

Assessing replication success via skeptical mixture priors

Guido Consonni* and Leonardo Egidi†

January 2, 2024

Abstract

There is a growing interest in the analysis of replication studies of original findings across many disciplines. When testing a hypothesis for an effect size, two Bayesian approaches stand out for their principled use of the Bayes factor (BF), namely the replication BF and the skeptical BF. In particular, the latter BF is based on the skeptical prior, which represents the opinion of an investigator who is unconvinced by the original findings and wants to challenge them. We embrace the skeptical perspective, and elaborate a novel mixture prior which incorporates skepticism while at the same time controlling for prior-data conflict within the original data. Consistency properties of the resulting skeptical mixture BF are provided together with an extensive analysis of the main features of our proposal. Finally, we apply our methodology to data from the Social Sciences Replication Project. In particular we show that, for some case studies where prior-data conflict is an issue, our method uses a more realistic prior and leads to evidence-classification for replication success which differs from the standard skeptical approach.

Keywords: Bayes factor, Bayesian hypothesis testing, consistency, prior-data conflict, replication studies, reverse-Bayes

*Department of Statistical Sciences, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano

†Department of Economics, Business, Mathematics, and Statistics *Bruno de Finetti*, University of Trieste

1 Introduction and Background

The so-called “replication crisis” has been plaguing scientific research across many disciplines (Open Science Collaboration, 2015; Camerer et al., 2018), and this has generated a growing interest in the analysis of replication studies. Several attempts have been carried out to pinpoint the notion of “replication success”; see for instance Hutton et al. (2020), Anderson and Maxwell (2016), Johnson et al. (2017), Ly et al. (2018), Hedges and Schauer (2019), Harms (2019) and Held (2020).

Within the Bayesian framework, the Bayes Factor (BF) has played an important role in evaluating the evidence for replication success. Notable examples are the *replication* BF (Verhagen and Wagenmakers, 2014) and the skeptical BF (Pawel and Held, 2022). In this paper we analyze consistency issues for both BF’s, and then discuss potential prior-data conflict underlying the use of the skeptical BF. This investigation will eventually lead to our proposal which in a loose sense can be regarded as a natural halfway house between the two.

We review the main features of the replication BF in Section 1.1 and of the skeptical BF in Section 1.2. Sections 1.3 to 1.5 contain the motivation for our work and present useful technical details. In particular, Section 1.3 is devoted to consistency issues under replication data; specifically, consistency of the replication BF is proven, while this is not the case for the skeptical BF. A more specific notion of consistency, named information consistency, is dealt with in Section 1.4: again the replication BF satisfies it; on the other hand we argue that information consistency cannot be properly formulated when it comes to the skeptical BF because the two contrasting hypotheses are not nested. Finally, Section 1.5 highlights why prior-data conflict should be taken into consideration in replication studies, and provides some background on the topic. Section 2 presents our proposal, namely the

skeptical mixture prior with the allied BF, along with a result on consistency and the extensive analysis of an example (Section 2.1). Section 3 contains an application to case studies from the *Social Sciences Replication Project* reported in Camerer et al. (2018), together with an assessment of our method, also from a comparative viewpoint. Some issues worthy of discussion are then summarized in Section 4. To ease the flow of ideas, several technical details have been collected in the Supplementary material.

1.1 The Replication Bayes Factor

Consider two Bayesian models for the same observable y

$$H_j : \{f(y | H_j, \theta_j); f(\theta_j | H_j)\}, j = 1, 2, \quad (1)$$

where $f(y | H_j, \theta_j)$ is the data distribution under H_j indexed by parameter θ_j , and $f(\theta_j | H_j)$ is the corresponding parameter prior. We evaluate the plausibility of H_1 relative to H_2 based on data y through the Bayes Factor (BF)

$$BF_{1:2}(y) = \frac{f(y | H_1)}{f(y | H_2)}, \quad (2)$$

where $f(y | H_j) = \int f(y | H_j, \theta_j)f(\theta_j | H_j)d\theta_j$ is the marginal data distribution under H_j , also named the marginal likelihood of H_j .

In Equation (1) both the data distribution and the prior may depend on H_j . In our setting however, the family of data distributions is the same under H_1 and H_2 with the same parameter θ say, so that $f(y | H_j, \theta_j) = f(y | \theta)$; as a consequence H_j characterizes only the prior for θ , and model comparison reduces to a Bayesian hypothesis testing problem.

Let θ be the effect of a treatment on an outcome of interest, and $\hat{\theta}_o$ and $\hat{\theta}_r$ denote estimators (typically MLE) of θ obtained under the *original* and the *replication* study respectively, with corresponding standard errors σ_o and σ_r . Following common practice in

meta-analytic studies, we further assume that the sample sizes n_k are sufficiently large to justify a normal distribution for the estimators, so that $\hat{\theta}_k | \theta \sim N(\theta, \sigma_k^2)$ with σ_k known, $k \in \{o, r\}$. This represents a reasonable approximation for various types of effect sizes, including means and mean differences, odds ratios, hazard ratios, risk ratios or correlation coefficients, usually after a suitable transformation; see for instance Spiegelhalter et al. (2003, Section 2.4).

The following notation will also be useful in the sequel. Denote the z -values associated to the estimates of the two studies with $z_o = \hat{\theta}_o/\sigma_o$, $z_r = \hat{\theta}_r/\sigma_r$, respectively; the relative effect estimate with $d = \hat{\theta}_r/\hat{\theta}_o$; the variance ratio with $c = \sigma_o^2/\sigma_r^2$. Since for many types of effect sizes the variances are inversely proportional to the sample size, often one can safely assume that $\sigma_k^2 = \sigma^2/n_k$, $k \in \{o, r\}$, where σ^2 is the unitary variance in each study. In this case $c = n_r/n_o$, the ratio between the replication and the original sample size.

Of particular interest in our setting is the situation wherein z_o is sufficiently large in absolute value, so that the original experiment is believed to provide substantial evidence that there is truly an effect, i.e. $\theta \neq 0$. To evaluate to what extent a replication study resulted in a success, thus confirming the original finding, Verhagen and Wagenmakers (2014) compared two hypotheses using replication data $\hat{\theta}_r | \theta \sim N(\theta, \sigma_r^2)$. The first one is the standard null hypothesis $H_0 : \theta = 0$ of no effect. The second one reflects the opinion of an *advocate* who believes the effect to be consistent with that found in the original study. This is quantified through a posterior distribution on θ , conditionally on the original data $\hat{\theta}_o$, and based on a flat prior for θ . The resulting *advocate prior* becomes

$$H_A : \theta \sim N(\hat{\theta}_o, \sigma_o^2).$$

The BF of H_0 against H_A ,

$$BF_{0:A}(\hat{\theta}_r) = \frac{f(\hat{\theta}_r | H_0)}{f(\hat{\theta}_r | H_A)} \equiv BF_R,$$

is named the *Replication Bayes factor*. It can be verified that

$$BF_R = \sqrt{1+c} \exp \left\{ -\frac{z_o^2}{2} \left(d^2 c - \frac{(1-d)^2}{1/c+1} \right) \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Replication success is declared whenever BF_R is sufficiently low to provide convincing evidence against H_0 , based on conventional evidence thresholds essentially dating back to Jeffreys (1961); see for instance Schönbrodt and Wagenmakers (2018, Table 1). It may be observed that the replication BF is a *partial* BF (O’Hagan and Forster, 2004) for checking H_0 against its complement $\theta \neq 0$ when the prior under the latter is flat. In this context, $\hat{\theta}_r$ is used as comparison data and $\hat{\theta}_o$ as training data; see also Ly et al. (2019). Notice that BF_R provides an answer to the following question: “In the replication experiment, is the effect absent or is it similar to what was found in the original one?”, where the latter supposition is represented through H_A . This should be contrasted with more traditional default Bayesian testing methods, where the alternative is usually a relatively uninformative prior centered on the null value $\theta = 0$; see for instance Wetzels and Wagenmakers (2012). We highlight that BF_R establishes a useful connection between the replication and the original experiment, through the advocate prior. However, replication success is declared on the basis of the evidential strength against H_0 when compared to H_A *solely* under the replication data. In other words there is no explicit consideration of the evidence against H_0 provided by the original data. This issue is taken up in the next section.

