

## Experiment aversion among clinicians and the public — an obstacle to evidence-based medicine and public health

Randi L. Vogt<sup>1\*</sup>  
Patrick R. Heck<sup>1\*</sup>  
Rebecca M. Mestechkin<sup>1</sup>  
Pedram Heydari<sup>1,2</sup>  
Christopher F. Chabris<sup>1†</sup>  
Michelle N. Meyer<sup>1†§</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Bioethics & Decision Sciences, Geisinger

<sup>2</sup>Department of Economics, University of Pittsburgh

\*Contributed equally

†Contributed equally

§Correspondence to: [michellenmeyer@gmail.com](mailto:michellenmeyer@gmail.com)

### Abstract

**Background:** Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are essential for determining the safety and efficacy of healthcare interventions. However, both laypeople and clinicians often demonstrate experiment aversion: preferring to implement either of two interventions for everyone rather than comparing them to determine which is best. We studied whether clinician and layperson views of pragmatic RCTs for Covid-19 or other interventions became more positive early in the pandemic, which increased both the urgency and public discussion of RCTs.

**Methods:** We conducted several survey studies with laypeople (total  $n=2,909$ ) and two with clinicians ( $n=895$ ;  $n=1,254$ ) in 2020 and 2021. Participants read vignettes in which a hypothetical decision-maker who sought to improve health could choose to implement intervention A for all, implement intervention B for all, or experimentally compare A and B and implement the superior intervention. Participants rated and ranked the appropriateness of each decision.

**Results:** Compared to our pre-pandemic results, we found no decrease in laypeople's aversion to non-Covid-19 experiments involving catheterization checklists and hypertension drugs. Nor were either laypeople or clinicians less averse to Covid-19 RCTs (concerning corticosteroid drugs, vaccines, intubation checklists, proning, school reopening, and mask protocols), on average. Across all vignettes and samples, levels of experiment aversion ranged from 28% to 57%, while levels of experiment appreciation (in which the RCT is rated higher than the participant's highest-rated intervention) ranged from only 6% to 35%.

**Conclusions:** Advancing evidence-based medicine through pragmatic RCTs will require anticipating and addressing experiment aversion among both patients and healthcare professionals.

## Introduction

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are crucial for understanding how to safely, effectively, and equitably prevent and treat disease and deliver healthcare. They have repeatedly upended conventional clinical wisdom and the results of observational studies,<sup>1</sup> and are urgently needed to evaluate new technologies.<sup>2</sup> However, RCTs often prove controversial, even when they compare interventions that are within the standard of care or otherwise unobjectionable, and about which the relevant expert community is in equipoise.<sup>3</sup> Prestigious medical journals have recently published several trials—including SUPPORT<sup>4</sup>, FIRST<sup>5</sup>, and iCOMPARE<sup>6</sup>—that have received considerable criticism from physician-scientists, ethicists, and regulators in those journals<sup>7,8</sup> and the public square.<sup>9–12</sup> Although criticisms of RCTs can be complex and nuanced, many reflect a rejection of the very idea that an experiment was conducted, as opposed to simply giving everyone the allegedly superior intervention.

In prior studies—inspired by several “notorious RCTs,” including technology industry “A/B tests”<sup>13–15</sup>—we confirmed that substantial shares of both laypeople and clinicians can be averse to randomized evaluation of efforts to improve health. People rated a pragmatic RCT designed to compare the effectiveness of two interventions significantly lower than the average rating of implementing either one, untested, for everyone, a phenomenon we call the “A/B effect.”<sup>16</sup> In some cases, the lower average rating of an experiment could be driven not by dislike of experiments, per se, but by the fact that many people believe one of its arms is inferior to the other,<sup>16,17</sup> a belief that is often not evidence-based. We therefore also documented “experiment aversion”: rating an RCT comparing two interventions as worse than *even one’s own least-preferred intervention*.<sup>17</sup> Both patterns of negative sentiments about experiments—including

experiments judged to compare two unobjectionable interventions—can impede efforts to identify what does and does not work to improve health outcomes.

The Covid-19 pandemic presented a potential inflection point in attitudes towards health experimentation. In April 2020, 72 Covid-19 drug trials were already underway<sup>18</sup> and RCTs became daily, front-page news. That sustained exposure might have educated people about RCTs, or made RCTs more normative. Separately, our previous research suggests that one cause of experiment aversion is an illusion of knowledge—a (mis)perception that experts already must know what works best, and should simply implement that. But Covid-19 was a novel disease, and—at least in the case of pharmaceutical interventions—no sensible person thought the correct treatments were already obvious. People therefore may be less averse to Covid-19 RCTs than to RCTs that test interventions against longstanding conditions or problems. On the other hand, because of the urgency attached to Covid-19, people may be *more* averse to Covid-19 RCTs, being even less inclined to risk giving someone a treatment that might turn out to “lose” in a comparison study.<sup>19,20</sup> Finally, even if the pandemic did not affect public attitudes towards RCTs, it could have affected the attitudes of clinicians, many of whom were involved in Covid-19 research. Because clinicians strongly influence whether particular RCTs are conducted, their attitudes matter.

We investigated attitudes towards experimentation in the first year of the pandemic by conducting a series of preregistered studies between August 2020 and February 2021. First, we used decision-making vignettes from our previous work to ask whether the extraordinary publicity around Covid-19 RCTs reduced general healthcare experiment aversion by the public. Next, we adapted these vignettes to determine whether the public was averse to experimentation on pharmaceutical and/or non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) for Covid-19. Finally, we

recruited two large clinician samples to investigate how their attitudes compared to those of laypeople. All three studies were randomized survey experiments in which participants first read about a decision-maker faced with a problem who either implemented one of two interventions (A or B) or ran an experiment to compare them (and then implemented the superior one). Participants then evaluated how appropriate each of those three decisions was.

## Methods

### Lay Sentiments About Healthcare Experimentation

In August 2020, we used the CloudResearch service to recruit 700 crowd workers on Amazon Mechanical Turk to participate in a brief online survey. These services provide samples that are broadly representative of the U.S. population and are well-accepted in social science research as providing as good or better-quality data than convenience samples such as student volunteers, with results that are similar to probability sampling methods.<sup>21,22</sup>

Each participant first read a vignette that described a problem that the decision-maker could address in three ways (see Table 1 for examples; see the Supplemental Appendix [SA] for text and motivations for all vignettes): by implementing intervention A for all patients (A); by implementing intervention B for all patients (B); or by conducting an experiment in which patients are randomly assigned to A or B and the superior intervention is then implemented for all (A/B). (Our vignettes are silent about whether consent will be obtained, but IRBs customarily waive consent when it would make low-risk pragmatic RCTs impracticable<sup>23</sup>; in separate work, we found that substantial shares of people object to such experiments even when we specify that consent will be obtained.<sup>24</sup>) Next, following standard methods in social and moral psychology for evaluating decisions,<sup>25</sup> participants rated each option on a scale of appropriateness from 1

(“very inappropriate”) to 5 (“very appropriate”), with 3 as a neutral midpoint. Participants then rank-ordered the options from best to worst. We also collected demographic information, but found no substantial associations with it in any of our studies (Tables S8-11).

Participants were randomly assigned to one of two vignettes. In Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug, some doctors in a walk-in clinic prescribe “Drug A” while others prescribe “Drug B” (both of which are affordable, tolerable, and FDA approved) and Dr. Jones prescribes either A or B for all his hypertensive patients, or runs a randomized experiment to compare their effectiveness. In Catheterization Safety Checklist, a hospital director similarly considers two locations where he might display a safety checklist for clinicians (see Table 1A).

