

Peer Review Comments

Article: Klein, R A et al 2014 Data from Investigating Variation in Replicability: A “Many Labs” Replication Project. *Journal of Open Psychology Data*, 2(1): e4, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/jopd.ad>

Article submitted: 27 January 2014

Article accepted: 11 March 2014

Article published: 4 April 2014

Editor: Jelte M. Wicherts

Responses for Version 1

Reviewer A: Kevin van Kalkeren

Review Completed: 4 February 2014

In their manuscript, Klein et al. provide and describe the data that were obtained during the Many Labs Replication Project. In 36 samples, containing the data from over 6,000 participants, 13 classic effects from psychology were put to the test in diverse settings. The studies focused on trying to replicate the 13 effects by using measures that were as similar as possible to the ones that were originally used. Data from demographic variables and contextual information are included.

The data sets have great reuse potential because of their relevance to psychology and their great size. Furthermore, because of the study's goal to recreate classic psychological paradigms, the data are also very applicable to discussions about the validity of said paradigms. In addition, the data paper contains most of the required information. There are however, some comments to be made. Firstly, the method section of the paper mentions that, despite the random order in which the 13 effects were presented to subjects, the 12th study on the list (Nosek, Banaj, & Greenwald, 2002), was always presented last, but neglects to explain why. Secondly, I would advise all 12 papers that served as sources for the examined 13 effects, be included in the reference section, since this will also add to the ease these effects and papers can be found and read up on. When it comes to the dataset itself, it is my belief that it could benefit from including a simple yet clear legend, specifying to whom the data in the 'referrer' column refer. Also, I would recommend translating all the data and/or label information to English, since this will increase its comprehensibility to most readers. This comment refers mostly to the descriptions in Codebook.xlsx.

If this paper and dataset are improved on the points mentioned above, I wholeheartedly recommend publishing this impressive set of information in JOPD.

Reviewer B: Marjan Bakker

Review Completed: 24 February 2014

The paper satisfies the criteria of JOPD data papers. Some small comments:

- Sample, first row: include “subjects” after 6,344
- In the abstract the authors mention 13 included effects, but in the Methods, Materials sections only 12 studies are mentioned.
- Procedures: a link that was provided to all researchers, or to all subjects?

The data satisfies the criteria b till f. The data is only not stored at one of the recommended repositories (criteria a). However, it is stored on the Open Science Framework, which will probably also satisfy the JOPD standards.