1.2 The Skeptical Bayes Factor

Pawel and Held (2022) propose a different route to establish replication success. Their key idea is to compare two particular BF’s: one based on the original data, and the other one on the replication data. For the former they compare the standard null hypothesis of no effect H_0 against that of a *skeptic* who is unconvinced by the result. This view is operationalized

through a *skeptical* Normal prior, centered on zero and with a variance $\sigma_S^2 = g\sigma_o^2$, where g is chosen so that the resulting BF provides unconvincing evidence against the null hypothesis. In other words, the skeptic wishes to “challenge” the original finding, and requires the Bayes factor to attain a value so that s/he cannot take a definitive commitment against the null, and thus further investigation (namely the replication experiment) is called for. More formally, let $0 < \gamma < 1$ be a value such that the comparison of

$$H_0 : \theta = 0 \quad \text{vs} \quad H_S : \theta \sim N(0, g_\gamma \sigma_o^2) \tag{4}$$

leads to

$$BF_{0:S}(\hat{\theta}_o; g_\gamma) = \gamma,$$

with the understanding that values above γ would *not* be considered adequate evidence against H_0 . For instance $\gamma = 1/10$ could be a suitable choice, because values of $BF_{0:S}$ in the bracket $(1/10, 1/3)$ provide only moderate evidence against H_0 , while those in the bracket $(1/30, 1/10)$ imply strong evidence against H_0 ; see again Table 1 of Schönbrodt and Wagenmakers (2018) (notice however that the BF in their table is the reciprocal of ours). A slightly different classification scheme is available in Kass and Raftery (1995).

We note that the skeptical prior $N(0, g_\gamma \sigma_o^2)$ is constructed through a *reverse-Bayes* methodology, a technique dating back to Good (1950). The reason is that the prior is specified *after* the data are in, because the BF is required to attain a specific value on the original data $\hat{\theta}_o$; see Held et al. (2022) for an insightful discussion of reverse-Bayes ideas.

The value of g_γ , whose dependence on the original data is omitted for simplicity, can be explicitly computed as in Pawel and Held (2022, formula (3)). It must be pointed out however that g_γ will not exist when $BF_{0:S}(\hat{\theta}_o, g)$ is always above γ for any $g > 0$: this happens for instance when $|z_o| \leq 1$, and $\gamma \leq 1$; but it may also happen for $1 < |z_o| \leq 2$

if γ is smaller than $1/3$. These situations however are hardly of interest, because in both cases either no effect is claimed, or the evidence of an effect is not particularly strong, and so replication of the experiment is often not even considered. On the other hand, when $BF_{0:S} = \gamma$ is attainable, there will typically be two values of g_γ leading to this result. The higher value, which is usually much greater than the smaller value, is merely an instance of the Jeffreys-Lindley paradox (Shafer, 1982), and is accordingly discarded because it represents vagueness rather than skepticism.

Clearly the skeptical prior is data-dependent; however its use is confined to obtain a BF whose value, on the original data, is set based on external considerations. The skeptical distribution will then be used as a regular prior to construct a BF based on the replication data $\hat{\theta}_r$, and in that context is *not* data-dependent.

Turning to replication data, one then compares the skeptical prior $H_S : \theta \sim N(0, g_\gamma \sigma_o^2)$ against the advocate $H_A : \theta \sim N(\hat{\theta}_o, \sigma_o^2)$, leading to

$$BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; g_\gamma) = \sqrt{\frac{1/c + 1}{1/c + g_\gamma}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{z_o^2}{2} \left(\frac{d^2}{1/c + g_\gamma} - \frac{(d-1)^2}{1/c + 1} \right) \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where $z_o = \hat{\theta}_o/\sigma_o$, $d = \hat{\theta}_r/\hat{\theta}_o$, and $c = \sigma_o^2/\sigma_r^2$. Replication success at level γ is declared if

$$BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; g_\gamma) \leq BF_{0:S}(\hat{\theta}_o; g_\gamma) = \gamma. \quad (6)$$

In the words of Pawel and Held (2022) “It is natural to consider a replication successful if the replication data favor the advocate over the skeptic to a higher degree than the skeptic’s initial objection to the original study”.

Rather than fixing a value γ , and then checking whether Equation (6) holds, one might instead look for the smallest γ satisfying (6), namely

$$BF_S \equiv \inf \{ \gamma : BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; g_\gamma) \leq \gamma \}. \quad (7)$$

The value BF_S is called the *skeptical BF*, and represents the smallest γ level for which replication success can be established. It may happen that BF_S does not exist, because there is no γ for which replication success can be established, but this usually occurs when $|z_o|$, or $|d| = |z_r|/|z_o|$, or both are too small. More details are provided in Pawel and Held (2022).

1.3 Consistency

Model selection consistency (Liang et al., 2008), or simply consistency, is the property of a statistical procedure to recover the true model (or hypothesis) as the sample size grows. Below we analyze separately the behavior of the replication and the skeptical Bayes factor. In both cases consistency is evaluated relative to a sequence of replication datasets whose sample size is assumed to grow indefinitely.

Proposition 1. *Consider a sequence of replication datasets with increasing sample size $n_r = 1, 2, \dots$. Assume there exists a corresponding sequence of estimators $\{\hat{\theta}_r^{(n_r)}\}_{n_r=1}^\infty$ of a common parameter θ whose distribution for sufficiently large n_r can be approximated as $\hat{\theta}_r^{(n_r)} | \theta \sim N(\theta, (\sigma_r^{(n_r)})^2)$ with $\sigma_r^{(n_r)}$ known. Denote with $BF_R^{(n_r)}$ the replication BF based on $\hat{\theta}_r^{(n_r)}$. Let θ^* denote the true value of θ . Then the following limits in probability hold*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \theta^* = 0, \quad BF_R^{(n_r)} &\xrightarrow[n_r \rightarrow \infty]{} \infty \text{ at rate } O(\sqrt{n_r}); \\ \text{if } \theta^* \neq 0, \quad BF_R^{(n_r)} &\xrightarrow[n_r \rightarrow \infty]{} 0 \text{ at rate } \exp\{-Kn_r\}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $K > 0$ is a positive constant. As a consequence, BF_R is consistent.

Proof. See Supplementary material.

Proposition 2. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 1, let $p_S(\cdot)$ and $p_A(\cdot)$ denote the density of the skeptical and the advocate prior leading to (5). Let θ^* denote the true value*

of θ . Then the following limit in probability holds

$$BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r^{(n_r)}; g) \xrightarrow{n_r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p_S(\theta^*)}{p_A(\theta^*)}. \quad (9)$$

Proof. See Supplementary material.

It follows from Proposition 2 that consistency does not hold for $BF_{S:A}$ because it converges to a constant irrespective of the true value θ^* . Ly and Wagenmakers (2022), discussing Bayes factors for “peri-null” hypotheses, also mention, as a particular case, the inconsistency of $BF_{S:A}$. We note that both the consistency of BF_R and the inconsistency of $BF_{S:A}$ reported in Proposition 1 and Proposition 2, respectively, are in accord with theoretical results on the asymptotic behavior of Bayes factors under rather general conditions on model and priors presented in Dawid (2011).

Proposition 2 highlights the fact that the pair $\{H_S; H_A\}$ leading to $BF_{S:A}$ is a comparison between two *opinions* (priors) on the parameter for the *same* model. The bottom line is that even an infinite replication sample size cannot favor one over the other overwhelmingly.