We define the “A/B Effect” as the degree to which participants’ ratings of the A/B test were lower than the average of their ratings of implementing A and B.<sup>16</sup> “Experiment aversion” is the degree to which participants rated the A/B test *lower* than *their own lowest-rated* intervention (either A or B for each person). “Experiment appreciation” is the opposite: the degree to which the experiment is rated *higher* than each participant’s *highest-rated* intervention. (See the SA for full details on power analyses and sample sizes, statistical analyses, materials, preregistrations, and data availability.)

### **Lay Sentiments About Covid-19 Healthcare Experimentation**

Between August 2020 and January 2021, we recruited 2,209 additional laypeople in the same manner described above. They read, rated, and ranked six new vignettes involving Covid-19 interventions (N = 339–450 per vignette). Four vignettes were based on Covid-19-related interventions that were discussed, tested, and/or implemented at the time: Masking Rules (which described two masking policies, of varying scope); School Reopening (two school schedules

designed to increase social distancing); Best Vaccine (two types of vaccine—mRNA versus inactivated virus); and Ventilator Proning (two protocols for positioning ventilated Covid-19 patients; see Table 1B). The other two vignettes—Intubation Safety Checklist and Best Corticosteroid Drug—were adapted from the first study to apply to Covid-19.

### **Clinician Sentiments About Covid-19 Healthcare Experimentation**

Between November 2020 and February 2021, clinicians (including physicians, physician assistants, and nurse practitioners) in a large health system in the Northeastern U.S. were recruited by email to read, rate, and rank one of four Covid-19-related vignettes (Masking Rules:  $n = 349$ ; Intubation Safety Checklist:  $n = 271$ ; Best Corticosteroid Drug:  $n = 275$ ; Best Vaccine:  $n = 1254$ ) from the second study.

## **Results**

### **Lay Sentiments About Healthcare Experimentation**

We found substantial negative reactions to A/B testing in both vignettes (Table 2A), replicating our pre-pandemic findings.<sup>16,17</sup> In Catheterization Safety Checklist (Figure 1A), we found evidence of the A/B Effect: participants rated the A/B test significantly below the average ratings they gave to implementing interventions A and B ( $d = 0.69$ , 95% CI: (0.53, 0.85)). Here,  $41\% \pm 5\%$  (95% CI) of participants expressed experiment aversion (rating the A/B test lower than their own lowest-rated intervention;  $d = 0.25$ , 95% CI: (0.11, 0.39)). When ranking the three options from best to worst, only 32% placed the A/B test first, while 48% placed it last.

We also observed an A/B Effect in Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug (Figure 1B);  $d = 0.52$ , 95% CI: (0.36, 0.68)), where  $44\% \pm 5\%$  also expressed experiment aversion ( $d = 0.46$ , 95% CI:

(0.30, 0.52)). Notably, participants were averse to this experiment even though there is no reason to prefer “Drug A” to “Drug B,” and patients are effectively already randomized to A or B based on which clinician happens to see them—which occurs wherever unwarranted variation in practice determines treatments, such as walk-in clinics and emergency departments. Here, however, similar proportions of people ranked the A/B test best and worst (50% vs. 45%;  $p = 0.16$ ).

These levels of experiment aversion near the height of the pandemic were slightly (but not significantly) higher than those we observed among similar laypeople in 2019 (41%  $\pm$  5% in 2020 vs. 37%  $\pm$  6% in 2019 for Catheterization Safety Checklist,  $p = 0.31$  ; 44%  $\pm$  5% in 2020 vs. 40%  $\pm$  6% in 2019 for Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug,  $p = 0.32$ ).<sup>17</sup>

**Table 1**

*Vignette text for Catheterization Safety Checklist and Ventilator Proning*

	(A) Catheterization Safety Checklist	(B) Ventilator Proning
Background	Some medical treatments require a doctor to insert a plastic tube into a large vein. These treatments can save lives, but they can also lead to deadly infections.	Some coronavirus (Covid-19) patients have to be sedated and placed on a ventilator to help them breathe. Even with a ventilator, these patients can have dangerously low blood oxygenation levels, which can result in death. Current standards suggest that laying ventilated patients on their stomach for 12-16 hours per day can reduce pressure on the lungs and might increase blood oxygen levels and improve survival rates.
Intervention A	A hospital director wants to reduce these infections, so he decides to give each doctor who performs this procedure a new ID badge with a list of standard safety precautions for the procedure printed on the back. All patients having this procedure will then be treated by doctors with this list attached to their clothing.	A hospital director wants to save as many ventilated Covid-19 patients as possible, so he decides that all of these patients will be placed on their stomach for 12-13 hours per day.
Intervention B	A hospital director wants to reduce these infections, so he decides to hang a poster with a list of standard safety precautions for this procedure in all procedure rooms. All patients having this procedure will then be treated in rooms with this list posted on the wall.	A hospital director wants to save as many ventilated Covid-19 patients as possible, so he decides that all of these patients will be placed on their stomach for 15-16 hours per day.
A/B test	A hospital director thinks of two different ways to reduce these infections, so he decides to run an experiment by randomly assigning patients to one of two test conditions. Half of patients will be treated by doctors who have received a new ID badge with a list of standard safety precautions for the procedure printed on the back. The other half will be treated in rooms with a poster listing the same precautions hanging on the wall. After a year, the director will have all patients treated in whichever way turns out to have the highest survival rate.	A hospital director thinks of two different ways to save as many ventilated Covid-19 patients as possible, so he decides to run an experiment by randomly assigning ventilated Covid-19 patients to one of two test conditions. Half of these patients will be placed on their stomach for 12-13 hours per day. The other half of these patients will be placed on their stomach for 15-16 hours per day. After one month, the director will have all ventilated Covid-19 patients treated in whichever way turns out to have the highest survival rate.



**Table 2***Sentiments about experiments by vignette and population*

	Negative sentiment				Positive sentiment			
	Experiment Aversion	A/B Effect	More people averse than appreciative?	More people rank AB test worst than best?	More people rank AB test best than worst?	More people appreciative than averse?	Reverse A/B Effect	Experiment Appreciation
<b>(A) Lay Sentiments About Healthcare Experimentation</b>								
Catheterization Safety Checklist	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug	✓	✓	✓					
<b>(B) Lay Sentiments About Covid-19 Healthcare Experimentation</b>								
Ventilator Proning	✓	✓	✓					
School Reopening		✓	✓	✓				
Masking Rules	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Intubation Safety Checklist	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Best Corticosteroid Drug		✓			✓			
Best Vaccine		✓			✓			
<b>(C) Clinician Sentiments About Covid-19 Healthcare Experimentation</b>								
Masking Rules	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Intubation Safety Checklist	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Best Corticosteroid Drug	✓	✓	✓					
Best Vaccine		✓*			✓			


*Note.* The A/B Effect refers to the difference between the average rating of the two interventions and the rating of the A/B test. Experiment Aversion refers to the difference between the lowest-rated intervention and the rating of the A/B test. The Reverse A/B Effect refers to the difference between the rating of the A/B test and the average rating of the two interventions. Experiment Appreciation refers to the difference between the rating of the A/B test and the rating of the highest-rated intervention.

Checkmarks (✓) represent a statistically significant effect at  $p < .05$ . In one case, the checkmark is followed by an asterisk (\*). This indicates that while the effect reaches statistical significance, the effect size is very small and might have only reached significance due to the large sample size (three times as large as that for other vignettes).

Variables to the right of the thick vertical line are the reverse of those on the left. If no checkmark appears in either of the corresponding columns to the left and right of the thick vertical line (e.g., "More people rank A/B test worst than best?" and "More people rank A/B test best than worst?"), that means that there is no significant difference (e.g., there is no statistically significant difference between the proportion of people ranked that A/B test worst and the proportion of people who ranked the A/B test best).

