**Scoring Rubric  
Rigor and Reproducibility**

For your partner's Worksheet pre (before) and post (after) entries, please enter the # of items listed, and then check off all listed categories included.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Worksheets** | |
|  |  | **Pre** | **Post** |
|  | Total # of items pre (before) and post (after). |  |  |
| 1. **Incentives** | Anything stated that would push someone to cut corners OR that if implemented would increase attention to good practices of research. For example: funding, promotion, credit for reproducible research practices, etc. However, if training (or lack of training) is the focus, then it should be included in the ***Training*** category. |  |  |
| 1. **Training** | Any mention of a need for training about how to do the science, science methods, use of statistics, promoting good practices of research, etc. If training by a mentor is referenced, that it should be included in the ***Mentoring*** category. |  |  |
| 1. **Mentoring** | Emphasis on the role of a senior members of a research group to promote good practices of research through mentoring, but also to provide oversight of the research. |  |  |
| 1. **Research Tools** | Any indication of a reagent, tool, software, etc. that might vary because of failure to validate, lack of standardization, variability (e.g., genetic drift in a cell line), etc. |  |  |
| 1. **Experimental Design** | Anything explicitly about blinding (to minimize bias) and controls or randomization (to protect against incorrectly interpreting something as true [or false]). A decision to simply repeat work (or not) should be included in the ***Other*** category. |  |  |
| 1. **Data Management** | Anything referencing keeping good records or record retention (not just of data per se, but of software changes, methods, etc.) |  |  |
| 1. **Statistics** | Any mention of the misuse or proper use of statistics or sample size. If the focus is on the reporting of statistical methods, then that should be included in the ***Reporting*** category. |  |  |
| 1. **Reporting** | Any failure to include something in publications (or other forms of reporting) that would make it harder or impossible for someone else to reproduce the work (e.g., reporting of statistical methods used, sample size definition, handling of outliers, exclusion/inclusion criteria, etc. |  |  |
| 1. **Openness** | Any focus on open sharing of methods, materials, data, software, etc.; pre-registration (announcing plans ahead of time) |  |  |
| 1. **Peer Review** | Any approach to peer reviewing that would enhance chance a publication will be reproducible (e.g., a check list for reviewers) OR any referencing of problems of poor or biased peer review. |  |  |
| 1. **Other** | If something doesn't easily fit into one of the other categories, then it should be put in this category. Some examples include: research misconduct, editorial bias (if not explicitly talking about peer review), failure to repeat work, expectations of repetition before publishing, handling of retractions, options for publishing negative data, overreaching on conclusions, etc. |  |  |