1.4 Information Consistency

Besides consistency, another useful criterion to evaluate a Bayes factor is *information consistency*. Bayarri et al. (2012) present this criterion with regard to two *nested* models, M_0 and M , with M_0 (the null model) nested in M . Let $\Lambda_{M_0:M}(y)$ be the likelihood ratio, and consider a sequence of data vectors $\{y_m\}$ of *fixed* sample size, such that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_{M:M_0}(y_m) = \infty, \quad (10)$$

so that, in the limit, the data provide overwhelming evidence in favor of M . It is then required that the BF in favor of M follows suit and diverges accordingly. We show in the Supplementary material (Proposition S.1) that BF_R is information consistent. On the other

hand, the notion of information consistency becomes vacuous when it comes to the skeptical $BF_{S:A}$, because the two models under comparison are not nested, as already mentioned at the end of Section 1.2. We note that some concerns about information consistency are addressed in Pawel and Held (2022, Section 3.4), to whom we refer for further details.

1.5 Prior-Data Conflict

The skeptical prior is constructed by fixing a value γ for $BF_{0:S}$ which renders the original finding unconvincing at level γ . How reasonable is the skeptical prior $\theta \sim N(0, g_\gamma \sigma_o^2)$ relative to the information on θ provided by the data in the original experiment? The same concern applies to $N(0, g_S \sigma_o^2)$, where g_S is the value corresponding to BF_S defined in Equation (7). Surely a skeptical prior which is at odds with the original data would appear suspicious to an external agent (e.g. a regulatory agency or a project grant reviewer). Indeed we would like to be skeptical but not unrealistic. The problem we are addressing is an instance of *prior-data-conflict* (Evans and Moshonov, 2006; Egidi et al., 2021); see also Held (2020) in the context of replication studies.

Here we simply sketch the idea. Consider a statistic T having distribution $f_T(t|\theta)$ and a prior $\theta \sim \pi(\theta)$. Let the marginal density be given by

$$m_T(t) = \int f_T(t|\theta)\pi(\theta)d\theta, \quad (11)$$

where t ranges over the set of values of T . Let t_{obs} be the observed value of T . The p -value for prior-data conflict (Evans and Moshonov, 2006) is defined as:

$$P(t_{obs}) = \Pr^{m_T}\{t : m_T(t) \leq m_T(t_{obs})\}, \quad (12)$$

where $P^{m_T}(\cdot)$ is the probability computed under the marginal $m_T(\cdot)$ in (11). The index $P(t_{obs})$ measures how surprising is the value t_{obs} by computing the probability of all those

t 's whose density is below the density at $T = t_{obs}$. Intuitively, if $P(t_{obs})$ is very small, say below 10% or possibly a smaller value, then a surprising value has occurred and in this case we declare prior-data conflict. If $m_T(\cdot)$ is unimodal, $P(t_{obs})$ provides the tail probabilities under $m_T(\cdot)$, where the tails are the t -values whose density is below the cutoff $m_T(t_{obs})$.

2 The Skeptical Mixture Prior and Bayes Factor

We generalize the skeptical prior $H_S : \theta \sim N(0, g_\gamma \sigma_o^2)$ employed in (4) with a *mixture* prior composed of a point mass and a continuous component. These type of priors have been already implemented (Ročková, 2018) as variants of the classic spike-and-slab prior; they have also been used as data distribution in genomic studies (Taylor and Pollard, 2009).

Specifically we define the *family of skeptical mixture priors* at level $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ as

$$\theta \sim \psi_\gamma \delta_0 + (1 - \psi_\gamma) N(0, h_\gamma \sigma_o^2), \quad (\psi_\gamma, h_\gamma) \in U_\gamma, \quad (13)$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac measure at $\theta = 0$, $0 \leq \psi_\gamma \leq 1$ is a weight, $h_\gamma > 0$ is the relative variance, and U_γ is the set of pairs (ψ_γ, h_γ) such that the BF for the comparison of $H_0 : \theta = 0$ against the hypothesis that θ follows *any* distribution in the family (13) in the original experiment is equal to γ .

As for the skeptical prior, our notation does not make explicit the dependence of the pair (ψ_γ, h_γ) on the original estimator $\hat{\theta}_o$. It is worth emphasizing that, differently from the skeptical prior, its mixture counterpart is naturally defined as a *set* of distributions.

The family of priors in (13) includes the skeptical prior (4) as a special case by setting $(\psi_\gamma = 0, h_\gamma = g_\gamma)$. The family is clearly empty if the condition that the BF is equal to γ cannot be fulfilled.

2.1 Prior-data conflict under the skeptical mixture prior

Consider $\hat{\theta}_o|\theta \sim N(\theta, \sigma_o^2)$, with σ_o^2 known, and assume that θ is distributed according to the skeptical mixture prior at level γ , (13). The marginal density of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_o$ is

$$m(\hat{\theta}_o) = \int N(\hat{\theta}_o|\theta, \sigma_o^2)dF_{SM}(\theta),$$

where $N(\hat{\theta}_o|\theta, \sigma_o^2)$ is a shorthand notation for the sampling density of $\hat{\theta}_o$ and $F_{SM}(\theta)$ the cdf of the mixture prior (13). We obtain

$$m(\hat{\theta}_o) = \psi_\gamma N(\hat{\theta}_o|0, \sigma_o^2) + (1 - \psi_\gamma)N(\hat{\theta}_o|0, \sigma_o^2(1 + h_\gamma)). \quad (14)$$

Simplifying the notation, the structure of Equation (14) can be formally written as

$$m_T(t) = \psi N(t|0, \sigma^2) + (1 - \psi)N(t|0, \sigma^2(1 + h)). \quad (15)$$

To evaluate the p -value for prior-data conflict $P(t_{obs})$ defined in (12) with regard to (15) it is expedient to introduce an auxiliary random variable V having a Bern(ψ) distribution and define the joint density of (T, V) as $h(t, v|\theta) = f(t|v, \theta)g(v)$ where $g(0) = \psi$, $g(1) = (1 - \psi)$ and

$$f(t|v, \theta) = \begin{cases} N(t|0, \sigma^2) & \text{if } v = 0 \\ N(t|\theta, \sigma^2) & \text{if } v = 1. \end{cases}$$

Let $\theta \sim N(\theta|0, \sigma^2 \cdot h)$. Then, marginally

$$\begin{aligned} h(t) &= \sum_v \left\{ \int h(t, v|\theta)N(\theta|0, \sigma^2 \cdot h)d\theta \right\} g(v) \\ &= \psi \int N(t|0, \sigma^2)p(\theta)d\theta + (1 - \psi) \int N(t|\theta, \sigma^2)p(\theta)d\theta \\ &= \psi N(t; 0, \sigma^2) + (1 - \psi)N(t; 0, \sigma^2 \cdot (1 + h)), \end{aligned}$$

which coincides with (15).

Since V is ancillary, one can condition on it to compute prior-data conflict; see Evans and Moshonov (2006). Hence

$$\begin{aligned} P(t_{obs}|v = 0) &= \Pr \{N(T|0, \sigma^2) \leq N(t_{obs}|0, \sigma^2)\} \\ P(t_{obs}|v = 1) &= \Pr \{N(T|0, \sigma^2(1 + h)) \leq N(t_{obs}|0, \sigma^2)(1 + h)\}, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$P(t_{obs}) = \psi P(t_{obs}|v = 0) + (1 - \psi)P(t_{obs}|v = 1). \quad (16)$$

Lemma. *Let $T \sim f(t) = N(t|0, \tau^2)$. Then*

$$Pr\{f(T) \leq f(t_{obs})\} = Pr \left\{ U \geq \left(\frac{t_{obs}}{\tau} \right)^2 \right\},$$

where $U \sim \chi^2(1)$, a chi-squared distribution with one df.

