Health Notions
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.33846/hn100201
EDITORIAL
ISSN 2580-4936
Volume 10 Number 2, February 2026

Ensuring Replicability in Health Research: The Critical Role of Transparent and Systematic Methodological Reporting

Heru Santoso Wahito Nugroho[1]
[1]Department of Health, Poltekkes Kemenkes Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia
Correspondence: **Heru Santoso Wahito Nugroho**: Jl. Pucang Jajar Tengah 56, Surabaya, Indonesia; heruswn@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
The credibility of health research depends not only on the appropriateness of its methods but also on the clarity and completeness with which those methods are reported. Replicability is a fundamental principle of scientific inquiry, enabling independent verification, comparison of findings, and the accumulation of evidence. However, inadequate methodological reporting remains a common issue, with many studies lacking sufficient detail to allow replication. This editorial examines the concept of replicable methods in health research, emphasizing that a method is considered replicable when it is described clearly, systematically, and in sufficient detail to allow others to reproduce the procedures under similar conditions. The importance of replicability is discussed in relation to scientific validity, transparency, and its implications for clinical practice and public health decision-making. The paper also outlines practical strategies to enhance replicability, including sequential organization of methods, comprehensive description of study procedures, clear definition of variables and instruments, and transparent reporting of analytical approaches and study limitations. Authors are encouraged to adopt a deliberate and structured approach to methodological reporting, ensuring that their work can be independently evaluated and reproduced. Ultimately, improving the replicability of research methods strengthens the reliability, credibility, and impact of scientific evidence in healthcare.
Keywords: replicability; health research methodology; methodological transparency; reproducibility; scientific rigor; reporting quality

INTRODUCTION
In health research, the credibility of scientific evidence depends not only on how well methods are designed, but also on how clearly they are reported [1]. The methods section is more than a technical requirement; it provides the foundation for transparency, allowing others to understand, evaluate, and, importantly, reproduce the study [2]. When methodological descriptions are incomplete or unclear, even well-conducted research can become difficult to interpret and verify [3].

The growing emphasis on evidence-based practice further reinforces the need for methodological transparency [4]. Clinicians, policymakers, and researchers rely on published studies to guide decisions that directly affect patient care and public health. For this reason, research findings must be open to independent verification. If other researchers cannot replicate the procedures used, confidence in the results is inevitably weakened [5].

In practice, however, insufficient methodological reporting remains a common issue. Many manuscripts describe methods in a way that is too brief, fragmented, or ambiguous to allow replication. Key procedural details are often omitted, making it difficult for others to follow the same steps or assess the validity of the findings. These challenges point to the need for a more careful and deliberate approach to writing the methods section.

This editorial highlights the importance of writing methods that are not only appropriate but also replicable. By discussing what constitutes a replicable methodology, why it matters in health research, and how it can be achieved in practice, we aim to encourage more transparent and reproducible scientific reporting.

ENSURING REPLICABILITY IN HEALTH RESEARCH METHODS

What is a replicable method?
A replicable method is one that is described in sufficient detail to allow other researchers to carry out the same procedures under similar conditions [6]. This includes clear descriptions of the study design, participants, sampling strategies, data collection processes, measurement tools, and analytical techniques. It is important to note that replicability does not guarantee identical results. Differences in setting, population, or context may lead to variation in outcomes. However, what should remain consistent is the ability to follow the same methodological steps. In this sense, replicability ensures that findings can be independently examined, compared, and, where appropriate, challenged. Clarity and structure are central to replicability. Methods should be written in a way that reflects how the study was actually conducted, avoiding vague or overly condensed descriptions. When key steps are implied rather than explicitly stated, the risk of misinterpretation increases, reducing the usefulness of the research [7].

Why replicability matters
Replicability is a fundamental principle of scientific inquiry. In health research, its importance is particularly pronounced because research findings often inform clinical decisions, guidelines, and health policies [8]. Without the possibility of replication, it becomes difficult to determine whether reported results are robust or context-specific. When methods are not replicable, several problems may arise. Other researchers cannot verify the findings, limiting confidence in their validity. The accumulation of evidence is also hindered, as studies that cannot be reproduced are difficult to include in systematic reviews or meta-analyses. Over time, this weakens the overall evidence base. From a practical perspective, non-replicable research can have real-world consequences. Clinical or public health decisions based on findings that cannot be independently confirmed may lead to ineffective or inappropriate interventions. Ensuring replicability, therefore, is not only a matter of methodological rigor but also a responsibility toward patient safety and public trust [9].

