



CALL FOR PROPOSALS
Pre-Approved Re-examinations (p-rex)
Journal of Financial Reporting
January 2019

Summary. Journal of Financial Reporting solicits submissions for *pre-registered re-examinations* (p-rex). This Call for Proposals will remain open indefinitely. Submissions will be processed on a rolling basis as they are received, with articles published in regularly scheduled issues. JFR remains open to submissions of all types consistent with our existing policies. The remainder of this document defines what we mean by re-examination, the standards we will apply in evaluating them, the editorial process we will use, and our policies for publishing supplementary comments by others.

Re-examinations. Following the framework proposed by [Bloomfield, Nelson and Soltes](#) (2016, adapted from [Clemens](#)), we identify four types of re-examinations:

- **Verifications** use the same data set and the same analyses, to assess whether the original claims were due to flawed execution or reporting.
- **Reproductions** apply the same analyses to a different set capturing the same target population, to assess whether original claims were the result of luck, flawed execution or flawed reporting.
- **Reanalyses** apply new analyses to the same data set to assess whether the original claims are robust to different statistical approaches.
- **Extensions** apply the same or new analyses to a data set drawn from a different target population or setting, to assess whether the claims extend to closely related contexts.

JFR is open to all types of re-examinations, including those that blend elements of two or more types. Note that re-examinations focus not on entire studies, but on particular claims in those studies, typically in the form of a p-value interpreted in the framework of Null Hypothesis Statistical Testing (NHST). However, a re-examination need not be restricted to NHST; it can also use Bayesian or other methods that simply estimate the strength and variability of the associations claimed by the original authors.

Standards for Re-examinations. Good re-examinations satisfy four criteria. They are:

- **Relevant.** Claims being re-examined are of interest to JFR's readership, as defined by JFR's mission statement.
- **Specific.** Proposals specify the claim being re-examined, and how they are mimicking and altering the original methods, clearly enough that readers can determine whether those methods have been followed in the final report.
- **Important.** Re-examined claims have established a record of influence, or good prospects of establishing such a record.
- **Informative.** Experts are unsure whether the re-examination will yield similar signs or magnitudes, and the methods used are powerful enough to provide convincing evidence.

In addition to these criteria, submissions will be evaluated using JFR's [existing policies](#), which distinguish between the substance of a study (how the authors gathered data, analyzed it and reported their results) and its commentary (how the authors discuss the motivation, interpretation and implications). We hold substance to the highest standards. However, we avoid rejecting papers based on reasonable disagreements over commentary, letting them be addressed in published discussions as appropriate.

Process. P-Rex submissions will be evaluated using a registration-based editorial process (REP). Authors first submit a proposal specifying the claims they will test, how they will gather and analyze data, and how they will interpret results in light of claim being re-examined. The proposal must also describe the extent to which authors have already gathered or analyzed data relevant to the re-examination. Ideally, proposals are submitted before authors have gathered any data through experiments, surveys or hand-collection, or before authors have conducted the relevant analyses of pre-structured databases like CRSP and Compustat. This policy is intended to mitigate concerns that authors are selectively submitting papers based on whether re-examinations support or overturn prior claims, or that reviewers and editors are selectively evaluating them on that basis. JFR will also consider re-examinations when the authors have gathered and analyzed data, but the proposal must not reveal the authors' findings (to mitigate concerns about selection bias among reviewers and editors), and proposals should be designed and written to mitigate concerns about authors' own selection biases. Before publication, authors are required to submit their data processing code, along with raw data when there are no legal obstacles to doing so (suitably redacted to protect identities).

Proposals will be assessed for quality control and assigned to a co-editor, who will assign two referees using JFR's typical single-blind process. The authors of the claims being re-examined are not eligible to serve as reviewers, but the proposal will be sent to them for advisory input on how the proposal might be improved. However, editors will not use their negative evaluations or non-responses as a basis for rejection. Editors will reject or approve proposals, possibly after one or more requests for revision. Approval constitutes "in-principle acceptance", and barring extraordinary circumstances, the final report will be published as long as the authors live up to the commitments reflected in their proposal. Authors of approved proposals are encouraged to conduct additional analyses, clearly noting their non-registered nature.

Discussions. Solicited discussions are intended to help readers interpret the results of re-examinations, and to encourage authors to take supplementary analysis seriously. Discussion remarks may be solicited from reviewers, authors of the original claim and other experts at two points in the process: after the proposal is approved but before authors report results, and after authors share their data and code. Authors may also be given an opportunity to respond to such comments, as editors deem appropriate.