Editor-in-Chief's introduction to the issue

Gregg R. Murray

The editorial team is pleased to publish volume 40, issue 2, of *Politics and the Life Sciences* (*PLS*). This issue continues the implementation of the Association for Politics and the Life Sciences initiative to fund research, particularly research following open science practices. In this case, researchers responded to a call for research designed to address "Psychophysiology, Cognition, and Political Differences." Funded proposals were approved through a competitive peer-review process that required (1) a pre-analysis plan (PAP) detailing the research to be undertaken prior to data collection or, in one case, prior to data analysis and (2) publication in the journal regardless of outcomes as long as the research was conducted according to the PAP. The four resulting "registered report" articles appear in this issue of the journal. For an overview of the articles, see the guest editor introduction by Mansell and colleagues (2021).

More broadly, the registered report process is designed to improve scientific reporting by increasing research transparency and reducing researchers' discretion over decisions that may make their work more publishable but also more biased. Such decisions may include selecting variables or model specifications that increase the likelihood of statistically significant results and/or support for hypotheses (Rubenson, 2021). Evidence suggests pre-registered biomedical and psychological studies report null findings for hypotheses about two-thirds of the time, while standard, non-registered studies report null findings only up to one in five times (Allen & Mehler, 2019). A later study focusing exclusively on findings in psychology suggests registered studies report null findings for first hypotheses almost six out of 10 times, while standard studies report null findings only about one in 20 times (Scheel et al., 2021). Consistent with these findings, a prior special issue of *PLS* on disgust and political attitudes in Fall 2020 "include[s] a large proportion of null findings that raise a number of important and interesting questions for current and future disgust researchers" (Murray, 2020, p. 128). The same can be said for the reported findings from registered reports in this issue. While the large preponderance of the registered report findings are null and do not support the hypothesized effects, these studies also raise a number of important and interesting questions for researchers studying political differences. As noted in last year's disgust and political attitudes special issue, these type of results are likely when the research process is informed by open science practices.

doi: 10.1017/pls.2021.25

The editorial team extends its thanks to the many reviewers who invested a great deal of time and effort in their consideration of "Psychophysiology, Cognition, and Political Differences." It is also eminently grateful to the guest editorial team – Jordan Mansell, Allison Harrell, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Patrick Stewart – for their diligent and insightful efforts on behalf of the authors, journal, and, indeed, the scientific endeavor.

The abundance of support for the journal comes from other sources as well. Besides being ambassadors to the scientific community for *PLS*, Editorial Board members advise the editorial team on strategic issues and provide timely, expert reviews of submitted manuscripts. We would like to welcome five new members to the Editorial Board:

Kevin (Vin) Arceneaux: Professor of Political Science at the Center for Political Research at Sciences Po Paris and Research Fellow at the Behavioral Foundations Lab at Temple University. Vin's research focuses on behavioral foundations and political decision making.

Kavita Berger: Director of the Board on Life Sciences at the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Her research looks at global health policy and security.

Ingrid Haas: Associate Professor of Political Science and Resident Faculty in the Center for Brain, Biology, and Behavior at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln. Ingrid's research is centered on political psychology and cognitive neuroscience.

Jaime Settle: Associate Professor of Government and Director of the Social Networks and Political Psychology Lab at William and Mary. Her research focuses on political psychology and communication, particularly using genetics, psychophysiology, and data science.

Kevin Smith: Professor of Political Science and co-director of the Political Physiology Lab at the

https://doi.org/10.1017/pls.2021.25 Published online by Cambridge University Press

University of Nebraska – Lincoln. Kevin's research is centered on the biology and psychology of individual-level differences in political attitudes and behavior.

Further, thank you to Jordan Mansell, who is stepping down as Book Review Editor after five years of identifying important biopolitical books and securing thoughtful reviews of them. These reviews have not only provided *PLS* readers an introduction to new research, they have also provided fair and thoughtful critiques of the arguments, situated authors' arguments in the broader biopolitical literature, and suggested appropriate audiences for the books.

Finally, the editorial team thanks Cambridge University Press for its support of the journal and the Association for Politics and the Life Sciences, the scientific society that founded *PLS* over 40 years ago and continues to nurture and support it.

References

Allen, C., & Mehler, D. M. A. (2019). Open science challenges, benefits and tips in early career and beyond. *PLoS Biology*, 17(5), e3000246.

Mansell, J., Harrell, A., Gidengil, E., & Stewart, P. A. (2021). Psychophysiology, Cognition, and Political Differences. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 40(2), 137–141.

Murray, G. R., (2020). The new framework in action: Open science and pioneering funding. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 39(2), 127–128.

Rubenson, D. (2021). Tie My Hands Loosely: Pre-analysis Plans in Political Science. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 40(2), 142–151.

Scheel, A. M., Schijen, M. R. M. J., & Lakens, D. (2021). An excess of positive results: Comparing the standard psychology literature with Registered Reports. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*. https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459211007467.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pls.2021.25 Published online by Cambridge University Press