Appendix 2:

A: Content Analysis Sample by Strata

As noted in the main text, in selecting articles to sample for analysis, we stratified by whether an article reported a lab, survey, or field experiment, whether the journal in which an article appeared was a general interest or specialized journal, and whether the article was published early or late in the time period. See the main text for definitions of these strata. Table A1 presents the counts of articles identified within each stratum.

Table A1: Experiment Population Counts by Cell

Number of Articles from Early Period (2005-2009)

	Experiment Type			
	Survey	Lab	Field	Total
General	32	23	10	65
Specialized	94	36	18	148

Number of Articles from Late Period (2010-2013)

	Experiment Type			
	Survey	Lab	Field	Total
General	49	22	19	90
Specialized	118	42	22	182

B: Agreement Between Coders for Jointly Coded Articles

As noted in the main text, 12 of the 60 sampled articles were evaluated by both of the coders. Table B1 presents the percentage of agreement between coders for each of the 19 coding categories used in the analysis, using both the raw codes and combining codes of 0 and 1.

Table B1: Agreement between Coders on Jointly Coded Articles

	Raw Agreement		Raw Agreement (combining 0 and 1)	
Coding Category	Percent Agreement	[s.d.]	Percent Agreement	[s.d.]
Did the author(s) report who was eligible to participate in the study?	75.00	[.45]	83.33	[.39]
Did the author(s) report dates defining the periods of recruitment and when the experiments were conducted	83.33	[.39]	91.67	[.29]
(If a survey:) Did the author(s) identify the survey firm used and describe how it recruits respondents	100.00	[.00]	100.00	[.00]
(If a survey:) Did the author(s) provide the response rate and how it was calculated?	75.00	[.45]	75.00	[.45]
Did the author(s) report whether random assignment was used?	100.00	[.00]	100.00	[.00]
If random assignment was used, did the author(s) report the unit of randomization?	91.67	[.29]	91.67	[.29]
Did the author(s) report baseline means and standard deviations for pretreatment measures by experimental group?	41.67	[.51]	75.00	[.45]
Did the author(s) report what treatment was given to each of the treatment and control groups?	100.00	[.00]	100.00	[.00]
Did the author(s) make complete treatment materials available?	83.33	[.39]	83.33	[.39]
Did the author(s) report how the outcome variables are measured and coded?	91.67	[.29]	91.67	[.29]
(If an index was used:) Did the author(s) report exactly how it was constructed?	83.33	[.39]	83.33	[.39]
Did the author(s) report how all other variables included in the statistical models are measured and coded?	75.00	[.45]	75.00	[.45]
Did the author(s) report the number of subjects initially assessed for eligibility for the study?	83.33	[.39]	83.33	[.39]
Did the author(s) report exclusions prior to random assignment and the reasons for the exclusions?	83.33	[.39]	83.33	[.39]
Did the author(s) report the number of subjects assigned to each experimental group?	100.00	[.00]	100.00	[.00]
Did the author(s) report the proportion of each group that received its allocated intervention and the reasons why some did not?	83.33	[.39]	83.33	[.39]
Did the author(s) report the number of subjects in each group that do not have outcome data?	41.67	[.51]	75.00	[.45]
Did the author(s) report the number of subjects in each group that are included in the statistical analysis, and the reasons for any exclusions?	50.00	[.52]	58.33	[.51]
Did the author(s) report sample means, standard deviations, and Ns for the outcome variables using intent-to-treat analysis?	83.33	[.39]	91.67	[.29]

Note: Column 1 presents the percentage of raw agreement between coders. Column 2 presents the standard deviation of an indicator for raw agreement. Column 3 presents the percentage of raw agreement between coders, combining categories 0 and 1. Column 4 presents the standard deviation for an agreement indicator, combining categories 0 and 1.

Furthermore, in Table 2 of the main text we presented average values for all of the jointly coded articles. In Table B2, we present information analogous to that presented in Table 2 of the main text, but treat each jointly coded article as two distinct observations.