## Figure 1

### *Lay Sentiments About Healthcare Experimentation*



*Note.* (A) Percentages of participants objecting to implementing intervention A, intervention B, and the A/B test (objecting was defined as assigning a rating of 1 or 2—“very inappropriate” or “somewhat inappropriate”—on a 1–5 scale). (B) Mean appropriateness ratings, on a 1–5 scale, with SEs, for intervention A, intervention B, the highest-rated intervention, the average intervention, the lowest-rated intervention, and the A/B test.


## Lay Sentiments About Covid-19 Specific Healthcare Experimentation

In all six Covid-19 vignettes, we found evidence of the A/B Effect (Table 2B). In three, however, we did not find experiment aversion: Best Vaccine, Best Corticosteroid Drug, and School Reopening. In the first two of these, participants rated the two interventions very similarly and the experiment only slightly lower (Figure 2B). These vignettes also elicited the largest proportion of participants (65% in Best Vaccine and 56% in Best Corticosteroid Drug) in any vignette who ranked the A/B test best among the three options, compared to 31–34% of participants who ranked it worst. In School Reopening, experiment aversion was not observed because participants on average clearly preferred intervention B to A and rated the experiment similar to intervention A.<sup>26,27</sup> 53% of participants ranked intervention B as the best of the three options (compared to 17% choosing intervention A and 30% choosing the A/B test).

In the other three vignettes, participants rated the A/B test condition as significantly less appropriate than their lowest-rated intervention (Masking Rules:  $d = 0.56$ , 95% CI: (0.41, 0.71); Ventilator Proning:  $d = 0.17$ , 95% CI: (0.04, 0.30); Intubation Safety Checklist:  $d = 0.36$ , 95% CI: (0.21, 0.49)). These levels of aversion to Covid-19 RCTs are similar to the levels of aversion to non-Covid-19 RCTs both before<sup>17</sup> and during the pandemic (see above).

**Figure 2**

*Lay Sentiments About Covid-19 Specific Healthcare Experimentation*



*Note.* (A) Percentages of participants objecting to implementing intervention A, intervention B, and the A/B test (objecting was defined as assigning a rating of 1 or 2—“very inappropriate” or “somewhat inappropriate”— on a 1–5 scale). (B) Mean appropriateness ratings, on a 1–5 scale, with SEs, for intervention A, intervention B, the highest-rated intervention, the average intervention, the lowest-rated intervention, and the A/B test.


## Clinician Sentiments About Covid-19 Specific Healthcare Experimentation

We observed an A/B effect in all four vignettes. In two, clinicians, like laypeople, were also significantly experiment averse (Masking Rules:  $d = 0.74$ , 95% CI: (0.57, 0.91); Intubation Safety Checklist:  $d = 0.30$ , 95% CI: (0.15, 0.45)). In Best Vaccine, clinicians, like laypeople, did not show any significant difference in their ratings of the A/B test and their lowest-rated intervention ( $d = -0.03$ , 95% CI: (-0.10, 0.04)). Again, like laypeople, 58% of clinicians ranked the vaccine A/B test as the best of the three options, the highest proportion of any clinician-rated vignette.

Clinicians differed from laypeople in their response to Best Corticosteroid Drug. Laypeople did not show experiment aversion, but clinicians rated the A/B test as significantly less appropriate than their lowest-rated intervention ( $d = 0.49$ , 95% CI: (0.32, 0.66)). This difference may be due to clinicians' greater familiarity with the treatment of Covid-19. Clinicians may also have seen an urgent need for *any* drugs to treat Covid-19<sup>20</sup> and thus rated adopting a clear treatment intervention as more appropriate than an RCT.

**Figure 3**

*Clinician Sentiments About Covid-19 Specific Healthcare Experimentation*



*Note.* (A) Percentages of participants objecting to implementing intervention A, intervention B, and the A/B test (objecting was defined as assigning a rating of 1 or 2—“very inappropriate” or “somewhat inappropriate”— on a 1–5 scale). (B) Mean appropriateness ratings, on a 1–5 scale, with SEs, for intervention A, intervention B, the highest-rated intervention, the average intervention, the lowest-rated intervention, and the A/B test.

## Discussion

We found no diminution in general experiment aversion among laypeople during the first year of the Covid-19 pandemic, despite increased exposure to the nature and purpose of RCTs. Neither laypeople nor clinicians were overall less averse to Covid-19 experiments, despite the fact that confidence in anyone's knowledge of what works should have been even more circumscribed than in the everyday contexts of hypertension and catheter infections. To the contrary, we found an A/B effect (the average rating of the RCT was lower than the average rating of the two policies) in all vignettes and samples. Most Covid-19 vignettes were met with experiment aversion (on average, participants rated the RCT lower than each participant's lowest-rated intervention). This is consistent with an emphasis during the pandemic that we must "do" instead of "learn," a false dichotomy that fails to recognize that implementing an untested intervention is itself a nonconsensual experiment from which, unlike an RCT, little or nothing can be learned.<sup>28–30</sup> Similarly, across *all* vignettes and samples, between 28% and 57% of participants demonstrated experiment aversion, while only 6%–35% demonstrated experiment appreciation (by rating the RCT higher than their highest-rated intervention).

In none of our 12 studies were more people appreciative of than averse to the RCT, in none was the average RCT rating higher than the average intervention rating, and in none was the RCT rating higher than each participant's highest-rated intervention, on average. Notably, unlike trials with placebo or no-contact controls, the A/B tests in our vignettes compared two active, plausible interventions, neither of which was obviously known *ex ante* to be superior. Yet substantial shares of participants still preferred that one intervention simply be implemented without bothering to determine which (if either) worked best.

There is one bright spot in our results: the most positive sentiment towards experiments was observed in both laypeople and clinicians in the vignettes involving Covid-19 drugs and vaccines. Here we observed the highest proportions of participants who demonstrated experiment appreciation (31%–46%) and who ranked the RCT first (49%–65%). This result is consistent with our previous findings that the illusion of knowledge—here, the belief that either the participant herself or some expert already does or should know the right thing to do and should simply do it—biases people to prefer universal intervention implementation to RCTs.<sup>16,17</sup> Rightly or wrongly, both laypeople and clinicians might (a) appropriately recognize that near the start of a pandemic, no one knows which existing drugs, if any, are safe and effective in treating a novel disease, and that new vaccines need to be tested, yet (b) fail to sufficiently appreciate the level of uncertainty around NPIs like masking, pronging, and social distancing, which can also benefit from rigorous evaluation. This is consistent with the dearth of RCTs of Covid-19 NPIs:<sup>31</sup> of the more than 4,000 Covid-19 trials registered worldwide as of August 2021, only 41 tested NPIs.<sup>32</sup> Explaining critical concepts like clinical equipoise or unwarranted variation in medical and NPI practice alike might diminish experiment aversion.

Critics note that RCTs have limited external validity when they employ overly selective inclusion/exclusion criteria or are executed in ways that deviate from how interventions would be operationalized in diverse, real-world settings. However, the solution is not to abandon randomized evaluation, but to incorporate it into routine clinical care and healthcare delivery via pragmatic RCTs.<sup>1,33</sup> It has been many years since the Institute of Medicine urged research of many varieties to be embedded in care.<sup>34</sup> More recently, the FDA established a Real-World Evidence Program that promotes pragmatic RCTs to support post-marketing monitoring and other regulatory decision-making.<sup>35,36</sup> Pragmatic RCTs have been fielded successfully and



informed healthcare practice and policy,<sup>37–39</sup> but they remain far from ubiquitous and they require buy-in to be successful, as shown by the case of a Denmark school reopening trial that was abandoned due to lack of such support.<sup>40</sup> Wider use of pragmatic RCTs will require not only redoubling investment in interoperable electronic health records and recalibrating regulators' views of the comparative risks of research versus idiosyncratic practice variation,<sup>1</sup> but also anticipating and addressing experiment aversion among patients and healthcare professionals.

