## LANGUAGE LEARNING
*A Journal of Research in Language Studies*

**Reviewer guidelines for Registered Reports**

> The guidelines for Registered Reports should be read in conjunction with any other Reviewer and Author guidelines provided by *Language Learning*, which also apply to Registered Reports unless specifically contraindicated by the specific guidelines below.

**Brief overview.** Registered Reports are a form of empirical article in which a substantial part of the manuscript (including the methods and proposed analyses) is peer-reviewed and then pre-registered, once approved, prior to the research being conducted. This format is designed to reduce bias and other questionable research practices, particularly in deductive science, while also allowing researchers the flexibility to conduct subsequent unregistered (exploratory) analyses and to report serendipitous findings. As well as being appropriate for hypothesis-driven research, the format can also be suitable for other approaches, such as meta-analysis, observation, case study, or ethnography, where (at least some of the) methods and analysis procedures are known in advance of data collection.

The review process for Registered Reports is divided into two stages. At Stage 1, reviewers assess study proposals before data are collected. At Stage 2, reviewers consider the full study, including results and interpretation.

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

1.  The importance of the research question(s).

2.  The logic, rationale, and plausibility of the proposed research questions/hypotheses.

3.  The soundness and feasibility of the proposed methods and analysis plans.

    a.  The methods should include appropriate control/comparison groups and quality checks that ensure that the results obtained are able to test the stated hypotheses.

    b.  The analysis plans should include alternate analyses to be pursued if the data do not meet the assumptions of the proposed statistical analyses and statistical power analyses where appropriate (e.g., based on previous research, meta-analyses, or clearly justified assumptions).

4.  The clarity and degree of methodological detail, specifically, whether they are sufficient to replicate the proposed experimental procedures and analysis plans without needing further information.

Following Stage 1 peer review, manuscripts will be accepted with in-principle acceptance (IPA), offered the opportunity to revise, or rejected outright. IPA indicates that the article will be published pending successful completion of the study according to the preregistered methods and analytic procedures, as well as a defensible and evidence-based interpretation of the results.

Following completion of the study, authors will complete the manuscript, including Results and Discussion sections. These Stage 2 manuscripts will more closely resemble a regular article format. The manuscript will then be returned to (some of) the original reviewers and one or (under unusual circumstances) more new reviewer(s), who will be asked to appraise:

1.  Whether the introduction, rationale, and stated hypotheses are the same as the approved Stage 1 submission (required).

2.  Whether the authors adhered precisely to the registered methods and analyses.

3.  Whether the data are able to test the authors' proposed hypotheses by satisfying the approved plans for control/comparison group and quality check outcomes that were specified in Stage 1.

4.  Whether any unregistered analyses which were added by the authors are justified, methodologically sound, and informative.

5.  Whether the authors' interpretation of the results is sound, with conclusions that are justified by the data.

Reviewers at Stage 2 may suggest that authors carry out and report additional unregistered analyses on their data; however, authors are not obliged to do so unless such analyses are necessary to satisfy Stage 2 review criteria (e.g., Points 4 and 5).

> Editorial decisions will not be based on the perceived importance, novelty, or conclusiveness of the results.

Adapted from resources openly available at https://cos.io/rr/

Last update: 20 August 2018