Preregistration refers to the practice of specifying what you are going to do, and what you expect to find in your study, before carrying out the study.

Process:
1. Register hypothesis, experimental design and analysis
2. Submit time-stamped private/public preregistration
3. Follow the plan as closely as possible
4. Submit final study for publication

Goal:
• Reproducible science
• Distinguish exploratory and confirmatory research

ZENY: Socart, there’s an additional argument for preregistration, I believe. Early feedback on experimental methodology through a peer-reviewed registration process should improve the quality of the methodology, should it not? Such feedback also saves resources otherwise spent on failed or misleading experiments.

SOCART: Zeny, we both know turn-around is fast in NLP research. Experiments are easier to run and feedback is much faster than for clinical trials, where preregistration is common.

ZENY: NLP as a field has many virtues, but the reviewing cycle is slowing as the field grows larger. Moreover, experiments are becoming more expensive with larger models, creating barriers of entry and experiments have substantial environmental impact.

SOCART: You make an important point, Zeny, but early feedback would require more time from reviewers. Since reviewers and researchers coincide, preregistration would potentially save compute resources, but not working hours.

Read the paper for more dialogue on why...

✓ Preregistration may bias NLP toward confirmatory research
✓ Preregistration should allow for re-classification of confirmatory research as exploratory research
✓ Preregistration may increase publication bias
✓ Preregistration may increase flag-planting
✓ Preregistration may increase p-hacking
✓ Preregistration may lower our risk tolerance

And for a practical proposal for implementing preregistration in NLP research

Preregistering NLP research (van Miltenburg et al., NAACL 2021)