



The effect of survey mode on data quality: Experimental evidence from Nigeria

First Submission: RR_NGA_2025_486

Ceren Huryol

reproducibility@worldbank.org

November 24, 2025

This review verifies the reproducibility of the exhibits included in the paper *"The effect of survey mode on data quality: Experimental evidence from Nigeria"*.

Contents in this review:

1. Main findings
2. List of exhibits and reproducibility status
3. Reproduction Environment

Main findings

- **Every exhibit in the main section of the paper and 10 randomly selected exhibits in the appendix were reproduced accurately**
- The code was successfully executed on a new computer after:
 1. Changing the path in the main script and run the code.
- The output demonstrates consistent stability across multiple runs. Specifically, executing the code two times consecutively yielded identical results.
- The code takes approximately 5 minutes to run.
- We conducted our reproducibility analysis based on the paper shared by the authors by email on November 5th.
- **Verification Process and Data Handling:**
 - The reproducibility package relies on 3 types of data: open, restricted data (available only from the authors) and future open data (expected to be made available through the World Bank Microdata Library).
 - Open data is included in the public reproducibility package.
 - Reviewers used forthcoming and restricted data provided directly by the authors to conduct the reproducibility verification, and this is not included in the public reproducibility package. The data is forthcoming on the World Bank Microdata Library.
 - *data_hash_report.csv* lists the SHA256 hashes of all files in the Data folder to support data integrity checks.
- **Reproducibility Summary:**

- **Data:** Some data is restricted and are not included in the reproducibility package.
- **Code:** All code files (from cleaning to analysis) are included in the reproducibility package.
- **Outputs:** All outputs are generated by code included in the reproducibility package.
- **Dependencies environment:** The reviewers created a new environment using the latest versions of dependencies available at the moment of the review.

List of exhibits and reproducibility status

Results in the Main Section of the Paper

- **Figure 1** Does not apply. Exhibit does not represent analysis results.
- **Figure 2** Does not apply. Exhibit does not represent analysis results.
- **Figure 3** Reproduced.
- **Figure 4** Reproduced.
- **Figure 5** Reproduced.
- **Figure 6** Reproduced.
- **Figure 7** Reproduced.
- **Table 1a** Reproduced.
- **Table 1b** Reproduced.
- **Table 2** Reproduced.
- **Table 3** Reproduced.
- **Table 4** Reproduced.

Results in the Annex

For the Appendix, we did not review every exhibit. Instead, we randomly selected 10 exhibits from the remaining datasets to assess the appendix. Our review was based on those 10 exhibits. Since they were chosen randomly, we are operating under the assumption that if all randomly selected exhibits are reproducible, then the rest should be as well. The seed used to generate the random selection was 484080, the Stata version used was 18.5, and the exhibits selected were: 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14.

- **Table A1** Reproduced.
- **Table A3** Results reproduced, but table or figure includes manual changes from code output (Omnibus F-test p value).
- **Table A5** Reproduced.
- **Table A6** Reproduced.

- **Table A8 panel A** Reproduced.
- **Table A9** Reproduced.
- **Table A10** Reproduced.
- **Table A11** Reproduced.
- **Figure A2** Reproduced.
- **Figure A3** Reproduced.

Reproduction Environment

Paper exhibits were reproduced on a computer with the following specifications:

- OS: Windows 11 Enterprise
- Processor: Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 5218 CPU @2.30GHz
- Memory available: 6 GB
- Software version: Stata 18.5 MP