Proof: $f(T) \leq f(t_{obs})$ iff $\left(\frac{T}{\tau}\right)^2 \geq \left(\frac{t_{obs}}{\tau}\right)^2$, and $(T/\tau)^2 \equiv U \sim \chi^2(1)$. \square

Using the lemma together with (16) and reverting to the notation used in (14), the p -value for prior-data conflict based on the skeptical mixture prior (13) is

$$P_\gamma(\hat{\theta}_o) = \psi_\gamma(1 - G_1(z_o^2)) + (1 - \psi_\gamma)(1 - G_1(z_o^2/(1 + h_\gamma))), \quad (17)$$

where $G_1(\cdot)$ is the cdf of a chi-squared distribution with one df.

2.2 Embedding control for prior-data conflict in the skeptical mixture prior

Since any element in the set U_γ of hyperparameters $\{(\psi_\gamma, h_\gamma)\}$ describing the family (13) leads to a BF equal to γ , a skeptic is offered the opportunity to select a prior which in addition provides some control on prior-data conflict.

Based on the analysis reported in Section 2.1 and in particular Equation (17), let

$$(\psi_{\gamma,\alpha}, h_{\gamma,\alpha}) \in U_\gamma : P_\gamma(\hat{\theta}_o) = \alpha, \quad (18)$$

be a pair defining a skeptical mixture prior in (13) whose p -value for prior-data conflict, $P_\gamma(\hat{\theta}_o)$, is equal to α . Small values of α indicate that the observed value $\hat{\theta}_o$ is highly unlikely to occur under the skeptical mixture prior. One could set for instance $\alpha = 0.1$ as an upper-bound for the p -value to declare *lack* of prior-data conflict. The problem of finding $(\psi_{\gamma,\alpha}, h_{\gamma,\alpha})$ can be visually represented by plotting, in (h, ψ) space: i) the contour lines realizing $P(\hat{\theta}_o; \psi, h) = \alpha$ for a grid of α -values, where $P(\hat{\theta}_o; \psi, h)$ is identical to the expression in (17) except that (h, ψ) are *unconstrained*: ii) the contour line U_γ for a fixed value of γ ; and finally looking for possible points of intersection. Figure 1 illustrates this procedure with varying z_o and γ . We remark that the general shape of the contours $P(\hat{\theta}_o; \psi, h) = \alpha$ can be easily checked analytically because $\partial P(\hat{\theta}_o; \psi, h)/\partial \psi < 0$ for all $h > 0$ and $\partial P(\hat{\theta}_o; \psi, h)/\partial h > 0$ for all $0 < \psi < 1$. Notice that $P_\gamma(\hat{\theta}_o) = \alpha$ might not be attainable at the chosen level α . This can happen for a variety of reasons which are depicted in Figure 1 for three selected values of γ . The first one is that an intersection is available, but it occurs only at values α *greater* than the predetermined threshold (third panel in Figure 1) This means that there is no appreciable prior-data conflict even for the standard skeptical prior ($\psi = 0$), which can therefore be safely employed by default. Yet another possibility is that an intersection does not occur even for very small α -values: this goes in the opposite direction of the case discussed above; see the first panel in Figure 1. This situation will actually occur only for few real studies that we examine in Section 3. In this case one might settle down again on the standard skeptical prior, although one should be aware that prior-data conflict is not under control. The final possibility is that our predetermined level α can indeed be achieved but not with the standard skeptical prior; this is clearly the most

interesting case from our perspective and it happens in the middle panel of Figure 1. In this case the standard skeptical barely achieves $\alpha = 0.05$ while a skeptical mixture with a positive ψ and correspondingly higher relative variance h achieves the goal of $P_\gamma(\hat{\theta}_o) = 0.1$

Consider now the comparison

$$H_{SM} : \theta \sim \psi_{\gamma,\alpha}\delta_0 + (1 - \psi_{\gamma,\alpha})N(0, h_{\gamma,\alpha}\sigma_o^2) \quad \text{versus} \quad H_A : \theta \sim N(\hat{\theta}_o, \sigma_o^2), \quad (19)$$

where H_{SM} represents the skeptical mixture prior and H_A the advocate prior. Let $p_A(\cdot)$ be the density function of the advocate prior and let $f(\hat{\theta}_r | H_A) = \int f(\hat{\theta}_r | \theta)p_A(\theta)d\theta$ denote the marginal density of $\hat{\theta}_r$ conditionally on H_A . Similarly let $p_S(\theta; h_{\gamma,\alpha}) = N(\theta; 0, h_{\gamma,\alpha}\sigma_o^2)$ be the density function of the continuous component of the skeptical mixture prior and let $f(\hat{\theta}_r | H_S, h_{\gamma,\alpha}) = \int f(\hat{\theta}_r | \theta)p_S(\theta; h_{\gamma,\alpha})d\theta$ denote the marginal density of $\hat{\theta}_r$ conditionally on H_S with given $h_{\gamma,\alpha}$, as in (4). Finally, let $P_{SM}(\cdot)$ be the cdf of the skeptical mixture prior (19), which is everywhere continuous, save in $\theta = 0$, where it makes a jump equal to $\psi_{\gamma,\alpha}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} BF_{SM:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; \psi_{\gamma,\alpha}, h_{\gamma,\alpha}) &= \frac{\int f(\hat{\theta}_r | \theta)dP_{SM}(\theta)}{f(\hat{\theta}_r | H_A)} \\ &= \frac{1}{f(\hat{\theta}_r | H_A)} \times \left(\psi_{\gamma,\alpha}f(\hat{\theta}_r | \theta = 0) + (1 - \psi_{\gamma,\alpha})f(\hat{\theta}_r | H_S) \right) \\ &= \psi_{\gamma,\alpha}BF_R + (1 - \psi_{\gamma,\alpha})BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; h_{\gamma,\alpha}), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where BF_R is the replication BF defined in (3), and $BF_{S:A}$ is the BF comparing the skeptical and the advocate prior defined in (5) having relative variance $h_{\gamma,\alpha}$, which now depends on γ as well as α . We highlight that $BF_{S:A}$ appearing in (20) is not the standard skeptical BF of (5) because it is evaluated at the relative variance $h_{\gamma,\alpha}$, and thus already incorporates the prior-data conflict constraint. We then declare *replication success* at level γ iff

$$BF_{SM:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; \psi_{\gamma,\alpha}, h_{\gamma,\alpha}) \leq \gamma,$$

that is, the data favor the advocate over the sceptical mixture prior at a higher level than the skeptic’s initial objection. Analogously to the skeptical Bayes factor of Pawel and Held (2022) in Equation (7), the *skeptical mixture Bayes factor* is defined as

$$BF_{SM}(\alpha) = \inf\{\gamma : BF_{SM:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; \psi_{\gamma,\alpha}, h_{\gamma,\alpha}) \leq \gamma\}, \quad (21)$$

with α a further tuning parameter. As for the skeptical Bayes factor it may happen that $BF_{SM}(\alpha)$ does not exist, because there is no γ for which replication success can be established, but this usually occurs when $|z_o|$, or $|d| = |z_r|/|z_o|$, or both are too small.

The following represents an important feature of our proposal.

Result 1. *Under the skeptical mixture prior introduced in (19), if $\psi_{\gamma,\alpha} > 0$ and the true value is $\theta^* = 0$, then $BF_{SM:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; \psi_{\gamma,\alpha}, h_{\gamma,\alpha})$ is consistent.*

Proof. For $n_r \rightarrow \infty$, the result follows immediately from (20) and the fact that $BF_R \rightarrow \infty$, if $\theta^* = 0$ because of (8), while $BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; h_{\gamma,\alpha})$ converges to a constant because of (9).