### **Acknowledgements**

Supported by Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health (NIH) (3P30AG034532-13S1) and funded by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH or the FDA. We thank Daniel Rosica and Tamara Gjorgjieva for excellent research assistance. Vogt and Heck contributed equally to this work. Meyer and Chabris contributed equally to this work.

### **Data availability**

Participant response data, preregistrations, materials, and analysis code have been deposited in Open Science Framework and will be released upon final publication of this paper.

## References

1. Fanaroff AC, Califf RM, Harrington RA, et al. Randomized trials versus common sense and clinical observation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2020;76(5):580–9.
2. New England Journal of Medicine. Introducing NEJM AI [Internet]. NEJM AI. [cited 2023 Feb 28]; Available from: <https://ai.nejm.org/>
3. Freedman B. Equipoise and the ethics of clinical research. *N Engl J Med* 1987;317(3):141–5.
4. SUPPORT Study Group of the Eunice Kennedy Shriver NICHD Neonatal Research Network. Target Ranges of Oxygen Saturation in Extremely Preterm Infants. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362(21):1959–69.
5. Bilimoria KY, Chung JW, Hedges LV, et al. National cluster-randomized trial of duty-hour flexibility in surgical training. *N Engl J Med* 2016;374(8):713–27.
6. Silber JH, Bellini LM, Shea JA, et al. Patient safety outcomes under flexible and standard resident duty-hour rules. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380(10):905–14.
7. Rosenbaum L. Leaping without Looking — Duty Hours, Autonomy, and the Risks of Research and Practice. *N Engl J Med* 2016;374(8):701–3.
8. Magnus D, Caplan AL. Risk, Consent, and SUPPORT. *N Engl J Med* 2013;368(20):1864–5.
9. Rettner R. Premie Study Triggers Debate Over Informed Consent [Internet]. NBC News. 2013 [cited 2023 Feb 28]; Available from: <https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna52439269>
10. Carome MA, Wolfe SM. RE: The Surfactant, Positive Pressure, and Oxygenation Randomized Trial (SUPPORT) [Internet]. 2013; Available from: <https://www.citizen.org/wp-content/uploads/migration/2111.pdf>
11. Rice S. Studies on resident work hours “highly unethical,” lack patient consent [Internet]. *Mod. Healthc.* 2015 [cited 2023 Feb 28]; Available from:

<https://www.modernhealthcare.com/article/20151119/NEWS/151119854/studies-on-resident-work-hours-highly-unethical-lack-patient-consent>

12. Bernstein L. Some new doctors are working 30-hour shifts at hospitals around the U.S. [Internet]. Wash. Post. 2015 [cited 2023 Feb 28]; Available from: [https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/some-new-doctors-are-working-30-hour-shifts-at-hospitals-around-the-us/2015/10/28/ab7e8948-7b83-11e5-beba-927fd8634498\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/some-new-doctors-are-working-30-hour-shifts-at-hospitals-around-the-us/2015/10/28/ab7e8948-7b83-11e5-beba-927fd8634498_story.html)
13. Kramer ADI, Guillory JE, Hancock JT. Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2014;111(24):8788–90.
14. Strauss V. Analysis | Pearson conducts experiment on thousands of college students without their knowledge [Internet]. Wash. Post. 2018 [cited 2023 Mar 2]; Available from: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2018/04/23/pearson-conducts-experiment-on-thousands-of-college-students-without-their-knowledge/>
15. Hern A. OKCupid: we experiment on users. Everyone does [Internet]. *The Guardian*. 2014 [cited 2023 Mar 2]; Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/jul/29/okcupid-experiment-human-beings-dating>
16. Meyer MN, Heck PR, Holtzman GS, et al. Objecting to experiments that compare two unobjectionable policies or treatments. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2019;116(22):10723–8.
17. Heck PR, Chabris CF, Watts DJ, Meyer MN. Objecting to experiments even while approving of the policies or treatments they compare. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2020;117(32):18948–50.
18. Dunn A. There are already 72 drugs in human trials for coronavirus in the US. With hundreds more on the way, a top drug regulator warns we could run out of researchers to test

them all. [Internet]. Bus. Insid. [cited 2023 Feb 28];Available from:

<https://www.businessinsider.com/fda-woodcock-overwhelming-amount-of-coronavirus-drugs-in-the-works-2020-4>

19. London AJ, Kimmelman J. Against pandemic research exceptionalism. *Science* 2020;368(6490):476–7.
20. Dominus S. The Covid Drug Wars That Pitted Doctor vs. Doctor [Internet]. *N. Y. Times*. 2020 [cited 2023 Feb 28];Available from:  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/05/magazine/covid-drug-wars-doctors.html>
21. Germine L, Nakayama K, Duchaine BC, Chabris CF, Chatterjee G, Wilmer JB. Is the Web as good as the lab? Comparable performance from Web and lab in cognitive/perceptual experiments. *Psychon Bull Rev* 2012;19(5):847–57.
22. Simons DJ, Chabris CF. Common (mis)beliefs about memory: A replication and comparison of telephone and mechanical turk survey methods. *PLOS ONE* 2012;7(12):e51876.
23. Asch DA, Ziolek TA, Mehta SJ. Misdirections in Informed Consent - Impediments to Health Care Innovation. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377(15):1412–4.
24. Vogt RL, Mestechkin RM, Chabris CF, Meyer MN. Objecting to consensual experiments even while approving of nonconsensual imposition of the policies they contain [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Mar 31];Available from: <https://psyarxiv.com/8r9p7/>
25. Greene JD, Sommerville RB, Nystrom LE, Darley JM, Cohen JD. An fMRI Investigation of emotional engagement in moral judgment. *Science* 2001;293(5537):2105–8.
26. Mislavsky R, Dietvorst BJ, Simonsohn U. The minimum mean paradox: A mechanical explanation for apparent experiment aversion. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2019;116(48):23883–4.
27. Meyer MN, Heck PR, Holtzman GS, et al. Reply to Mislavsky et al.: Sometimes people

- really are averse to experiments. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2019;116(48):23885–6.
28. Angus DC. Optimizing the Trade-off Between Learning and Doing in a Pandemic. *JAMA* 2020;323(19):1895–6.
  29. Goodman JL, Borio L. Finding Effective Treatments for COVID-19: Scientific Integrity and Public Confidence in a Time of Crisis. *JAMA* 2020;323(19):1899–900.
  30. Manzi J. *Uncontrolled: The Surprising Payoff of Trial-and-Error for Business, Politics, and Society*. Basic Books; 2012.
  31. McCartney M. We need better evidence on non-drug interventions for covid-19. *BMJ* 2020;370:m3473.
  32. Hirt J, Janiaud P, Hemkens LG. Randomized trials on non-pharmaceutical interventions for COVID-19: a scoping review. *BMJ Evid-Based Med* 2022;27(6):334–44.
  33. Simon GE, Platt R, Hernandez AF. Evidence from Pragmatic Trials during Routine Care — Slouching toward a Learning Health System. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382(16):1488–91.
  34. Olsen L, Aisner D, McGinnis JM, editors. *IOM Roundtable on Evidence-Based Medicine, The Learning Healthcare System: Workshop Summary*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2007.
  35. Sherman RE, Anderson SA, Dal Pan GJ, et al. Real-World Evidence — What Is It and What Can It Tell Us? *N Engl J Med* 2016;375(23):2293–7.
  36. Office of the Commissioner. Real-World Evidence [Internet]. FDA. 2023 [cited 2023 Feb 28]; Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/science-research/science-and-research-special-topics/real-world-evidence>
  37. Finkelstein A, Zhou A, Taubman S, Doyle J. Health Care Hotspotting — A Randomized, Controlled Trial. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382(2):152–62.