Table B2: Percent of Articles Receiving Any Downgrade by Category, Considering Jointly Coded Articles as Distinct Observations

Coding Category	Experiment Type			Journal Type		Time Period		
	Survey	Lab	Field	General	Specialized	Early	Late	Overall
Did the author(s) report who was eligible to participate in the study?	4.17 24	54.17 24	8.33 24	19.44 36	25.00 36	22.22 36	22.22 36	22.22 72
Did the author(s) report dates defining the periods of recruitment and when the experiments were conducted?	20.83 24	54.17 24	8.33 24	33.33 36	22.22 36	36.11 36	19.44 36	27.78 72
(If a survey:) Did the author(s) identify the survey firm used and describe how it recruits respondents?	5.00 20	0.00 1	100.00 3	21.43 14	10.00 10	23.08 13	9.09 11	16.67 24
(If a survey:) Did the author(s) provide the response rate and how it was calculated?	71.43 21	50.00 2	33.33 3	73.33 15	54.55 11	61.54 13	69.23 13	65.38 26
Did the author(s) report whether random assignment was used?	0.00 24	0.00 24	0.00 24	0.00 36	0.00 36	0.00 36	0.00 36	0.00 72
If random assignment was used, did the author(s) report the unit of randomization?	4.17 24	0.00 23	0.00 24	0.00 35	2.78 36	0.00 35	2.78 36	1.41 71
Did the author(s) report baseline means and standard deviations for pretreatment measures by experimental group?	91.67 24	79.17 24	79.17 24	86.11 36	80.56 36	88.89 36	77.78 36	83.33 72
Did the author(s) report what treatment was given to each of the treatment and control groups?	0.00 24	0.00 24	0.00 24	0.00 36	0.00 36	0.00 36	0.00 36	0.00 72
Did the author(s) make complete treatment materials available?	16.67 24	33.33 24	29.17 24	25.00 36	27.78 36	33.33 36	19.44 36	26.39 72
Did the author(s) report how the outcome variables are measured and coded?	8.33 24	4.17 24	0.00 24	5.56 36	2.78 36	5.56 36	2.78 36	4.17 72
(If an index was used:) Did the author(s) report exactly how it was constructed?	0.00 5	0.00 1	0.00 3	0.00 8	0.00 1	0.00 6	0.00 3	0.00 9
Did the author(s) report how all other variables included in the statistical models are measured and coded?	15.00 20	14.29 21	8.70 23	16.13 31	9.09 33	12.90 31	12.12 33	12.50 64
Did the author(s) report the number of subjects initially assessed for eligibility for the study?	54.17 24	66.67 24	37.50 24	52.78 36	52.78 36	47.22 36	58.33 36	52.78 72
Did the author(s) report exclusions prior to random assignment and the reasons for the exclusions?	8.33 24	12.50 24	12.50 24	16.67 36	5.56 36	13.89 36	8.33 36	11.11 72
Did the author(s) report the number of subjects assigned to each experimental group?	66.67 24	25.00 24	8.33 24	41.67 36	25.00 36	30.56 36	36.11 36	33.33 72
Did the author(s) report the proportion of each group that received its allocated intervention and the reasons why some did not?	12.50 24	0.00 24	16.67 24	11.11 36	8.33 36	13.89 36	5.56 36	9.72 72
Did the author(s) report the number of subjects in each group that do not have outcome data?	79.17 24	45.83 24	37.50 24	52.78 36	55.56 36	55.56 36	52.78 36	54.17 72
Did the author(s) report the number of subjects in each group that are included in the statistical analysis, and the reasons for any exclusions?	75.00 24	58.33 24	50.00 24	52.78 36	69.44 36	58.33 36	63.89 36	61.11 72
Did the author(s) report sample means, standard deviations, and Ns for the outcome variables using intent-to-treat analysis?	75.00 24	79.17 24	70.83 24	75.00 36	75.00 36	75.00 36	75.00 36	75.00 72

Note: Cell entries for each coding category are the percentage of articles that received a score of zero or one with frequencies presented below. Frequencies differ when categories were coded as not applicable for certain articles.