□

Thus, if the effect is truly absent, this will be flagged by $BF_{SM:A}$ with unlimited evidence if the sample size grows indefinitely. On the other hand if $\theta^* \neq 0$, then the continuous skeptical component of the mixture will take the lead, and $BF_{SM:A}$ will converge to the constant $(1 - \psi_{\gamma,\alpha}) \frac{p_S(\theta^*; h_{\gamma,\alpha})}{p_A(\theta^*)}$; see Proposition 2. While this result is only partial, it is particularly useful in a replication setting wherein correctly ascertaining the lack of an effect may prove very valuable to contrast an original finding possibly pointing in a different direction.

To better appreciate the skeptical mixture BF, we further investigate the behavior of $BF_{SM}(\alpha)$ in (21). The following preliminary fact about the skeptical BF will be useful in the sequel. Recall that the value $BF_{0:S}(\hat{\theta}_o; h_\gamma) = \gamma$, when it exists, can be reached for two

values of h_γ , namely $h_\gamma = g_\gamma$ and $h_\gamma = g_\gamma^{JL}$, where $g_\gamma < g_\gamma^{JL}$. The former is the classic skeptical relative variance of Pawel and Held (2022); while the latter, corresponding to a higher variance, arises because of the Jeffreys-Lindley's paradox described for instance in Bernardo and Smith (2000, sect. 6.1.4) and illustrated in Pawel and Held (2022, Fig. 2).

For fixed $\hat{\theta}_{o,obs} \neq 0$ and $(\psi, h) \in \mathfrak{R}^+ \times \mathfrak{R}^+$ the partial derivative of $P_\gamma(\hat{\theta}_{o,obs}, \psi, h)$ wrt ψ is negative, while that wrt h is positive; see also Figure 1. The reason why this occurs is because increasing ψ while holding h fixed will subtract area from the tails of $m(\hat{\theta}_o, \psi, h)$ where the density is below $m(\hat{\theta}_{o,obs}, \psi, h)$. Thus, to increase α one should let ψ diminish and h increase; see also Figure 1 in the Supplementary material for a graphical explanation. The locus of points U_γ traverses the contours of $P_\gamma(\hat{\theta}_o, \psi, h)$, see Figure 1, and as h increases along U_γ , α also increases, while ψ eventually will decrease to zero. Suppose now the supremum of α having an intersection with U_γ exists, and let it be α_γ^* . Then as $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_\gamma^*$

$$\psi_{\gamma,\alpha} \rightarrow 0; \quad h_{\gamma,\alpha} \rightarrow g_\gamma^{JL}.$$

The above result holds for each γ . Because of (21) we can thus conclude that as $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_\gamma^*$

$$BF_{SM}(\alpha) \rightarrow BF_S,$$

where BF_S is the skeptical Bayes factor defined in (7). The result holds because $BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; g_\gamma) = BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; g_\gamma^{JL})$.

2.3 Example

To illustrate our method and provide a comparison we use the same setting discussed in Pawel and Held (2022, Sect. 2.2), and accordingly fix $z_o = 3$, $z_r = 2.5$ and $c = \sigma_r^2/\sigma_o^2 = 1$, so that $d = \hat{\theta}_r/\hat{\theta}_o = 0.83$. This setup is meant to represent a situation often encountered in practice with the replication study providing a somewhat weaker evidence against the

null than the original study. Additionally we fix the p -value for prior-data conflict at level $\alpha = 0.1$.

INCLUDE HERE Figure 2

We compute the skeptical and the skeptical mixture BF proposed in Equations (7), (21), equal to 0.19 and 0.16, respectively. In this case the skeptical relative variance can be shown to be $g_\gamma = 0.75$. Moreover, $(\psi_{\gamma,\alpha=0.1}, h_{\gamma,\alpha=0.1}) = (0.69, 8.16)$: see also Figure 2 in the Supplementary material for a graphical explanation. Turning to Figure 2 we see four curves. Two, namely $BF_{0:S}$ (solid dark brown) and $BF_{0:SM}$ (dashed light brown), are based on the original data, while $BF_{S:A}$ (solid dark blue) and $BF_{SM:A}$ (dashed light blue), refer to replication data. When two curves are basically superimposed they appear as dashed with alternating dark and light color. The black cross represents the skeptical BF, BF_S , while the green one represents the skeptical mixture BF, $BF_{SM}(\alpha)$. All curves are plotted as a function of the relative variance. Additionally all skeptical mixture priors realize a p -value for prior-data conflict equal to $\alpha = 0.1$. The replication Bayes factor BF_R is also included, and appears as a constant green line because its corresponding prior has no hyperparameters. Notice that $BF_{0:S}(\hat{\theta}_o)$ and $BF_{0:SM}(\hat{\theta}_o)$ initially decrease, and essentially coincide, up to a certain level of the relative variance. After this threshold the $BF_{0:SM}(\hat{\theta}_o)$ curve starts increasing whereas $BF_{0:S}(\hat{\theta}_o)$ continues to decrease for a while and then starts increasing, too. This behavior can be explained as follows. Recall that $z_o = 3$ is a result which exhibits evidence against the null. Consider the skeptical prior first. As the relative variance increases it will push mass towards areas in the θ -space better supported by the data, and so evidence for the null will initially decrease; then it will make a turn and start increasing (in the interval between 4 and 9): this happens because as the variance increases further mass is pushed away in the tails of the θ -space; the end result is that H_0

becomes more reasonable (Jeffreys'-Lindley paradox). Now turn to the curve under the skeptical mixture prior. In the first part it essentially coincides with that for the skeptical prior (monotone decreasing behavior), but then it makes a bend and starts increasing at an earlier stage than the skeptical prior curve (this is about half-way between 1 and 4 on the horizontal axis). The reason why this occurs is because the skeptical mixture incorporates a constraint on prior-data conflict which is absent in the skeptical prior. Specifically, pairs (h, ψ) on the same prior-data conflict contour level are positively related; see Figure 1. This implies that, as the relative variance increases so does ψ ; in this way the evidence for H_0 is further enhanced because it can benefit from two sources: the increased variance and the greater lump mass on $\theta = 0$ in the prior. This explains why the $BF_{0:SM}(\hat{\theta}_o)$ curve starts turning upward at an earlier stage.

A mirror-like phenomenon occurs for the curves $BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r)$ and $BF_{SM:A}(\hat{\theta}_r)$ because $z_r = 2.5$, so that evidence is still against the null, although to a lesser extent. Now the curves will first increase together because mass is pulled away from areas around zero which are not supported by the likelihood, and will thus favor the skeptical, respectively skeptical mixture, hypothesis (recall that they are both centered on $\theta = 0$). Both curves will then start decreasing basically for the same reason explained earlier, namely that as the variance increases more prior mass escapes to areas of the parameter space hardly supported by the likelihood and this makes a fixed prior, like the advocate prior, more reasonable. Again change in monotonicity happens at an earlier stage for the skeptical mixture prior, because it must control for prior-data conflict. Another feature to be noted is that $BF_{SM:A}$ lies between the upper curve $BF_{S:A}$ and the lower one BF_R coherently with Equation (20).

Finally, we assess the behavior of $BF_{SM}(\alpha)$ as a function of α , in order to highlight the role of the prior-data conflict threshold in terms of replication success. To this end we

plot some scenarios in Figure 3, where $c = 1$, $z_o \in \{2, 2.5, 3\}$ and the ratio $d = \hat{\theta}_r / \hat{\theta}_o \in \{1, 0.75, 0.5\}$. The skeptical Bayes factor is marked by a black cross in correspondence of the realized level of prior-data conflict attained by the skeptical prior of Pawel and Held (2022), whereas the skeptical mixture Bayes factor varying with α is denoted by a pink dashed line. As we argued at the end of Section 2.2, one can see that the skeptical mixture BF stabilizes around the BF_S as α grows. Also it appears that the prior-data conflict realized under the skeptical prior increases (α decreases) as z_o increases. In particular for $z_o = 3$ the value of α is always below 5% suggesting incompatibility of the skeptical prior with the data in the original study.