38. Weinfurt KP, Hernandez AF, Coronado GD, et al. Pragmatic clinical trials embedded in healthcare systems: generalizable lessons from the NIH Collaboratory. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2017;17(1):144.
39. Horwitz LI, Kuznetsova M, Jones SA. Creating a Learning Health System through Rapid-Cycle, Randomized Testing. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381(12):1175–9.
40. Fretheim A. ISRCTN44152751: School opening in Norway during the COVID-19 pandemic [Internet]. [cited 2023 Apr 3]; Available from: <https://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN44152751>

## Experiment aversion among clinicians and the public — an obstacle to evidence-based medicine and public health

Randi L. Vogt<sup>1\*</sup>  
Patrick R. Heck<sup>1\*</sup>  
Rebecca M. Mestechkin<sup>1</sup>  
Pedram Heydari<sup>1,2</sup>  
Christopher F. Chabris<sup>1†</sup>  
Michelle N. Meyer<sup>1†§</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Bioethics & Decision Sciences, Geisinger

<sup>2</sup>Department of Economics, University of Pittsburgh

\*Contributed equally

†Contributed equally

§Correspondence to: michellenmeyer@gmail.com

### Supplemental Appendix

#### Table of Contents

<b>Methods</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Preregistrations, sample sizes, and power analyses.....	3
Procedure and design.....	5
Measures .....	7
Vignettes .....	8
<b>Results</b> .....	<b>9</b>
Sample demographics.....	9
Lay participants.....	9
Clinicians .....	12
Results presented in main text.....	14
Comparisons to previously published work.....	19
Results not presented in the main text.....	19
Results of Best Vaccine vignette (initial ambiguous version).....	19
Order effect in clinician study.....	20
Heterogeneity in experiment aversion .....	21
<b>References</b> .....	<b>29</b>

## Methods

In the main text, we grouped the vignettes thematically into three sets: “Lay Sentiments About Healthcare Experimentation,” “Lay Sentiments About Covid-19 Specific Healthcare Experimentation,” and “Clinician Sentiments About Covid-19 Specific Healthcare Experimentation.” However, when we collected data, we grouped our vignettes differently such that we started with vignettes that we have used in previous published work and their respective Covid-19 derivatives, then we developed and tested novel Covid-19 specific vignettes separately, and then, again separately, we tested a Covid-19 vaccine vignette. We followed a similar pattern in our clinician sample: we first tested three Covid-19 specific vignettes (two which were derivatives of vignettes from our previous work, one which was new to this work) and then separately, we tested a Covid-19 vaccine vignette. These groupings are important for understanding how participants were randomly assigned to vignettes and why there are slight discrepancies (or large discrepancies in the case of the Best Vaccine vignette in the clinician sample<sup>1</sup>) in the number of participants in each vignette (see Table S1).

**Table S1**

*Population, sample size, and dates of data collection for each vignette*

<b>Preregistration #</b>	<b>Vignette</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Sample size</b>	<b>Dates of data collection</b>
1	Catheterization Safety Checklist	MTurk workers	343	August 13, 2020
	Intubation Safety Checklist	MTurk workers	347	August 13, 2020
	Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug	MTurk workers	357	August 13, 2020
	Best Corticosteroid Drug	MTurk workers	357	August 13, 2020
2	Masking Rules	MTurk workers	360	September 30-October 2, 2020
	School Reopening	MTurk workers	339	September 30-October 2, 2020
	Best Vaccine (ambiguous version)*	MTurk workers	350	September 30-October 2, 2020
	Ventilator Proning	MTurk workers	357	September 30-October 2, 2020
3	Intubation Safety Checklist	Clinicians	271	November 13-December 9, 2020
	Best Corticosteroid Drug	Clinicians	275	November 13-December 9, 2020
	Masking Rules	Clinicians	349	November 13-December 9, 2020
4	Best Vaccine	MTurk workers	450	January 8, 2021
5	Best Vaccine	Clinicians	1254	January 25-February 9, 2021

*Note.* Within each data collection batch, participants were randomly assigned to one of the vignettes. In the clinician sample (preregistration #3), clinicians saw all three vignettes in randomized order. The sample size reported here is the number of clinicians who saw that vignette first.

\*Our first attempt at the Best Vaccine vignette included wording that unintentionally made the experiment condition less aversive. For this reason, this vignette is not included in the main analyses.

<sup>1</sup> The Best Vaccine vignette was combined with another study that required a sample size much larger than the sample sizes in our previous vignette studies to have adequate statistical power.



For clarity, in the main text of this article we used different names for the vignettes than those used in the preregistrations and in previous publications (see Table S2).

## Table S2

*Original vignette names from preregistrations and previous work and corresponding name in main text*

Original vignette name	Main text vignette name
Hospital Safety Checklist (also called Checklist)	Catheterization Safety Checklist
Best Drug: Walk-In Clinic (also called Best Drug) Checklist (Covid-19)	Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug
Best Drug (Covid-19)	Intubation Safety Checklist
Ventilator Proning	Best Corticosteroid Drug
School Reopening	Ventilator Proning
Mask Requirements	School Reopening
Modified Covid-19 Vaccines	Masking Rules
Vaccine Distribution	Best Vaccine
	(not reported in main text)

Note. Vignette names in this article were changed from those in previous work and in our preregistrations in order to clarify the content for readers.

## Preregistrations, sample sizes, and power analyses

Our research questions, power analyses and sample sizes, and analysis plans were all preregistered at Open Science Framework (OSF) before data collection. These sample size precommitments are copied from each preregistration document which will be released upon final publication of this paper.

Preregistration 1 (Catheterization Safety Checklist, Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug, Intubation Safety Checklist, Best Corticosteroid Drug vignettes):

“We predict that, using a two-tailed, paired t-test with  $\alpha = .05$  within each scenario, participants will rate the A/B test condition as significantly less appropriate than their own average rating of the two policy conditions,  $\text{mean}(A,B)$ . This is the test for the “A/B Effect.” Recruiting 350 participants for each scenario provides 95% power to detect an effect as small as  $d = 0.19$ , which is substantially smaller than the effect sizes we have observed using the Hospital Safety Checklist and Best Drug: Walk-In Clinic vignettes in past research.”

Preregistration 2 (Ventilator Proning, School Reopening, Masking Rules, and Best Vaccine (initial ambiguous version) vignettes):

“We predict that, using a two-tailed, paired t-test with  $\alpha = .05$  within each scenario, participants will rate the A/B test condition as significantly less appropriate than their own average rating of the two policy conditions,  $\text{mean}(A,B)$ . This is the test for the “A/B Effect.” Recruiting 350

participants for each scenario provides 95% power to detect an effect as small as  $d = 0.19$ , which is substantially smaller than the effect sizes we have observed using the Hospital Safety Checklist and Best Drug: Walk-In Clinic vignettes in past research.”

Preregistration 3 (Clinicians; Intubation Safety Checklist, Best Corticosteroid Drug, and Masking Rules vignettes):

Note that because of time constraints around the possible starting dates of our clinician surveys, we launched this study before preregistering it, and we did not report an explicit power analysis before collecting the data. Because this study follows a similar structure to the studies above, however, it was reasonable to apply the previous sample size and power analysis considerations. We did, however, preregister our approach and research plan twice during this study: once during data collection, before any analyses had been conducted, and again after all data had been collected (but before analyzing any of them).