C: Rules for Coding Categories

As noted in the main text, we narrowed our content analysis to a search 19 features of an experiment that we argue are critical for effective communication of a study's design and findings. Adherence to each of the 19 reporting items was coded on a three-point scale in which a "0" indicated that no pertinent information was provided, a "1" indicated that some information was provided but that there were important omissions, and a "2" indicated that either trivial or no omissions were made. Two coders initially jointly coded 12 articles from our final sample, achieving high raw agreement scores with respect to 16 of the 19 categories. For the three remaining categories, it was determined that further clarification was required before the coders proceeded to independently code the remaining articles in the sample. In what follows, we present the question asked of the coders with respect to each of the 19 categories, and further information for each category that the coders used to assign one of the three possible scores to an article. The three categories that did not achieve high raw agreement scores in the initial round of joint coding are marked with an asterisk (*) and the more extensive set of rules developed to achieve greater standardization across coders is presented.

Coding Categories

Subjects and Context

1) Did the author(s) report who was eligible to participate in the study?

- If no information is given about participant eligibility: 0
- If partial information is given about participant eligibility (e.g., specifies subjects are people from the "community," but does not specify whether they are adults, registered voters, etc.): 1
- If readers can fully reconstruct the set of characteristics that led to subject eligibility for inclusion in the study population: 2

2) Did the author(s) report dates defining the periods of recruitment and when the experiments were conducted? Did the author(s) report the dates of any repeated measurements as part of a follow-up?

- If no indication of the time period in which the study was conducted is provided: 0
- If a rough approximation of the time period (e.g., a year, a season) is provided: 1
- If exact dates that the study was carried out are provided: 2

3) (If a survey:) Did the author(s) identify the survey firm used and describe how it recruits respondents if the survey firm is not well known?

- If survey was clearly carried out by an outside firm, and the name of the firm is not provided and no information about recruitment of subjects is provided: 0
- If survey was clearly carried out by a firm, and either the name of the firm or the method of subject recruitment is provided, but not both: 1
- If author(s) give the name of the firm and a description of how subjects are recruited: 2

4) (If a survey:) Did the author(s) provide the response rate and how it was calculated?

- If no information about response rate to a survey is provided: 0
- If a rough approximation of a response rate is given (e.g., “about 65% of contacted individuals agreed to participate”) or if an exact figure is provided but it cannot be determined how that figure was calculated: 1
- If response rate is provided and either exact method of calculation is described in the text or a well-known calculation standard is provided (e.g., an AAPOR standard): 2

Allocation Method

5) Did the author(s) report whether random assignment was used?

- If no information about randomization is provided: 0
- If it can be reasonably inferred that randomization was used, but there remains ambiguity from what is reported in the article: 1
- If authors specifically report that units were randomly assigned to different treatment or control groups: 2

6) If random assignment was used, did the author(s) report the unit of randomization (individuals, groups, households, etc.)?

- If no information is provided about the unit that was randomly assigned: 0
- If the reporting in the text makes it unclear as to what the unit of randomization was (e.g., discussion of both households and individuals within households as units): 1
- If a specific statement of the unit of randomization is provided, or if this is unambiguous from the full context of the article: 2

7) *Did the author(s) provide a table (in the text or an appendix) showing baseline means and standard deviations for demographic characteristics and other pretreatment measures (if collected) by experimental group?

- If pretreatment measures can be broken down by group:
  - If author(s) do not present means by group: 0
  - If author(s) present means, but not either sample sizes or standard deviations by group: 1
  - If author(s) present means, sample sizes, and standard deviations by group: 2
  - If author(s) perform a multivariate randomization test with pretreatment covariates: 2
    - Even if they do not present means, sample sizes, or standard deviations
  - Note: If we can reasonably infer any of the above information is presented in supplemental materials, but those supplemental materials cannot be found, we assume that the materials do in fact exist and we code according to what we can infer.
- If pretreatment measures cannot be broken down by group: N/A
  - Example: behavioral economics experiments in which all subjects go through each of the treatment conditions at least once.

