Reproducible research

Guido España



Reproducible research from two perspectives



- For peers:
 - The data and code should be available and sufficient to recreate the findings
- For authors:
 - Authors should replicate their own findings!
 - Better work habits

Steps toward scientific publishing



Many things can go wrong at every step of the process

- Gathering data, analyzing data, presenting results
- Responding to reviewers
- Remember which scripts create which figures N times after first iteration and 2 years later

Five obstacles towards reproducible research

- 1) Keeping results updated in the manuscript
- 2) Previous versions of the document
- 3) Collaborating with co-authors
- 4) Responding to reviewers
- 5) Sharing with other researchers

Some tips¹

- Document everything
- Everything is a (text) file
- All files should be human readable
- Explicitly tie your files together
- Have a plan to organize, store, and make your files available

¹Gandrud C. Reproducible research with R and R studio. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2016 Jul 6.

File management



- File conventions
 - Don't use spaces (or strange characters)
 - Use relative paths
- analysis_fig1.R sounds good, but what if that figure # changes?

LaTeX example

See the GitHub repository of this demo: https://github.com/confunguido/latex_demo_rep_res

Issue 1. Keeping results updated in the manuscript



- For tables in R: Xtable, kabble, texreg
- For figures: Makefiles

Knit files with R-Makefiles and GNU-Makefiles

%% Makefile.R setwd("analysis/data/")

source(".R")

Latex compiler

Convert to Docx using pandoc

%% GNU-Makefile

TARGET: PREREQUISITE... RECIPE

•••

•••

Issue 2. Keeping track of old versions

manuscript



- Too many files!!
- Difficult to understand different versions
- Version control is a better idea

Version control: Git

% mkdir ~/exampleProject
% git init
% echo test > README.md
% git add .
% git commit -a -m "My very first commit for this great research project"

% git tag % git tag -a v0.1 -m "Initial draft" % git checkout v0.1 % git checkout v0.1 -b v0.1Branch

% git remote add origin https:// % git push -u origin master % git pull



- Keep track of manuscripts, reports, etc
- Keep track of code
- Collaborate & see changes (like word track changes)

Issue 3: Dealing with coauthors revisions



- Works better if the co-authors uses latex, otherwise \rightarrow pandoc
- Git tag, git checkout -b bname tname
- Git merge --no-commit
- Use latexdiff to see the PDF with differences

Issue 3: Dealing with coauthors revisions



- Drawbacks:
 - Git uses lines and no paragraphs
 - Not as nice GUI as MS Word

Issue 4: Dealing with journal reviews

• Example of a comment from reviewer:

"This was a beautiful work and I could only come up with a couple of comments"

- Figure 2. The authors could extend the cost of the vaccine up to 300 USD
- Line 18. Who are the others?
- Please add information of how the PE9 was calculated
- LaTex:
 - \usepackage{lineno} \linenumbers
 - \lineref and \linelabel are useful commands
 - Run Makefile before submission!!

RStudio + knitr

```
Sweave:
<< >>=
insert your code here
@
Rmarkdown:
```R
```

```
Insert your code here :)
```

See the GitHub repository of this demo: https://github.com/confunguido/knitr\_demo\_rep\_res

#### Emacs + org-mode

#+BEGIN\_SRC R plot(x,y) #+END\_SRC

#+BEGIN\_SRC python
 plt.plot(x,y)
#+END\_SRC

\* Section header 1
\*\* Section header 2
\*\*\* Section header 3

See the GitHub repository of this demo: https://github.com/confunguido/orgmode\_demo

# Some other options for literate programming

- Jupyter notebooks
- Google colab (based on jupyter notebooks)
- e-life approach

### Issue 5: Sharing with other researchers

- GitHub, GitLab, BitBucket
- Git pull, git merge, git push



If we have good work habits, it should be straightforward

#### Summary

- Use good name files and folder structure
- Use version control
- Connect all your files together



#### Don't go down the rabbit hole