Preregistration 3.1: “At the time of this preregistration, we have received 655 complete responses. No data have been explored or analyzed at this point. We will conduct an interim analysis on this dataset using the same analyses we have previously preregistered, and we may continue to collect more data from this population.”

Preregistration 3.2: “Data collection is now complete and we have closed the survey. On 11/24/2020, we conducted an interim analysis on 601 complete responses. Since then, we have received an additional 295 complete responses, to which we remain blind.”

Preregistration 4 (Best Vaccine):

“We recruited 350 participants for the original Covid-19 vaccines study. Because we are running this study to determine whether even a small effect emerges, we will increase the sample size to 450 participants. This provides 80% power to detect an effect as small as  $d = 0.13$  in a repeated-measures, two-tailed t-test, and 95% power to detect an effect as small as  $d = 0.17$ .”

Preregistration 5 (Clinicians; Best Vaccine):

“Our previous survey of healthcare providers resulted in approximately 900 complete responses; we expect a similar response rate for this survey. This sample size provides 95% power to detect an effect as small as  $d = 0.12$  using a two-tailed, repeated measures t-test. Even if we only receive 600 complete responses, we will have 95% power to detect an effect as small as  $d = 0.15$ .”

## Procedure and design

Several aspects of the procedure and experimental design were consistent across the studies reported here. Below, we describe these consistent features and note in specific studies where we deviated from them.

For the lay participant samples, we used the CloudResearch service to recruit crowd workers on Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) to participate in a 3–5-minute survey experiment. Participants were excluded from recruitment in any of the studies reported here if they had participated in any of our previous studies on this topic. Across all laypeople vignettes, the completion rate of participants starting the survey was 91.5%. The Geisinger IRB determined that these anonymous surveys were exempt (IRB# 2017-0449).

For the clinician samples, we recruited healthcare providers from a large health system in the Northeastern U.S via email. Each provider received either one or two emails about the study during the recruitment window. In the first clinician study (Intubation Safety Checklist, Best Corticosteroid Drug, and Masking Rules vignettes), we first tested the email recruitment system by sending out the survey invitation email to just 200 clinicians. Clinicians who completed the survey based on this survey invitation were included in the final sample. Then, all clinicians were sent the recruitment email on November 19, 2020, followed by a reminder email on December 3, 2020. In the second clinician study (Best Vaccine), the initial recruitment email was sent January 25, 2021, with the follow-up email sent February 2, 2021. In the first clinician study, 5,925 clinicians were emailed and 895 completed the survey. In the second clinician study, 6,993 clinicians were emailed and 1,254 completed the survey. In these samples, because survey responses were fully anonymous, we were not able to restrict participation based on our previous studies, so some participants who completed the Best Vaccine vignette may have earlier completed the Intubation Safety Checklist, Best Corticosteroid Drug, and Masking Rules vignettes.

In all cases, participants completed an online survey hosted by Qualtrics. After opening the survey, participants were randomly assigned to one of the possible vignettes being studied.<sup>2,3</sup> In

---

<sup>2</sup> For the clinician study of the Intubation Safety Checklist, Best Corticosteroid Drug, and Masking Rules vignettes, clinicians were randomly assigned to one of these three scenarios and then completed the remaining two scenarios in random order. For consistency with the rest of this project and with our previous survey experiment with clinicians regarding the A/B effect (Meyer et al., 2019, Study 6), and in order to make the results from clinician samples comparable to those with lay samples (in which each participant only ever saw one scenario), we analyze data from this study as a between-subjects design where we only consider the first scenario that every participant completed. See the section “Order Effect in Clinician Study” elsewhere in this appendix for further analyses.

<sup>3</sup> The clinician version of the Best Vaccine vignette was combined with another study being conducted by a subset of researchers on this team. The materials for Best Vaccine were presented after the survey materials from the other study. Data from the other study are unrelated to the research questions tested here and will be reported separately.

the case of data collection batches 4 and 5, there was only one vignette being tested that all participants saw. At this point, we used the exact same procedure detailed in Heck et al. (2020)<sup>1</sup>. First, participants were instructed to read about several possible decisions made by different decision-makers<sup>4</sup>, and to try to treat each decision as separate from the others. All scenarios contained a brief “background” text at the top of the page that summarized a problem, followed by three “situations,” each of which detailed the decision-maker’s choice to adopt intervention A, intervention B, or to run an A/B test by randomly assigning people to one of two test conditions. These conditions were presented in fully counterbalanced order; each participant received one of six possible orders (i.e., Situation 1 = A, Situation 2 = B, and Situation 3 = A/B; Situation 1 = A/B, Situation 2 = B, and Situation 3 = A; etc...). At no point did we observe a meaningful effect of presentation order, so we collapsed across this variable for all analyses.

For our primary outcome measures, participants were asked to rate the appropriateness of the decisions made in Situation 1, Situation 2, and Situation 3 (“How appropriate is the director's decision in Situation 1/2/3?”), using a 1-5 scale (1 = “Very inappropriate”, 2 = “Inappropriate”, 3 = “Neither inappropriate nor appropriate”, 4 = “Appropriate”, 5 = “Very appropriate”). Participants then specified a ranked order of the three decisions (“Among these three decisions, which decision do you think the director should make? Please drag and drop the options below into your preferred order from best to worst. You must click on at least one option before you can proceed.”), with 1 being the best decision and 3 being the worst. The last item on this page asked participants to explain why they chose these ratings and rankings in a couple of sentences (“In a couple of sentences, please tell us why you chose the ratings and rankings you chose.”).

Following these primary measures, participants completed standard demographic items on the next page. For MTurk participants, these were measures of sex, race/ethnicity, age, educational attainment, household income, religious belief or affiliation, whether they have a degree in a STEM field or not, and four items identifying political orientation and affiliation. As part of an ongoing study in our laboratory (whose results will be reported elsewhere), these participants were randomized to one of six conditions for this demographic questionnaire where we varied the option to select “prefer not to answer” and whether the items were mandatory, optional, or requested (but not required). For clinician participants, demographic items were mandatory response and were limited to the following: sex, sources of training in research methods and statistics, self-reported comfort with research methods and statistics, past experience with activities related to research methods and statistics (e.g., publishing a scientific paper or analyzing data), current involvement in research, position (e.g., doctor, physician assistant, nurse, medical student, etc.), length of time working in the medical field, and field of specialty.

After completing the survey, MTurk participants were given a completion code to receive payment (\$0.40). Clinician participants were invited to enter into a lottery to win a \$50 Amazon gift card by following a link to an independent survey where they could enter their email address. All participants were thanked for their participation and offered the opportunity to comment on the survey.

---

<sup>4</sup> In all vignettes, the protagonist (e.g., the hospital director or Dr. Jones) was male for ease of comparison to our previous work using these vignettes. Future work should examine the impact of the characteristics of the decision-maker on evaluations of their decisions regarding policy imposition and conducting RCTs.

## Measures

We computed several variables to measure participants' sentiments about experimentation.

Following Meyer et al. (2019)<sup>1</sup>, we define an “A/B effect” as the difference between participants' mean policy rating and their rating of the A/B test—that is, the degree to which the policies are (on average) rated higher than the A/B test. We also report the percentage of participants whose mean policy rating is higher than their rating of the A/B test.

Following Heck et al. (2020<sup>2</sup>; see also Mislavsky et al., 2019<sup>3</sup>), we define “experiment aversion” as the difference between participants' rating of their own lowest-rated policy and their rating of the A/B test. We also report the percentage of participants who express experiment aversion.

“Experiment rejection” (first reported in Heck et al., 2020<sup>2</sup>, but without this name) occurs when a participant rates the A/B test as inappropriate (1 or 2 on the 5-point scale) while also rating each policy as neutral or appropriate (3–5 on the scale).

