

Review of *Should you choose to do so... A replication paradigm*

In this paper, the author attempts to illustrate a replication paradigm using two papers Dewald, Thursby and Anderson (1986) and James Payne and George Waters (2008). Overall, I believe the paper does address most of the four issues requested. Below are several suggestions to improve the paper.

Comments:

1. In the abstract the author states, “*But ‘replication’ as a scientific endeavor will never achieve respectability unless and until it abandons a narrow focus on data and expands its focus to the underlying scientific inferences.*” It is unclear that replication predominantly focuses on data and thus lacks respectability. This is a strong statement that is not explained in the text.
2. The author states on page 5, “*Unfortunately, analysts continue to confound and confuse the concept of “replication” as used in the physical sciences, where it refers to repeating an experiment, and the concept in economics, where it is solely a matter of calculation.*” It is unclear what the author’s definition is for replication. It appears the author’s definition of replication differs from Kane (1984) and Hamermesh (2007). Thus, the introduction appears to outline a general discussion of principles for how one should not do a replication study.
3. The author could provide a more detailed explanation for why the "candidate" papers were selected for replication. Currently, the only explanation provided for replicating Dewald, Thursby and Anderson (1986) is page 4, which states that “*[t]he choice was based, in part, on tractability: the article was relatively brief with a straightforward three-equation linear regression model of the growth of agencies, branches and subsidiaries of foreign banks in the United States, and the authors responded promptly to our queries.*” Replicating Dewald, Thursby and Anderson (1986) appears to highlight the issue of data availability where James Payne and George Waters (2008) appears to highlight the fragility of estimates.
4. Section 5, *How Do We Judge When a Replication Is Successful?*, focuses heavily on statistical error, but the author should also mention coding errors and other potential sources for unsuccessfully replicating a published paper. Using the author(s) original data when available, section 3 illustrates potential issues with data availability, and implicitly assuming data coming from the authors is free errors will ignore potential sources of inaccuracy and imprecision.