Review for 'A Proposal for Replicating Evanschitzky, Baumgarth, Hubbard, and Armstrong's (2007) "Replication Research's Disturbing Trend"'

In his proposal, Professor Hubbard suggests to replicate one of his earlier papers in which he and others determined the share of *replications* and *extensions* in some of the most influential marketing journals for the time period between 1990 and 2004.

I think the proposal is very useful and I appreciate the aims of such a study. In Marketing there are only few studies which address the question of replicable research or the share of papers which deal with replications.

Furthermore, the proposal is well written.

(i) General discussion of principles about how one should do a replication

This is the part of the paper, where I have several thoughts about:

First, I am not sure about the author's comments on the impossibility of conducting an *exact replication*: "*In practice, exact replications are never conducted because of the impossibility of duplicating every circumstance.*" This might be valid for most approaches (and beyond doubt, *exact replications* are almost never conducted respectively published in practise), but for a defined sample of a population (like 'published articles in journals'), the (sub)population remains stable and identical. Therefore, even to *check the analysis* (type 1 in terms of Tsang and Kwan) could be an option.

Second, I miss the term "sample" in the listing of the different types of replication. On the one hand, there is a population. But on the other hand, as soon as a research project only includes a part of the entire population (which is most often the case), I would suggest using the term "(sub)sample".

Third, what is the difference between a replication (especially with regard to the replication type 6) and a follow-up study? The main goal of a replication, to my understanding, is to reproduce findings – with the same sample or another. Researchers are 'standing of the shoulders of giants' and science progress should be built on robust and replicable findings and methods of one's predecessors.

(ii) Why the "candidate" paper was selected

In my opinion, the goal to replicate the paper from 2007 is well justified: Especially for journals in marketing, there are only few studies available which deal with the frequency of published replications. Also the amount of citations for the article in questions underlines the importance to replicate the findings of the paper.

To conduct a replication, as proposed by the author, would be beneficial to the research community and also shed light on potential changes of the frequency of published replications in marketing journals.

(iii) The replication plan

Based on my comments in paragraph (i), I am not sure whether the proposed replication plan in fact is a replication. By adding another subpopulation, choosing more recent volumes AND changing the time dimension of the analysis, the question is, whether the proposed research design primarily is a

replication (probably a *conceptual replication* or a replication type 5 or 6) or (what I suggest), a follow-up study.

In addition, determining effects might be easier when only one condition is changed. With a new sample and another time period we have two changes, which might result in challenges to compare the outcomes of the analysis with the findings of EBHA. These parameters are the main reason why I am not sure, whether the approach described in fact is a replication.

Therefore I would suggest to slightly changing the research design:

In a first step, Prof. Hubbard might analyse the publications in JAMS, ML and MS for the time period 1990 to 2004. By this approach, a comparison to the findings of EBHA is facilitated, because only one parameter is changed.

To enable comparability of EBHA to the findings of Prof. Hubbard, the methodology should be identical to the one of EBHA. Particulary, this is important, when Prof. Hubbard states that "*If doubt arises concerning whether the article is a replication, I will err on the liberal side and include it*." Have EBHA also been on the liberal side, when gauging whether an article is a replication?

Step1	Sample 1	Sample 2	
	JCR, JM, JMR (study by EBHA)	JAMS, ML, MS (not done, yet)	time period: 1990-2004
	JCR, JM, JMR (not done, yet)	JAMS, ML, MS (not done, yet)	time period:2005-2015

Step2	Sample 1	Sample 2	
	JCR, JM, JMR, JAMS, ML, MS		time period: 1990-2004
	JCR, JM, JMR, JAMS, ML, MS		time period:2005-2015

In a second step, one could compare the findings for time period one to the second time period.

I also would like to raise the question, which of the definitions of 'replication' (according to the schema provided by Tsang and Kwan, 1999) the author wants to use to assess whether an article in his sample is a replication? Is it intended to divide the replication papers into the six categories? Or, if not, which definition will be used?

(iv) Discussion of how to interpret the results of the replication

When analysing a full population, there is no need to conduct statistical tests. This also is what Prof. Hubbard stated, when we wrote "since the data in EBHA and my replication constitute entire populations, no statistical testing will be involved."

On these grounds it is no clear, how a potential estimation model would look like and why confidence intervals should play a role in the analysis. To conclude: I really appreciate the proposal and I am very curious about the outcomes of the study!