A “reverse A/B effect” is the difference between participants' rating of the A/B test and their mean policy rating—that is, the degree to which the A/B test is rated higher than the policies (on average). We also report the percentage of participants whose rating of the A/B test is higher than their mean policy rating.

“Experiment appreciation” is the difference between participants' rating of the A/B test and their rating of their own highest-rated policy. We also report the percentage of participants who express experiment appreciation.

“Experiment endorsement” occurs when a participant rates the A/B as appropriate (4 or 5 on the 5-point scale) while also rating each intervention as neutral or inappropriate (1–3 on the scale).

In all cases where a *d*-value was calculated (i.e., A/B effect, experiment aversion, reverse A/B effect, experiment appreciation), we used Cohen's *d* recovered from the *t*-statistic, *n*, and correlation between the two measures being compared (Dunlop et al., 1996, equation 3<sup>4</sup>:  $d = t_c[2(1-r)/n]^{1/2}$ ; see also <http://jakewestfall.org/blog/index.php/category/effect-size/kewestfall.org><sup>5</sup>). To calculate this *d*-value, we use the following R code: `effsize::cohen.d(x,y, paired = TRUE)`.

## Vignettes

Our vignettes were inspired by discussions about the ethics of real-world RCTs (see Table S3).

**Table S3**

*Literature calling for or reporting an RCT similar to what is proposed in each vignette*

Vignette name	Relevant literature
Catheterization Safety Checklist	Pronovost et al., <sup>6</sup> Urbach et al., <sup>7</sup> Arriaga et al. <sup>8</sup>
Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug	ROMP Ethics Study, <sup>9</sup> Sinnott et al. <sup>10</sup>
Intubation Safety Checklist	Turner et al. <sup>11</sup>
Best Corticosteroid Drug	Wagner et al. <sup>12</sup>
Ventilator Proning	Elharrar et al., <sup>13</sup> Sartini et al., <sup>14</sup> Caputo et al. <sup>15</sup>
School Reopening	Fretheim et al. <sup>16,17</sup> , Helsingen et al. <sup>18</sup> , Angrist et al. <sup>19</sup> , Kolata <sup>20</sup>
Masking Rules	Abaluck et al. <sup>21</sup> , Jefferson et al. <sup>22</sup> , Bundgaard et al. <sup>23</sup>
Best Vaccine	Bach <sup>24</sup>

## Results

### Sample demographics

#### *Lay participants*

Across all vignettes reported in the main text (i.e., excluding the initial ambiguous version of the Best Vaccine vignette), there were a total of 2,910 lay participants. They ranged in age from 18 to 88 years old (mean = 38.4, SD = 12.8) and the majority were White (74.6%) and female (55.9%). 35.7% had a 4-year college degree, 29.7% had some college, and 20.5% had a graduate degree. 21.3% of participants had a degree in a STEM field. The most frequently selected income level was between \$20,000 and \$40,000 (20.7%). A majority of participants reported being moderate, leaning liberal, or being liberal both generally and specifically with regards to social and economic issues. Similarly, a majority of participants reported being independent, leaning Democrat, or being Democrat in their political party affiliations. 37.7% of participants reported being non-religious. Of those who reported being religious, the most reported religion was Protestant (24.2%). See Table S4 for demographic breakdowns by vignette and in the combined lay participant sample.

Table S4

*Demographics of lay participants by vignette*

	Catheterization Safety Checklist	Best Anti- Hypertensive Drug	Intubation Safety Checklist	Best Corticosteroid Drug	Best Vaccine (first attempt)	Best Vaccine	School Reopening	Ventilator Proning	Masking Rules	All vignettes
Total N	343	357	346	357	350	450	339	357	360	2909
Age [Mean (SD)]	37.9 (12.9)	38.6 (12.9)	37.9 (12.4)	38.0 (12.7)	36.7 (12.0)	37.7 (12.6)	38.7 (13.0)	39.4 (12.7)	39.0 (12.8)	38.4 (12.8)
Sex (%)										
Male	51.3%	41.5%	48.1%	51.5%	36.6%	38.4%	39.2%	40.9%	39.7%	43.6%
Female	47.8%	58.0%	51.9%	48.2%	63.1%	60.9%	60.5%	58.8%	60.0%	55.9%
Other	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%
Prefer not to answer	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Race - select all that apply (%)										
Black/African-American	11.1%	5.0%	8.4%	10.1%	10.9%	11.3%	9.7%	6.7%	8.9%	9.0%
Hispanic or Latino	8.2%	8.4%	7.2%	8.4%	8.3%	5.6%	5.9%	9.5%	7.5%	7.5%
White	72.0%	78.7%	71.5%	72.0%	70.9%	72.7%	77.0%	77.6%	75.8%	74.6%
Asian	12.5%	8.7%	15.3%	12.6%	12.6%	13.3%	8.6%	7.0%	7.8%	10.8%
Other	1.2%	1.7%	1.2%	0.3%	3.4%	0.9%	1.8%	1.7%	2.2%	1.3%
Prefer not to answer	0.9%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
Education (%)										
Less than high school	0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	9.8%	0.8%	0.4%
High school degree	5.5%	7.8%	8.9%	9.2%	9.1%	10.2%	10.3%	29.4%	11.4%	9.2%
Some college	32.7%	32.2%	24.2%	28.0%	30.3%	32.0%	26.3%	33.6%	31.9%	29.7%
Four-year college degree	37.3%	35.6%	39.5%	35.9%	37.1%	35.8%	37.8%	3.1%	30.6%	35.7%
Some graduate school	4.4%	3.4%	4.6%	4.2%	4.6%	5.1%	4.4%	23.8%	4.7%	4.3%
Graduate degree	19.2%	19.9%	22.5%	22.1%	18.3%	16.2%	20.9%	0.3%	20.6%	20.5%
Prefer not to answer	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Income (%)										
< \$20,000	11.1%	8.4%	9.2%	7.6%	12.0%	9.3%	9.4%	11.2%	9.7%	9.5%
\$20,000-\$40,000	17.8%	22.1%	21.6%	25.8%	19.7%	20.2%	18.9%	19.0%	19.7%	20.7%
\$40,000-\$60,000	24.5%	18.8%	19.0%	20.2%	21.4%	20.4%	21.2%	19.9%	20.8%	20.6%
\$60,000-\$80,000	13.7%	17.4%	16.1%	17.9%	18.6%	17.8%	16.5%	19.3%	19.2%	17.3%
\$80,000-\$100,000	11.4%	13.7%	11.0%	9.5%	10.6%	12.2%	13.3%	8.4%	12.2%	11.5%
> \$100,000	20.7%	18.5%	21.3%	17.4%	17.1%	18.7%	20.4%	19.6%	16.9%	19.1%
Prefer not to answer	0.9%	1.1%	0.9%	1.4%	0.3%	1.3%	0.3%	2.5%	1.4%	1.2%
No response	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Political Ideology (%)										
Very liberal	12.2%	12.6%	13.0%	11.2%	10.6%	13.1%	12.7%	12.0%	12.8%	12.5%
Liberal	32.1%	30.3%	32.3%	35.9%	29.4%	31.1%	30.4%	30.8%	28.6%	31.4%
Moderate	29.2%	25.5%	28.2%	26.1%	31.1%	27.3%	27.7%	24.9%	28.3%	27.1%
Conservative	19.8%	20.2%	20.7%	17.1%	21.7%	18.7%	20.9%	21.3%	23.6%	20.2%
Very conservative	5.8%	10.6%	5.2%	9.5%	6.3%	8.9%	7.4%	9.8%	5.8%	7.9%
Prefer not to answer	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%
No response	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%