INCLUDE HERE Figure 3.

3 Case studies

In this section we consider real data sets from the *Social Sciences Replication Project* (SSRP), (Camerer et al., 2018). In 2016 SSRP planned to replicate a collection of experimental studies in the social sciences published in *Nature* and *Science* in the period 2010-2015. These studies were chosen because they were published in two high-profile journals, share a common experimental structure and test a treatment effect with a statistically significant finding. In particular, we compare the results obtained from 12 all without missing data using our skeptical mixture prior methodology with those produced by the skeptical BF as well as the replication BF. Effect estimates for each study were reported on the correlation scale r . Following Pawel and Held (2022, Section 5 and Table 2), Fisher z -transformation was applied to obtain approximate normality for the estimator $\hat{\theta} = \tanh^{-1}(r)$, and moreover $c \approx n_r/n_o$. Throughout we evaluated the skeptical BF, BF_S , and the skeptical mixture BF, $BF_{SM}(\alpha)$, along with the target p -value for prior-data

conflict for three selected thresholds, $\alpha = \{0.01, 0.05, 0.1\}$ when applicable.

For each study, the summary statistics $\{z_o, z_r, n_o, n_r, c, d\}$ are reported in columns 1 through 6 of Table 1 together with the hyperparameters for the skeptical priors and the three Bayes factors under investigation. Specifically, we denote with g_S and $(\psi_{SM,\alpha}, h_{SM,\alpha})$ the hyperparameters of the skeptical, respectively skeptical mixture prior, computed in correspondence of the degrees of skepticism $\gamma_S = BF_S$ and $\gamma_{SM} = BF_{SM}(\alpha)$; see Equations (7) and (21). Finally, P_S and P_{SM} denote the realized p -values—see Equation (17)—under the skeptical and the skeptical mixture prior. The distinct scenarios reported in Table 1—one for each α —are depicted in Figures 4, 5, and 6.

We now summarize the main features which emerge.

First of all we notice that the ratio $d = \hat{\theta}_r / \hat{\theta}_o$ is always below one, save for the study Kovács et al. (2010), so that the effect is less pronounced in the replication study.

Consider first the section of Table 1 with $\alpha = 0.01$. Recall that, notwithstanding this value of α , for some studies the corresponding prior-data conflict p -value P_{SM} may differ from this target because of the reasons we explained in Section 2.2. For a few studies, notably Aviezer et al. (2012), Balafoutas and Sutter (2012), Janssen et al. (2010), Kovács et al. (2010), Nishi et al. (2015), and Pyc and Rawson (2010), the resulting BF_S and BF_{SM} are either the same or they belong to the same broad evidence class as for instance reported in Schönbrodt and Wagenmakers (2018, Table 1). This happens because the *realized* prior-data conflict is similar in the two approaches. Turning now to studies for which there appears to be a difference between the skeptical mixture BF_{SM} and the standard skeptical BF_S , an interesting pattern comes to the surface. Start with the study Derex et al. (2013), for which $P_S = 0.001$ is much smaller than our set value $\alpha = 0.01$. One can see that $BF_S = 0.12 > BF_{SM} = 0.05$ (we approximate values to the second digit for ease of legibility), so

that there is *weaker* evidence of replication success under the skeptical prior than under the skeptical mixture. Interestingly this difference is meaningful on the BF scale, because BF_S corresponds to *moderate* evidence in favor of replication success, while evidence becomes *strong* when BF_{SM} is considered. The skeptical BF_S achieves only moderate evidence for replication success because the resulting skeptical prior is highly conflicting with the original data ($P_S = 0.001$). Our approach reduces the conflict to 0.01 by making the prior variance much higher, and this boosts the advocate prior and hence replication success. A similar phenomenon happens with the study Karpicke and Blunt (2011). Conversely, consider study Gneezy et al. (2014); in this case $P_S = 0.034 > P_{SM} = 0.01$ and so the resulting prior-data conflict is less strong under the skeptical prior than under the skeptical mixture. As a consequence, we now obtain $BF_S = 0.15 < BF_{SM} = 0.36$ so that evidence for replication success is moderate under the skeptical and only anecdotal under the skeptical mixture; a similar phenomenon holds for the study Morewedge et al. (2010). Clearly for both studies by setting a higher value of α such as 0.05 or 0.1 we obtain agreement.

INCLUDE HERE Figure 4

INCLUDE HERE Figure 5

INCLUDE HERE Figure 6

4 Discussion

We presented a method to analyze replication studies and in particular to assess whether a replication experiment is successful in reproducing the findings of an original experiment. We used a stylized framework with effect size estimators approximately normally

Table 1: Twelve studies from the *Social Sciences Replication Project* (Camerer et al., 2018). Effect values, originally expressed as sample correlation coefficients, were subsequently turned into effect estimates $\hat{\theta}$ using Fisher z -transformation. Reported are the z -values for the original (z_o) and replication studies (z_r); $c \approx n_r/n_o$, and relative effect estimates $d = \hat{\theta}_r/\hat{\theta}_o$. Based on the choice $\gamma_S = BF_S$ and $\gamma_{SM} = BF_{SM}$ for skepticism, respectively, prior hyperparameters are shown, namely the relative variance g_S for the skeptical prior and the pair $(\psi_{SM,\alpha}, h_{SM,\alpha})$ for the skeptical mixture prior, the latter based on three possible prior-data conflict scenarios for $\alpha = \{0.01, 0.05, 0.1\}$, when these thresholds are achievable. $P_S(\hat{\theta}_o)$ indicates the p -value for prior-data conflict under the skeptical prior, whereas $P_{SM}(\hat{\theta}_o)$ indicates the p -value for prior-data conflict under the skeptical mixture prior. The skeptical Bayes factors BF_S , the replication Bayes factor BF_R , and the skeptical mixture Bayes factor $BF_{SM}(\alpha)$ are reported in the last three columns.