How to write replicable methods
Writing a replicable methods section requires attention to clarity, completeness, and logical flow [1]. Authors should aim to describe their procedures in a way that allows readers to follow the study step by step. First, methods should be presented sequentially. The description should mirror the actual progression of the study—from design and setting, to participant selection, data collection, and analysis. A well-structured narrative helps readers understand how each stage connects to the next.

Second, sufficient detail must be provided. This includes clearly defining inclusion and exclusion criteria, explaining how participants were selected, and describing the tools and instruments used. If established instruments are employed, appropriate references should be provided. If new tools are developed, their development and validation should be described.

Third, data collection procedures should be explained in practical terms. Authors should specify who collected the data, how it was collected, and under what conditions. Similarly, analytical methods should be described with enough precision to allow replication, including the statistical tests used and any relevant software.

Fourth, transparency is essential. Any deviations from the original plan, challenges encountered during the study, or methodological limitations should be openly reported. This does not weaken the study; rather, it allows readers to better understand and evaluate the findings.

Finally, the use of reporting guidelines can be very helpful. Frameworks such as CONSORT, STROBE, or COREQ provide structured guidance to ensure that all key methodological elements are adequately reported [10].

MESSAGE TO AUTHORS

As editors, we encourage authors to view the methods section as a cornerstone of scientific communication. It should not be treated as a brief technical summary, but as a clear, structured, and comprehensive account of how the study was actually conducted. A well-written methods section allows readers to fully understand the research process [11-15], from initial design to data analysis, and provides the necessary foundation for evaluating the credibility of the findings. In this sense, the methods section is not merely descriptive, but explanatory—it demonstrates how the evidence presented in the study was generated.

Authors should therefore ensure that their methods are described in a way that allows others to replicate the study without relying on assumptions or interpretation [16,17]. This requires careful attention to detail, logical organization, and clarity of language. Each step of the research process should be explicitly stated, including study design, participant selection, data collection procedures, measurement tools, and analytical strategies. Vague or overly condensed descriptions may create ambiguity, making it difficult for readers to follow the procedures or reproduce the study accurately. Omitting key steps, even unintentionally, can significantly reduce the scientific value and usability of the research.

We also emphasize the importance of presenting methods in a coherent and sequential manner [18]. The structure of the methods section should reflect the actual flow of the study, enabling readers to trace the progression of decisions and procedures [11]. This not only enhances readability but also ensures that the research process can be understood as a logical and reproducible sequence of actions. Where standardized instruments or established protocols are used, appropriate references should be provided. When novel approaches are introduced, sufficient detail must be included to allow others to apply them in different contexts.

Transparency is another essential component of high-quality methodological reporting [19]. Clearly reporting limitations, potential sources of bias, and practical constraints strengthens, rather than weakens, a manuscript. Acknowledging these aspects demonstrates scientific integrity and allows readers to assess the robustness and generalizability of the findings. Authors should also report any deviations from the original study plan, as such information is critical for understanding how the research was conducted in practice.

Furthermore, authors are encouraged to consider the broader implications of their methodological reporting. A well-documented methods section not only supports replication but also facilitates critical appraisal, inclusion in systematic reviews, and the accumulation of evidence across studies. In contrast, poorly described methods can limit the impact of otherwise valuable research, as other investigators may be unable to verify or build upon the findings.

Ultimately, research that cannot be replicated contributes less to the advancement of knowledge [20,21]. By contrast, methods that are carefully documented, transparently reported, and logically presented enhance the credibility of the research, facilitate independent verification, and support the development of a more reliable and cumulative evidence base. For this reason, authors should approach the methods section with the same level of rigor and attention as any other part of the manuscript, recognizing its central role in ensuring the integrity and impact of scientific work.

CONCLUSION

Replicability is a fundamental aspect of high-quality health research. A well-written methods section enables others to understand, evaluate, and reproduce the study, thereby strengthening the credibility of its findings. Authors should strive to present their methods in a clear, detailed, and systematic manner. By doing so, they contribute to more transparent, reliable, and impactful research—an essential goal in advancing clinical practice and public health.

