



University of Groningen

Introducing the Replication Studies section

Ditzen, Jan; Elhorst, J. Paul

Published in: Spatial Economic Analysis

DOI:

10.1080/17421772.2022.2018169

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database

Citation for published version (APA):
Ditzen, J., & Elhorst, J. P. (2022). Introducing the Replication Studies section. Spatial Economic Analysis, 17(1), 7-9. https://doi.org/10.1080/17421772.2022.2018169

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverneamendment.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): http://www.rug.nl/research/portal. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Download date: 29-10-2022



Spatial Economic Analysis



ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rsea20

Introducing the Replication Studies section

Jan Ditzen & J. Paul Elhorst

To cite this article: Jan Ditzen & J. Paul Elhorst (2022) Introducing the Replication Studies section, Spatial Economic Analysis, 17:1, 7-9, DOI: <u>10.1080/17421772.2022.2018169</u>

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/17421772.2022.2018169

	Published online: 01 Feb 2022.
	Submit your article to this journal $oldsymbol{arGeta}$
ılıl	Article views: 431
a Q	View related articles ☑
CrossMark	View Crossmark data ☑





INTRODUCTION



Introducing the Replication Studies section

Jan Ditzen Da and J. Paul Elhorst Db

Spatial Economic Analysis is pleased to announce a new section, Replication Studies, devoted to short papers that replicate or extend published empirical results and discuss their sensitivity to relevant changes in the model, estimation method and/or interpretation.

Empirical studies are part of the backbone of the social sciences because they help to support theories and form policy recommendations. In recent decades there has been a 50% increase in the share of published empirical studies in comparison with articles focused on economic theory and econometric theory. In addition, empirical papers receive more citations than theoretical papers (Angrist et al., 2017). It is 35 years since Dewald et al. (1986) emphasized the importance of replications in empirical research. Out of a sample of 54 published papers in the Journal of Money, Credit and Banking in 1980, they found only eight (15%) were replicable without problems and 14 (26%) were incomplete. More recently, Vilhuber (2020) found that about 30% of replication attempts fail. Still, replication studies are not common. Empirical work from well-published and highly cited articles or top five journals is more likely to be reproduced (Berry et al., 2017; Hamermesh, 2007), but the number of replication studies for even well-published works is small. Berry et al. (2017) find that only 3.5% of the papers that cited empirical works published in the American Economic Review in 2010 are replications. Replications in regional science, spatial economics and economic geography are also scarce and unsatisfactory to our knowledge. By contrast, in experimental economics and financial economics, two subfields within the economics literature, replications are more common (Ingerslev et al., 2021 Maniadis et al., 2017).

The literature suggests two reasons for the lack of replication studies (Dewald et al., 1986; Galiani et al., 2017; Vilhuber, 2020):

- Accessibility of data and codes. In recent years, it has become easier and more common to share codes and data. Sharing is supported by platforms such as GitHub as well as by more journals requesting that codes and data are made publicly available by authors. For example, the American Economic Association (AEA) has a data editor leading a data replication team that assists authors.
- Missing incentives to publish. Berry et al. (2017) state that there is substantial uncertainty over
 the number of replication studies. This might be because replication studies are often treated
 as insufficiently novel for publication. In a survey, Galiani et al. (2017) found that out of the
 204 editors and co-editors of 11 top journals in economics, only 29% would publish replication
 studies confirming existing results.

We at *Spatial Economic Analysis* believe that replicating empirical results should form part of the core of the social sciences. Without the ability to replicate results, the social sciences will

CONTACT

^a (Corresponding author) A Jan.Ditzen@unibz.it

Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Bozen-Bolzano, Italy.

^b Faculty of Economics and Business, Department of Economics, Econometrics & Finance — Management, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands.

struggle to convince and defend their findings, interpretations and policy recommendations. With this in mind, we want to take the next step and encourage scientists to work on replications by introducing the Replication Studies section.

Replications are defined following Clemens (2017) as either:

- Replications in the narrow sense, which can be a verification or reproduction of results. In
 both cases the same raw data, specification and methods should be used as in the original
 study, but with different or updated software, or corrections to the software. Thus, this definition includes corrections to coding errors in the data-cleaning process or the estimation of
 parameters. The definition of replication in the narrow sense also extends to more detailed
 discussions about how to replicate results.
- Robustness tests, which should use different raw datasets, specifications or methods and
 include the re-analysis of results and its extension. Robustness tests include changes
 in the specification, recoding of variables or the use of recently developed statistical or
 econometric methods.

We invite replications of studies that are within the aims and scope of *Spatial Economic Analysis*. This includes published articles with a focus on regional science, economic geography, urban economics, input—output analysis, spatial statistics or economics, and spatial or network econometrics. The study being replicated must have been originally published in a peer-reviewed journal.

We encourage submissions from both established scholars and early-career researchers seeking to publish replication results from their master's or doctoral theses. Articles submitted to the Replication Studies section will be subject to the same peer-review process as any other manuscript submitted to the journal, ensuring the high quality of published pieces.

Contributions to the Replication Studies section should include a summary of the original published article being replicated, a short motivation for why it is being replicated, the empirical set-up and its results. Manuscripts should highlight differences between the original study and the replication, explaining and discussing the implications of these differences, and provide a discussion of the newly established results. Data and code should also be made available as supplemental data online. Manuscripts should be no more than 4000 words. For more information on how to submit, see the Instructions for Authors at: https://rsa.tandfonline.com/action/authorsubmission?show=instructions&journalcode=rsea20/. We look forward to reading your submissions to the Replication Studies section.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Jan Ditzen D http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1227-7544 J. Paul Elhorst D http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6062-1202

REFERENCES

Angrist, J., Azoulay, P., Ellison, G., Hill, R., & Feng Lu, S. (2017). Economic research evolves: Fields and styles. American Economic Review, 107(5), 293–297. https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.p20171117. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20171117

- Berry, J., Coffman, L. C., Hanley, D., Gihleb, R., & Wilson, A. J. (2017). Assessing the rate of replication in economics. *American Economic Review*, 107(5), 27–31. https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.p20171119. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20171119
- Clemens, M. A. (2017). The meaning of failed replications: A review and proposal. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 31 (1), 326–342. https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12139
- Dewald, W., Thursby, J., & Anderson, R. (1986). Replication in empirical economics: The journal of Money, Credit and Banking project. *The American Economic Review*, 76(4), 587–603. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1806061.
- Galiani, S., Gertler, P., & Romero, M. (2017). Incentives for replication in economics. NBER Working Paper No. 23576. https://doi.org/10.3386/w23576
- Hamermesh, D. S. (2007). Viewpoint: Replication in economics. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 40(3), 715–733. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.00428.x
- Ingerslev, T., Jensen, B., Kelly, T., & Pedersen, L. H. (2021). Is there a replication crisis in finance? NBER Working Paper No. 28432. https://www.nber.org/papers/w28432
- Maniadis, Z., Tufano, F., & List, J. A. (2017). To replicate or not to replicate? Exploring reproducibility in economics through the lens of a model and a pilot study. *The Economic Journal*, 127(605), F209–F235. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecoj.12527
- Vilhuber, L. (2020). Reproducibility and replicability in economics. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 2(4). https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.4f6b9e67