



Do Patients Value High-Quality Medical Care? Experimental Evidence from Malaria Diagnosis and Treatment

Firt submission: RR_MLI_2023_69-v01

Temidayo Falade, María Reyes Retana

reproducibility@worldbank.org

January 15th, 2024

This review verifies the exhibits' reproducibility in the paper "*Do Patients Value High-Quality Medical Care? Experimental Evidence from Malaria Diagnosis and Treatment*".

Contents in this review:

1. Main findings
2. Reproducibility assessment
3. List of exhibits and reproducibility status

Main findings

- The code was successfully executed on a new computer after:
 1. Changing the file path in the main do file.
- The output appears to be stable across multiple runs. In particular, the code produced identical results after two consecutive runs.
- The full code takes approximately 45 minutes to run.
- The provided package has successfully reproduced every exhibit. However, to achieve complete reproducibility, the survey data, as produced by the authors, is expected to be made available in the World Bank Microdata Library, with full documentation.

Reproducibility assessment

- Paper exhibits were attempted to be reproduced in a computer with the following specifications:
 - OS: Windows 10 Enterprise
 - Processor: Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6226R CPU @ 2.90GHz, 2900 Mhz, 8 Core(s)
 - Memory available: 108 GB
 - Software version: Stata 17 (version 14.2 in the code)
- Our reproducibility analysis was conducted based on the paper included in the reproducibility package the authors shared. The validation process involved comparing the code-generated results with the paper's exhibits to assess consistency.

*List of exhibits and reproducibility status***Results in the Main Section of the Paper**

- **Table 1** Reproduced.
- **Table 2** Reproduced.
- **Table 3** Reproduced.
- **Table 4** Reproduced.
- **Table 5** Reproduced.
- **Table 6** Reproduced.
- **Figure 1** Reproduced.
- **Figure 2** Does not apply.
- **Figure 3** Reproduced with small differences. Comparing both graphs from reproducible output and paper, shows they are identical. However, there is a minor disparity in the labeling. The bar graph in the reproduced output has a labeling of 'No' and 'Yes', while the bar graph in the paper output is labeled as 'basic training' and 'extended training'
- **Figure 4** Reproduced.
- **Figure 5** Reproduced.
- **Figure 6** Reproduced.

Results in the Appendix
A: Additional Results

- **Table A1** Reproduced.
- **Table A2** Reproduced.
- **Table A3** Reproduced.
- **Table A4** Reproduced.
- **Table A5** Reproduced.
- **Table A6** Reproduced.
- **Table A7** Reproduced.
- **Table A8** Reproduced.
- **Table A9** Reproduced.
- **Table A10** Reproduced.

- **Figure A1** Reproduced.

B: Main Results Without Double-Lasso Selected Controls

- **Table B1** Reproduced.
- **Table B2** Reproduced.
- **Table B3** Reproduced.
- **Table B4** Reproduced.
- **Table B5** Reproduced
- **Table B6** Reproduced.