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- 3 years, 3 application rounds, € 3,000,000
- Goals:
  1. pilot, explore, experience
  2. fund replication studies
- NWO
  - Social Sciences & Humanities
  - Exact & Natural Sciences
  - Technical & Applied Sciences
- ZonMw
  - Health Research & Development
Types of Replication

- Reproduction: replication with existing data: repeated analysis of the datasets from the original study.
- Replication: new data collection with the same research protocol as the original study.
- Conceptual replication: new data collection but using a different research protocol than the original study.

Amidst all the drivel about exact, direct, operational or conceptual replications, your statement that there are three types of replication … is the most accurate, concise and eloquent definition of what is and is not a replication I have ever seen.
Demand for RS applications

- Substantial demand
  - Psychology
  - Medicine
  - Sociology, communication science, law…
- Applicants from assistant to full professors
- Funded replication studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% awarded</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requirements for funding

• High quality research
• Exact replication
• Available data and/or protocol
• Open science
  • Preregistration
  • Data sharing (FAIR principles)
• Adherence to publication guidelines (e.g. ARRIVE)
Cornerstone value

• What? Why?

• Impact of the original study, e.g.
  • Number of citations
  • Application in medicine
  • Part of policy / regulations
  • Taught to students
  • Post-publication debate, attention from media

• Additional impact replication
Review experience

1. Reviewers on relevance & methodology
   - Differences in review quality:
     - Overlap in reviews
     - Narrow scope of reviews

2. Narrow scope on review of cornerstone criterion
   - Reviewer: relevant for specific field
   - Committee: relevant for science

3. No reviewers
   - Committee will decide relevance and quality
Concluding statements

• Science is interested in replication!
• Upcoming: replication in the humanities
• White spot: replication in technical, exact & natural sciences
• Replication as integral part of regular funding
• Funding replication studies makes sense

http://daniellakens.blogspot.com/2016/06/nwo-pilot-project-will-fund-3000000.html