Treatments

8) Did the author(s) report what treatment was given to each of the treatment groups and what was given to the control group?

- If no information is provided about what treatment each of the groups described in the article received: 0
- If there is a statement about the treatments that some groups received, but not others: 1
- If a specific statement of the treatments that each group received is provided: 2

9) Did the author(s) make the complete treatment materials available? If treatments are scripts, did the author(s) make the exact scripts available? If the treatments are question wordings, did the author(s) make exact variations in question wordings available? If the treatments are mailings, did the author(s) make sample mailings available?

- If treatments are of a form such that it is possible to provide them (e.g., treatments are vignettes, survey question wordings, etc.),
  - But they are not provided: 0
  - And either some full treatments are provided but not others, or partial versions of some or all treatments are provided, or detailed descriptions of the treatments are provided but not the treatments themselves: 1
  - And full treatments are provided: 2
- If treatments are of a form such that it is not possible to provide them (e.g., treatments are video footage, training programs, etc.),
  - But no information about them is provided: 0

- And partial, but not full, information is provided about how a reader could view or reconstruct treatments (e.g., "subjects watched an NBC newscast from the Spring of 2009"): 1
- And full information is provided about how a reader could view or reconstruct treatments (e.g., "subjects watched NBC Nightly News with Brian Williams from March 30th, 2009"): 2

Measurement

10) Did the author(s) report how the outcome variables are measured and coded?

- If no information about how outcome variables are measured is provided: 0
- If partial information about coding of outcome variables is provided, but not enough for readers to fully reconstruct the analysis: 1
- If enough information about coding of outcome variables is provided for readers to fully reconstruct the analysis: 2

11) If there is an index used, did the author(s) report exactly how it was constructed?

- If it is reported that an index was used but no information is provided about the underlying measures that make up the index: 0
- If it is reported that an index was used and partial information is provided about the underlying measures that make up the index, but not enough for readers to fully reconstruct the analysis: 1
- If it is reported that an index was used and enough information is provided about the underlying measures that make up the index for readers to fully reconstruct the analysis: 2

12) Did the author(s) report how all other variables included in the statistical models are measured and coded?

- If no information about how covariates used in statistical analyses are measured is provided: 0
- If partial information about how covariates used in statistical analyses are measured is provided, but not enough for readers to fully reconstruct the analysis: 1
- If enough information about how covariates used in statistical analyses are measured is provided for readers to fully reconstruct the analyses: 2

CONSORT Diagram Information

13) Did the author(s) report the number of subjects initially assessed for eligibility for the study?

- If no information is given about the number of individuals initially contacted to request participation: 0
- If approximate number is given for the number of individuals initially contacted to request participation: 1

- If exact number is given for the number of individuals initially contacted to request participation: 2

14) Did the author(s) report exclusions prior to random assignment and the reasons for the exclusions?

- If it is stated or can be inferred that some units were deemed initially eligible but were excluded prior to random assignment,
    - And no information is given as to how many or why: 0
    - And either full or partial information about how many or why is reported, but not full information for both: 1
    - And full information is given as to how many and why: 2
- If it is stated or can be inferred that no units that were initially deemed eligible were excluded prior to random assignment: 2

15) Did the author(s) report the number of subjects assigned to each experimental group?

- If numbers assigned to each experimental group are not reported: 0
- If approximate numbers assigned to each experimental group are reported, or if exact numbers are reported for some groups but not others: 1
- If exact numbers assigned to each experimental group are reported: 2

16) Did the author(s) report the proportion of each group that received its allocated intervention and the reasons why subjects did not receive the intended intervention?