Study	z_o	z_r	n_o	n_r	c	d	g_S	P_S	P_{SM}	$\psi_{SM,\alpha}$	$h_{SM,\alpha}$	BF_S	BF_R	BF_{SM}
$\alpha = 0.01$														
Aviezer et al.	6.8	3.93	15	14	0.92	0.6	0.24	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.24	0.013	< 0.001	0.013
Balaf. and S.	2.37	2.28	72	243	3.48	0.52	0.25	0.034	0.034	< 0.001	0.25	0.638	0.26	0.638
Derex et al.	4.04	2.97	51	65	1.29	0.65	0.4	0.001	0.01	0.963	12.26	0.117	0.03	0.05
Duncan et al.	2.83	4.41	15	92	7.42	0.57	0.5	0.021	0.01	0.303	0.21	0.322	< 0.001	0.545
Gneezy et al.	3	3.71	178	407	2.31	0.81	1	0.034	0.01	0.173	0.38	0.149	< 0.001	0.356
Janssen et al.	5.76	2.24	63	42	0.65	0.48	0.03	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.03	0.63	0.61	0.63
Karp. and Bl.	4.24	2.75	40	49	1.24	0.58	0.26	< 0.001	0.01	0.972	20	0.179	0.08	0.031
Kovacs et al.	2.22	6.44	24	95	4.38	1.38	3.95	0.317	0.317	< 0.001	3.95	0.309	< 0.001	0.309
Morewedge et al.	2.63	3.44	32	89	2.97	0.76	0.97	0.061	0.01	0.809	0.05	0.256	0.01	0.874
Nishi et al.	2.85	2.55	200	480	2.42	0.57	0.35	0.014	0.011	0.189	0.32	0.401	0.12	0.529
Pyc and Rawson	2.27	2.63	36	306	9.18	0.38	0.09	0.029	0.029	< 0.001	0.09	0.849	0.25	0.849
Rand et al.	2.62	1.19	343	2136	6.27	0.18	-	-	-	< 0.001	-	-	9.59	-
$\alpha = 0.05$														
Aviezer et al.	6.8	3.93	15	14	0.92	0.6	0.24	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.24	0.013	< 0.001	0.013
Balaf. and S.	2.37	2.28	72	243	3.48	0.52	0.25	0.034	0.05	0.561	0.97	0.638	0.26	0.553
Derex et al.	4.04	2.97	51	65	1.29	0.65	0.4	0.001	0.05	0.927	100	0.117	0.03	0.042
Duncan et al.	2.83	4.41	15	92	7.42	0.57	0.5	0.021	0.05	0.663	2.67	0.322	< 0.001	0.256
Gneezy et al.	3	3.71	178	407	2.31	0.81	1	0.034	0.05	0.458	2.13	0.149	< 0.001	0.143
Janssen et al.	5.76	2.24	63	42	0.65	0.48	0.03	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.03	0.63	0.61	0.63
Karp. and Bl.	4.24	2.75	40	49	1.24	0.58	0.26	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.26	0.179	0.08	0.179
Kovacs et al.	2.22	6.44	24	95	4.38	1.38	3.95	0.317	0.05	0.009	0.31	0.309	< 0.001	0.653
Morewedge et al.	2.63	3.44	32	89	2.97	0.76	0.97	0.061	0.05	0.012	0.81	0.256	0.01	0.287
Nishi et al.	2.85	2.55	200	480	2.42	0.57	0.35	0.014	0.05	0.744	3.59	0.401	0.12	0.275
Pyc and Rawson	2.27	2.63	36	306	9.18	0.38	0.09	0.029	0.05	0.71	1.1	0.849	0.25	0.674
Rand et al.	2.62	1.19	343	2136	6.27	0.18	-	-	-	0.948	-	-	9.59	-
$\alpha = 0.1$														
Aviezer et al.	6.8	3.93	15	14	0.92	0.6	0.24	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.24	0.013	< 0.001	0.013
Balaf. and S.	2.37	2.28	72	243	3.48	0.52	0.25	0.034	0.1	0.634	3.11	0.638	0.26	0.466
Derex et al.	4.04	2.97	51	65	1.29	0.65	0.4	0.001	0.001	< 0.001	0.4	0.117	0.03	0.117
Duncan et al.	2.83	4.41	15	92	7.42	0.57	0.5	0.021	0.1	0.667	6.2	0.322	< 0.001	0.219
Gneezy et al.	3	3.71	178	407	2.31	0.81	1	0.034	0.1	0.608	5.82	0.149	< 0.001	0.132
Janssen et al.	5.76	2.24	63	42	0.65	0.48	0.03	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.03	0.63	0.61	0.63
Karp. and Bl.	4.24	2.75	40	49	1.24	0.58	0.26	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.26	0.179	0.08	0.179
Kovacs et al.	2.22	6.44	24	95	4.38	1.38	3.95	0.317	0.1	0.002	1.7	0.309	< 0.001	0.441
Morewedge et al.	2.63	3.44	32	89	2.97	0.76	0.97	0.061	0.1	0.406	2.55	0.256	0.01	0.238
Nishi et al.	2.85	2.55	200	480	2.42	0.57	0.35	0.014	0.1	0.73	8.65	0.401	0.12	0.245
Pyc and Rawson	2.27	2.63	36	306	9.18	0.38	0.09	0.029	0.1	0.688	3.26	0.849	0.25	0.561
Rand et al.	2.62	1.19	343	2136	6.27	0.18	²³ -	-	-	0.884	-	-	9.59	-

distributed with known variances, a procedure often used in meta-analysis, possibly after a suitable transformation, with reasonably large sample sizes.

Throughout we systematically used the Bayes factor (BF) as a measure of evidence, coupled with reverse-Bayes techniques to elicit a skeptical prior, along the lines originally presented in Pawel and Held (2022). We proposed a novel skeptical mixture prior which combines skepticism while hedging against prior-data conflict, a feature which is not currently available in the methodology for skeptical BF's. For this reason, our method could be more attractive to external agencies or reviewers when evaluating a replication protocol, in particular when a standard skeptical prior is strongly in conflict with the original data. In this context, a useful take-home message of our investigation is that restoring prior-data conflict to a tolerable level may lead to declare stronger evidence for replication success, as illustrated in the analysis of some cases within the Social Science Replication Project.

We evaluated prior-data conflict using the notion of p -value proposed by Evans and Moshonov (2006) and examined sensitivity of our results to a grid of α -values. However our framework can be employed with alternative measures of conflict, such as those presented in Reimherr et al. (2021) or in Young and Pettit (1996) and Veen et al. (2018).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We express our thanks to Leonhard Held and Samuel Pawel (University of Zurich) for useful discussions on the issue of replication studies.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary material contains technical results. Specifically: the proofs of Proposition 1 and 2 and the proof of information consistency for the replication BF.

Part of the data appearing in Table 1 was downloaded from Samuel Pawel’s Github page: <https://github.com/SamCH93/ReplicationSuccess>.

FUNDING DETAILS

Partial financial support for GC was provided by UCSC, projects D1 years 2021-2023.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors report that there are no competing interests to declare. A Conflict of Interest statement is included at the end of the manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

References

- Anderson, S. F. and S. E. Maxwell (2016). There’s more than one way to conduct a replication study: Beyond statistical significance. *Psychological Methods* 21(1), 1–12.
- Aviezer, H., Y. Trope, and A. Todorov (2012). Body cues, not facial expressions, discriminate between intense positive and negative emotions. *Science* 338(6111), 1225–1229.
- Balafoutas, L. and M. Sutter (2012). Affirmative action policies promote women and do not harm efficiency in the laboratory. *Science* 335(6068), 579–582.
- Bayarri, M. J., J. O. Berger, A. Forte, and G. García-Donato (2012). Criteria for Bayesian model choice with application to variable selection. *The Annals of Statistics* 40(3), 1550–1577.

- Bernardo, J. M. and A. Smith (2000). *Bayesian Theory*. Wiley series in probability and statistics. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Camerer, C. F., A. Dreber, F. Holzmeister, T.-H. Ho, J. Huber, M. Johannesson, M. Kirchler, G. Nave, B. A. Nosek, T. Pfeiffer, et al. (2018). Evaluating the replicability of social science experiments in nature and science between 2010 and 2015. *Nature Human Behaviour* 2(9), 637–644.
- Dawid, A. P. (2011). Posterior model probabilities. In P. S. Bandyopadhyay and M. Forster (Eds.), *Philosophy of Statistics*, pp. 607–630. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Derex, M., M.-P. Beugin, B. Godelle, and M. Raymond (2013). Experimental evidence for the influence of group size on cultural complexity. *Nature* 503(7476), 389–391.
- Egidi, L., F. Pauli, and N. Torelli (2021). Avoiding prior–data conflict in regression models via mixture priors. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* 50(2), 491–510.
- Evans, M. and H. Moshonov (2006). Checking for prior-data conflict. *Bayesian Analysis* 1(4), 893–914.
- Gneezy, U., E. A. Keenan, and A. Gneezy (2014). Avoiding overhead aversion in charity. *Science* 346(6209), 632–635.
- Good, I. J. (1950). Probability and the weighing of evidence. *Philosophy* 26(97), 163–164.
- Harms, C. (2019). A Bayes factor for replications of ANOVA results. *The American Statistician* 73(4), 327–339.
- Hedges, L. V. and J. M. Schauer (2019). Statistical analyses for studying replication: Meta-analytic perspectives. *Psychological Methods* 24(5), 557–570.

