

Room for improvement: The low level of reproducibility in Regional Science and how it can be improved

Extended Abstract

This paper presents an empirical analysis of reproducibility of published regional science articles. We investigate articles published in four main regional science journals over a period of five years.

In our analysis we focus on one of the most basic requirements for reproducibility, the availability of the data. We analyze the selected articles and assign each to one of four categories. Category A contains articles where the data can be directly accessed by the reader based on the information provided. Only 3% of the Regional Science articles we investigated fall into this category. On the other end of the spectrum, category D contains those articles, where the reader cannot get access the data at all (because of data privacy, lack of information, author's unwillingness to share, etc.). 28% of the Regional Science articles we investigated fall into this category.

In our paper, we will explain, why we find this result to be alarming. We will compare the results to those of a comparable analysis for Real Estate journals. The detailed results over all the categories broken down by journal and year of publication provide some hints for how to improve the situation. Regional Science is in a more favorable position to achieve a major improvement than Real Estate. We will discuss some possible strategies for journals and organizations like ERSa to advance reproducibility in published Regional Science research.