- If it is stated or can be inferred that some units did not receive the treatment to which they were assigned,
    - And no information is given as to how many in each group or why: 0
    - And either full or partial information about how many in each group or why is reported, but not full information for both: 1
    - And the exact number for the full study is reported, but the number is not broken down by experimental group: 1
    - And full information is given as to how many in each group and why: 2
- If it is stated or can be inferred that no units failed to receive the treatment to which they were assigned: 2

17) *Did the author(s) report the number of subjects in each group that dropped out or for other reasons do not have outcome data?

- If the author(s) collapse treatments and do not analyze data within the categories making up the collapsed treatment, we consider that to be one treatment for coding purposes.
- If the author(s) do not report the initial sample size, but only the number of units used in the analysis, we do not have enough information to code for attrition within or across groups.
- If study is a survey, we can reasonably infer that discrepancies between starting sample sizes and sample sizes reported in statistical analyses are due to item non-response, unless otherwise stated.

    - In the survey context, this inference serves as the author(s) providing a reason for the exclusions.
- If study requires multi-wave participation and there is attrition between waves, or if there is attrition due to subjects not completing a survey instrument, and the author(s) do not provide a reason for attrition between waves or a reason for non-completion within a wave, we cannot infer a reason for the attrition.
- If outcome data can be broken down by group:
    - If we only know the attrition rate for the full sample, but not a reason for attrition: 0
    - If we know the attrition rate roughly by groups but not exactly: 1
    - If we know the attrition rate for the full sample and a reason for the attrition, but it is not broken down by experimental group: 1
    - If we know the attrition rate by experimental group, but not a reason for the attrition: 1
    - If we know the actual attrition figures by experimental group and a reason for the attrition: 2
    - If we know there was no attrition, even if it is not discussed: 2

18) *Did the authors report the number of subjects in each group that are included in the statistical analysis, and the reasons for any exclusions?

- If study is a survey, we can reasonably infer that discrepancies between starting sample sizes and sample sizes reported in the analyses are due to item non-response unless author(s) state otherwise.
    - In the survey context, this inference serves as the author(s) providing a reason for the exclusions.
- If outcome data can be broken down by group:
    - If the author(s) only report the number used in the analysis not broken down by group: 0
    - If the author(s) report the numbers in each group, but not the reason for exclusions: 1
    - If the author(s) report the numbers used in the analysis and report exclusions, but not the reasons for the exclusions: 1
    - If the author(s) report the numbers used in the analysis broken down by group and provide a reason for the exclusions: 2

19) Did the author(s) report sample means and standard deviations and Ns for the outcome variables using intent-to-treat (ITT) analysis (i.e., means and standard deviations for the entire collection of subjects assigned to a group, whether a treatment is successfully delivered or not)?

- If neither means nor standard deviations nor sample sizes for the outcome variables using ITT analysis are presented: 0
- If at least one of means, standard deviations, or sample sizes for the outcome variables using ITT analysis are presented, but not all three: 1
- If all of means, standard deviations, and sample sizes for the outcome variables using ITT analysis are presented: 2

D: Full Coding Report

Tables D1a, D1b, and D1c present the codes assigned to each of the articles sampled for the analysis in the main text. Table D1a reports the figures for the articles that were coded jointly, with scores from each coder. Tables D1b and D1c report the figures for the articles that were coded by coder 1 and coder 2, respectively. The 19 columns in each table correspond to the 19 numbered categories from Section C above.