- Held, L. (2020). A new standard for the analysis and design of replication studies. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 183(2), 431–448.
- Held, L., R. Matthews, M. Ott, and S. Pawel (2022). Reverse-Bayes methods for evidence assessment and research synthesis. *Research Synthesis Methods* 13(3), 295–314.
- Hutton, J. L., P. J. Diggle, S. M. Bird, C. Hennig, N. Longford, M. B. Mathur, T. J. Vander Weele, J. P. Ioannidis, C. P. Chai, D. L. Dowe, et al. (2020). Discussion on the meeting on ‘signs and sizes: understanding and replicating statistical findings’. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (Statistics in Society)* 183(2), 449–469.
- Janssen, M. A., R. Holahan, A. Lee, and E. Ostrom (2010). Lab experiments for the study of social-ecological systems. *Science* 328(5978), 613–617.
- Jeffreys, H. (1961). *Theory of Probability (3rd Edition)*. Oxford, University Press.
- Johnson, V. E., R. D. Payne, T. Wang, A. Asher, and S. Mandal (2017). On the reproducibility of psychological science. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 112(517), 1–10.
- Karpicke, J. D. and J. R. Blunt (2011). Retrieval practice produces more learning than elaborative studying with concept mapping. *Science* 331(6018), 772–775.
- Kass, R. E. and A. E. Raftery (1995). Bayes factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90(430), 773–795.
- Kovács, Á. M., E. Téglás, and A. D. Endress (2010). The social sense: Susceptibility to others’ beliefs in human infants and adults. *Science* 330(6012), 1830–1834.
- Liang, F., R. Paulo, G. Molina, M. A. Clyde, and J. O. Berger (2008). Mixtures of g -priors

- for Bayesian variable selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 103(481), 410–423.
- Ly, A., A. Etz, M. Marsman, and E.-J. Wagenmakers (2018). Replication Bayes factors from evidence updating. *Behavior Research Methods* 51, 2498–2508.
- Ly, A., A. Etz, M. Marsman, and E.-J. Wagenmakers (2019). Replication bayes factors from evidence updating. *Behavior research methods* 51, 2498–2508.
- Ly, A. and E.-J. Wagenmakers (2022). Bayes factors for peri-null hypotheses. *TEST* 31(4), 1121–1142.
- Morewedge, C. K., Y. E. Huh, and J. Vosgerau (2010). Thought for food: Imagined consumption reduces actual consumption. *Science* 330(6010), 1530–1533.
- Nishi, A., H. Shirado, D. G. Rand, and N. A. Christakis (2015). Inequality and visibility of wealth in experimental social networks. *Nature* 526(7573), 426–429.
- O’Hagan, A. and J. J. Forster (2004). *Kendall’s advanced theory of statistics, volume 2B: Bayesian inference*, Volume 2. Arnold.
- Open Science Collaboration (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science* 349(6251), aac4716.
- Pawel, S. and L. Held (2022). The sceptical Bayes factor for the assessment of replication success. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 84(3), 879–911.
- Pyc, M. A. and K. A. Rawson (2010). Why testing improves memory: Mediator effectiveness hypothesis. *Science* 330(6002), 335–335.

- Reimherr, M., X.-L. Meng, and D. L. Nicolae (2021). Prior sample size extensions for assessing prior impact and prior-likelihood discordance. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 83(3), 413–437.
- Ročková, V. (2018). Bayesian estimation of sparse signals with a continuous spike-and-slab prior. *The Annals of Statistics* 46(1), 401 – 437.
- Schönbrodt, F. D. and E.-J. Wagenmakers (2018). Bayes factor design analysis: Planning for compelling evidence. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 25(1), 128–142.
- Shafer, G. (1982). Lindley’s paradox. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 77(378), 325–334.
- Spiegelhalter, D., K. Abrams, and J. Myles (2003). *Bayesian Approaches to Clinical Trials and Health-Care Evaluation*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Taylor, S. and K. Pollard (2009). Hypothesis tests for point-mass mixture data with application to Omics data with many zero values. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology* 8(1), 1–43.
- Veen, D., D. Stoel, N. Schalken, K. Mulder, and R. Van de Schoot (2018). Using the data agreement criterion to rank experts’ beliefs. *Entropy* 20(8), 592.
- Verhagen, J. and E.-J. Wagenmakers (2014). Bayesian tests to quantify the result of a replication attempt. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 143(4), 1457–1475.
- Wetzels, R. and E.-J. Wagenmakers (2012). A default Bayesian hypothesis test for correlations and partial correlations. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 19(6), 1057–1064.
- Young, K. and L. Pettit (1996). Measuring discordancy between prior and data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 58(4), 679–689.




Figure 1: Contours of p -values for prior-data conflict (solid black line). Contour for $BF_{0:SM}(\hat{\theta}_o; \psi, h) = \gamma$ (dashed red line), for three selected values of z_o and γ .

$$z_o = 3, z_r = 2.5, \sigma_o^2 / \sigma_r^2 = 1$$




Figure 2: Bayes factors $BF_{0:S}(\hat{\theta}_o; g)$, $BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; g)$, $BF_{0:SM}(\hat{\theta}_o; \psi, h)$, $BF_{SM:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; \psi, h)$ and $BF_R(\hat{\theta}_r)$ as a function of the relative variance. The black cross represents the skeptical BF, BF_S , while the green one represents the skeptical mixture BF, $BF_{SM}(\alpha)$, with $(\psi_{\gamma,\alpha}, h_{\gamma,\alpha})$ evaluated at $\gamma_{SM} = BF_{SM}(\alpha)$ and $\alpha = 0.1$ under the original data.




Figure 3: Skeptical and skeptical mixture Bayes factors BF_S and $BF_{SM}(\alpha)$ for varying z_o and d as functions of the prior-data conflict threshold α . In all examples $c = \sigma_o^2/\sigma_r^2 = 1$.




Figure 4: Bayes factors $BF_{0:S}(\hat{\theta}_o; g)$, $BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; g)$, $BF_{0:SM}(\hat{\theta}_o; \psi, h)$, $BF_{SM:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; \psi, h)$ as a function of the relative variance. Data from twelve studies of the *Social Sciences Replication Project* (Camerer et al., 2018). The black cross represents the skeptical BF, BF_S , while the green cross represents the skeptical mixture BF, BF_{SM} , with g_γ and $(\psi_{\gamma,\alpha}, h_{\gamma,\alpha})$ evaluated at $\gamma_S = BF_S$ and $\gamma_{SM} = BF_{SM}(\alpha)$, respectively, and $\alpha = 0.01$ under the original data.




Figure 5: Bayes factors $BF_{0:S}(\hat{\theta}_o; g)$, $BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; g)$, $BF_{0:SM}(\hat{\theta}_o; \psi, h)$, $BF_{SM:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; \psi, h)$ as a function of the relative variance. Data from twelve studies of the *Social Sciences Replication Project* (Camerer et al., 2018). The black cross represents the skeptical BF, BF_S , while the green cross represents the skeptical mixture BF, BF_{SM} , with g_γ and $(\psi_{\gamma,\alpha}, h_{\gamma,\alpha})$ evaluated at $\gamma_S = BF_S$ and $\gamma_{SM} = BF_{SM}(\alpha)$, respectively, and $\alpha = 0.05$ under the original data.




Figure 6: Bayes factors $BF_{0:S}(\hat{\theta}_o; g)$, $BF_{S:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; g)$, $BF_{0:SM}(\hat{\theta}_o; \psi, h)$, $BF_{SM:A}(\hat{\theta}_r; \psi, h)$ as a function of the relative variance. Data from twelve of the *Social Sciences Replication Project* (Camerer et al., 2018). The black cross represents the skeptical BF, BF_S , while the green cross represents the skeptical mixture BF, BF_{SM} , with g_γ and $(\psi_{\gamma,\alpha}, h_{\gamma,\alpha})$ evaluated at $\gamma_S = BF_S$ and $\gamma_{SM} = BF_{SM}(\alpha)$, respectively, and $\alpha = 0.1$ under the original data.