid common misrepresentations of claims about the value of replications, I would suggest changing this to "replications of previous work are one mechanism by which science can self-correct" or something like that.

**This sentence is updated to reflect replications are not the only way for science to self-correct, avoiding common misrepresentation of the value of replications.**

p. 4 "show that there is approximately a two-year lag" maybe change "is " to "was" to highlight that this was based on a previous study (I found myself confusing this result with your slightly different result).

**Changed “is” to “was” to correctly keep this previous study result in past tense.**

p. 6 I would cut the parenthetical beginning "(e.g., resolving the difference..." as you have a very similar parenthetical in the next sentence.

**The first parenthetical is removed since that example is contained in the next sentence.**

p. 17 "allow the authors identities to be known" should be "authors' identities"

**Apostrophe is added to make authors’ grammatically correct.**

Thanks again for taking on such an extensive revision, I really think this is a fanstastic manuscript. I look forward to receiving your final revision and accepting it for publication in Collabra: Psychology.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at editorialoffice@collabra.org.

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Sincerely,

Simine Vazire

Editor in Chief

Collabra: Psychology

**Editor Final Decision—Accept**

Apr 29, 2021

Dear Amanda,

I have now had a chance to read over your manuscript “Opening the Door to Registered Reports: Census of Journals Publishing Registered Reports (2013 - 2020)”, along with the letter describing the changes you made. Thank you for your responsiveness to the small issues I raised in the most recent decision. I am happy to say that your paper is now officially accepted for publication in Collabra: Psychology. Congratulations on this excellent work, I think it will make an important contribution to the literature and I look forward to seeing it published! I hope your experiences with Collabra: Psychology have been positive and that you will continue to consider it as an outlet for your work.

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point. Our managing editor will contact you in case there are any pre-prodution file related questions. You will have an opportunity to check the page proofs before we publish your article. Thank you again for publishing in Collabra: Psychology.

Sincerely, Simine Vazire