Table D1a: Assigned Codes by Article, Jointly Coded Articles

	Coding Categories																		
Article Identifier	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
Joint Article 1, Coder 1	2	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	0	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	0
Joint Article 2, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Joint Article 3, Coder 1	2	0	2	0	2	2	1	2	1	2	N/A	2	0	2	1	2	1	2	1
Joint Article 4, Coder 1	1	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
Joint Article 5, Coder 1	1	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	1	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
Joint Article 6, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	1	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1
Joint Article 7, Coder 1	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	0	2	1	1	1
Joint Article 8, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Joint Article 9, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
Joint Article 10, Coder 1	0	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
Joint Article 11, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0
Joint Article 12, Coder 1	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1
Joint Article 1, Coder 2	1	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	0	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	0
Joint Article 2, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2
Joint Article 3, Coder 2	2	0	2	0	2	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1
Joint Article 4, Coder 2	1	2	N/A	1	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	1	1	2	2	2	0	2	2
Joint Article 5, Coder 2	1	1	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	1	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
Joint Article 6, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	2	2	1	0	2	1	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Joint Article 7, Coder 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	0	2	2	1	1
Joint Article 8, Coder 2	2	1	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	0	2	0
Joint Article 9, Coder 2	1	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	0	1	1
Joint Article 10, Coder 2	1	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	0	2	2	2	1	1
Joint Article 11, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0
Joint Article 12, Coder 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	1

Note: Cell entries are the raw score assigned to each article for each of the 19 coding categories. See Section D of the Appendix for details.

Table D1b: Assigned Codes by Article, Articles Coded by Coder 1

	Coding Categories																		
Article Identifier	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
Article 1, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	1	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
Article 2, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	0
Article 3, Coder 1	1	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	0	2
Article 4, Coder 1	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	0	2	2	1	1	0
Article 5, Coder 1	1	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	0
Article 6, Coder 1	1	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
Article 7, Coder 1	1	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	1
Article 8, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	0	1	2	1	2	2	2
Article 9, Coder 1	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	N/A	1	0	0	2	1	1	0
Article 10, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	0	1	1	2	2	2	2
Article 11, Coder 1	2	2	1	2	2	2	0	2	1	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
Article 12, Coder 1	1	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	0	2	2	2	1	1
Article 13, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	1
Article 14, Coder 1	1	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	1	1	2	0	2	1	1	0
Article 15, Coder 1	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	2	0	2	1	1	1
Article 16, Coder 1	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Article 17, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	1	2	2	2	2	2	0
Article 18, Coder 1	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	1	2	N/A	N/A	1	2	2	2	1	1	1
Article 19, Coder 1	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	1	0	2	1	2	0	0	2
Article 20, Coder 1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Article 21, Coder 1	1	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	1	2	2	2	0	0	1
Article 22, Coder 1	2	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	1
Article 23, Coder 1	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	1	2	1
Article 24, Coder 1	2	2	1	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	0	0	2

Note: Cell entries are the raw score assigned to each article for each of the 19 coding categories. See Section D of the Appendix for details.

Table D1c: Assigned Codes by Article, Articles Coded by Coder 2

	Coding Categories																		
Article Identifier	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
Article 1, Coder 2	1	0	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	0	2	2	2	2	1	1
Article 2, Coder 2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0
Article 3, Coder 2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	1	1	0
Article 4, Coder 2	2	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	1
Article 5, Coder 2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	N/A	2	1	2	1	0	1	1	1
Article 6, Coder 2	2	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
Article 7, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	1	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	2
Article 8, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	1	2	N/A	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	1
Article 9, Coder 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	1
Article 10, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	0	2	1	1	1
Article 11, Coder 2	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
Article 12, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	1
Article 13, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2
Article 14, Coder 2	2	1	2	0	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
Article 15, Coder 2	2	1	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	1	0	2	1	2	1	1	0
Article 16, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	0	2	2	2	2	1	2
Article 17, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Article 18, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	0	1	1	1	0
Article 19, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
Article 20, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	2	2	N/A	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
Article 21, Coder 2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	1	2	2
Article 22, Coder 2	2	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	1	2	1	2	N/A	2	2	2	0	2	1	1	1
Article 23, Coder 2	2	2	N/A	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	2	N/A	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1
Article 24, Coder 2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	N/A	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	1

Note: Cell entries are the raw score assigned to each article for each of the 19 coding categories. See Section D of the Appendix for details.