Ethical consideration, competing interest and source of funding

-As this article is an editorial and does not involve human or animal, ethical approval was not required.
-There is no conflict of interest related to this publication.
-Source of funding is authors.

REFERENCES

1. Nugroho HSW, Jeniawaty S, Karno K, Badiah A, Susilaningrum R, Al Mamun A. Action research as an ideal method for introducing research products in the field of public health. Health Notions. 2024 Feb 28;8(2):49-50.
2. Hardwicke TE, Wallach JD, Kidwell MC, Bendixen T, Crüwell S, Ioannidis J. An empirical assessment of transparency and reproducibility-related research practices in the social sciences (2014–2017). Royal Society open science. 2020 Feb 1;7(2).
3. Denscombe M. The good research guide: Research methods for small-scale social research projects. McGraw-Hill Education (UK); 2021 Sep 16.
4. Oliver K, Pearce W. Three lessons from evidence-based medicine and policy: increase transparency, balance inputs and understand power. Palgrave Communications. 2017 Dec 12;3(1):43.
5. Nosek BA, Hardwicke TE, Moshontz H, Allard A, Corker KS, Dreber A, Fidler F, Hilgard J, Kline Struhl M, Nuijten MB, Rohrer JM. Replicability, robustness, and reproducibility in psychological science. Annual review of psychology. 2022 Jan 4;73:719-48.
6. National Academies of Sciences, Medicine, Policy, Global Affairs, Board on Research Data, Information, Division on Engineering, Physical Sciences, Committee on Applied, Theoretical Statistics, Board on Mathematical Sciences. Reproducibility and replicability in science. National Academies Press; 2019 Sep 20.
7. Gaus N. Selecting research approaches and research designs: A reflective essay. Qualitative Research Journal. 2017 May 2;17(2):99-112.

8. Bartlett VL, Dhruva SS, Shah ND, Ryan P, Ross JS. Feasibility of using real-world data to replicate clinical trial evidence. JAMA network open. 2019 Oct 9;2(10):e1912869.
9. Sayfiddinovna RD. Ensuring methodological rigor and reproducibility in contemporary scientific studies. Confrencea. 2025 Oct 25;9(9):187-92.
10. Tate RL, Douglas J. Use of reporting guidelines in scientific writing: PRISMA, CONSORT, STROBE, STARD and other resources. Brain Impairment. 2011 May;12(1):1-21.
11. Willis LD. How to write the methods section of a research manuscript. Respiratory Care. 2023 Dec;68(12):1763-70.
12. Habtu Y, Deressa W. How to write a "results section" in biomedical scientific research papers?: Critical review. Research Methods in Medicine & Health Sciences. 2025 Jul 28;6(3):86-95.
13. Dumka P, Chauhan R, Mishra DR. How to write a research article: a structured approach. UC Journal: ELT, Linguistics and Literature Journal. 2025 May 30;6(1):36-42.
14. O'Sullivan TA, Jefferson CG. A review of strategies for enhancing clarity and reader accessibility of qualitative research results. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education. 2020 Jan 1;84(1):7124.
15. LaPlaca P, Lindgreen A, Vanhamme J. How to write really good articles for premier academic journals. Industrial Marketing Management. 2018 Jan 1;68:202-9.
16. Tuval-Mashiach R. Is replication relevant for qualitative research?. Qualitative Psychology. 2021 Oct;8(3):365.
17. Bamberger PA. On the replicability of abductive research in management and organizations: Internal replication and its alternatives. Academy of Management Discoveries. 2019 Jun;5(2):103-8.
18. González-Díaz RR, Bustamante-Cabrera GI. Predictive sequential research design to study complex social phenomena. Entropy. 2021 May 18;23(5):627.
19. Tuval-Mashiach R. Raising the curtain: The importance of transparency in qualitative research. Qualitative Psychology. 2017 Aug;4(2):126.
20. Nosek BA, Errington TM. What is replication?. PLoS biology. 2020 Mar 27;18(3):e3000691.
21. Singh K, Ang SH, Leong SM. Increasing replication for knowledge accumulation in strategy research. Journal of Management. 2003 Aug;29(4):533-49.