

Dear Uri Simonsohn,

Thanks for taking the time to discuss our Psychological Methods paper.

We concede that strong causal claims about the relationship between template and preregistration quality cannot be made, which is why we do not make these claims in the paper. Our analysis was based on the data we had at our disposal, and we have made these data openly available for interested readers to analyze in any way they see fit.

We understand why you focus on results related to AsPredicted, but we believe our paper contains interesting contributions to the literature apart from the comparison of preregistration templates. They include:

1. An assessment of the producibility and preregistration-study consistency using the largest sample of preregistered publications to date
2. An assessment of preregistration trends over time
3. An assessment of the most common types of deviations from preregistration
4. An assessment of how often researchers openly discuss deviations from preregistrations

We hope to see more meta-research efforts on preregistration in the future and would be happy to contribute to these efforts in any capacity we can.

On behalf of the co-authors,

Olmo van den Akker