Table S4, continued

*Demographics of lay participants by vignette*

	Catheterization Safety Checklist	Best Anti- Hypertensive Drug	Intubation Safety Checklist	Best Corticosteroid Drug	Best Vaccine (first attempt)	Best Vaccine	School Reopening	Ventilator Proning	Masking Rules	All vignettes
Political ideology on social issues (%)										
Very liberal	18.7%	16.8%	19.6%	13.7%	17.7%	18.0%	17.7%	17.6%	17.5%	17.5%
Liberal	34.1%	33.3%	33.4%	40.3%	31.1%	30.4%	36.6%	34.2%	31.7%	34.1%
Moderate	21.6%	23.8%	23.9%	19.9%	26.0%	25.6%	19.8%	21.8%	23.3%	22.6%
Conservative	16.6%	15.4%	17.3%	17.1%	18.0%	16.0%	18.3%	16.0%	19.4%	17.0%
Very conservative	8.2%	10.4%	5.2%	8.4%	6.3%	9.1%	6.8%	9.8%	7.5%	8.2%
Prefer not to answer	0.9%	0.3%	0.6%	0.6%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
No response	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Political ideology on economic issues (%)										
Very liberal	9.9%	12.0%	13.5%	11.2%	8.0%	13.8%	11.8%	10.4%	11.9%	11.9%
Liberal	28.3%	21.6%	27.1%	28.3%	24.9%	23.3%	27.7%	23.0%	19.7%	24.8%
Moderate	28.0%	27.5%	25.1%	25.2%	27.7%	28.4%	24.2%	27.5%	32.2%	27.3%
Conservative	23.0%	24.9%	24.8%	22.1%	30.9%	22.0%	24.2%	25.8%	26.4%	24.1%
Very conservative	9.3%	13.7%	8.6%	12.0%	7.4%	11.3%	11.2%	12.9%	9.2%	11.1%
Prefer not to answer	1.5%	0.3%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%
No response	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Political party (%)										
Strong Democrat	14.9%	10.9%	12.4%	13.7%	12.0%	13.6%	13.0%	14.0%	12.8%	13.2%
Democrat	23.3%	22.7%	27.7%	28.9%	26.3%	24.4%	22.7%	21.0%	21.7%	24.1%
Independent (but lean Democrat)	15.7%	16.2%	14.7%	12.9%	13.4%	14.9%	17.4%	14.3%	15.8%	15.2%
Independent	15.7%	16.8%	17.6%	14.3%	16.9%	16.9%	13.6%	15.1%	18.1%	16.0%
Independent (but lean Republican)	7.0%	8.7%	7.8%	10.4%	9.4%	8.7%	10.6%	10.9%	10.6%	9.3%
Republican	16.3%	14.6%	14.1%	12.0%	13.1%	15.3%	15.6%	14.0%	13.9%	14.5%
Strong Republican	4.1%	8.4%	4.3%	7.3%	6.9%	4.9%	6.5%	9.0%	6.4%	6.3%
Prefer not to answer	2.9%	1.7%	1.4%	0.6%	2.0%	1.3%	0.3%	1.7%	0.8%	1.3%
No response	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Religion (%)										
Christian - Protestant	26.2%	24.6%	23.6%	21.0%	24.6%	24.2%	25.4%	24.4%	23.9%	24.2%
Christian - Catholic	17.5%	16.5%	15.9%	18.2%	17.7%	14.0%	17.1%	18.8%	15.3%	16.6%
Christian - Other	11.1%	11.2%	8.1%	11.2%	11.7%	11.1%	11.8%	10.9%	12.2%	11.0%
Jewish	2.6%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.3%	1.8%	1.4%	2.5%	1.8%
Muslim	2.0%	0.8%	1.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.9%	1.2%	1.1%	1.7%	1.2%
Buddhist	2.3%	1.4%	2.0%	1.7%	1.1%	2.0%	2.4%	0.6%	1.4%	1.7%
Hindu	1.2%	0.6%	2.6%	1.1%	1.7%	1.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.6%	1.1%
Non-religious	32.7%	38.1%	40.9%	40.3%	36.6%	40.0%	35.4%	37.0%	36.4%	37.7%
Other	3.5%	3.6%	2.6%	3.4%	3.7%	3.8%	4.1%	3.4%	4.2%	3.6%
Prefer not to answer	0.9%	1.4%	1.2%	0.6%	0.9%	1.1%	0.6%	1.7%	1.9%	1.2%
No response	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%
STEM degree (%)										
No	77.6%	77.0%	75.2%	76.8%	77.4%	80.7%	78.5%	78.4%	78.6%	77.9%
Yes	21.9%	22.1%	23.3%	22.4%	22.3%	18.7%	21.5%	20.2%	21.1%	21.3%
Prefer not to answer	0.6%	0.8%	1.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
No response	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%

### *Clinicians*

There were 2,149 clinician responses across all vignettes. In the clinician samples, survey responses were anonymous, so we could not restrict participation based on our previous studies so some participants who completed the Intubation Safety Checklist, Best Corticosteroid Drug, and Masking Rules vignettes may have also completed the Best Vaccine vignette. For this reason, demographics are reported separately by vignette in Table S5. Across vignettes, a majority of clinicians were female. Over 50% of participants in the sample were registered nurses, followed by physicians and physician assistants. Over 50% of participants in the sample reported that they had been in the medical field for over 10 years. The clinicians reported that they had received training in research methods and statistics via an average of 1.5 of the sources we listed, and that they engaged in an average of 2.5 research methods and statistics activities. Most clinicians reported being somewhat to moderately comfortable with research methods and statistics.

**Table S5**

*Demographics of clinicians by vignette*

	Intubation Safety Checklist	Best Corticosteroid Drug	Masking Rules	Best Vaccine
Total N	271	275	349	1254
Sex (%)				
Male	18.1%	22.5%	18.1%	18.7%
Female	81.9%	77.1%	81.4%	81.2%
Other	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%
Source of research methods/statistics training - select all that apply (%)				
Undergraduate coursework	48.7%	49.5%	48.7%	47.4%
Professional school instruction	40.2%	31.3%	34.4%	34.4%
Postgraduate coursework	26.2%	20.7%	22.1%	21.1%
CME/CEU courses	27.7%	25.1%	24.1%	25.8%
Self-instruction via peer-reviewed literature	19.2%	15.6%	17.2%	21.3%
Other	7.0%	4.0%	3.2%	3.9%
Total number of research methods/statistics training [mean (SD)]	1.69 (1.22)	1.46 (1.02)	1.50 (1.13)	1.54 (1.16)
Comfort with research methods/statistics (%)				
Not at all	8.9%	12.7%	10.9%	11.1%
Somewhat	37.6%	44.4%	45.8%	46.6%
Moderately	39.5%	32.0%	32.7%	30.8%
Very	11.8%	9.1%	8.9%	9.9%
Extremely	2.2%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%
Research methods/statistics activities - select all that apply (%)				
Read results of RCT in peer-reviewed journal article	81.2%	75.3%	71.9%	71.2%
Changed typical prescription/recommendation after personally reading results of RCT in peer-reviewed journal article	41.0%	33.1%	33.0%	39.8%
Published scientific paper in peer-reviewed journal	13.3%	12.4%	9.7%	12.0%
Conducted or worked on a team conducting an RCT	18.5%	20.0%	19.2%	17.1%
Took a course/class in statistics, biostatistics, research methods	73.1%	69.8%	69.1%	68.5%
Analyzed data for statistical significance outside of course requirement	23.6%	21.8%	19.2%	21.1%
Used statistical software	12.2%	11.6%	11.5%	9.3%
Total number of research methods/statistics activities [mean (SD)]	2.63 (1.69)	2.44 (1.71)	2.34 (1.66)	2.39 (1.72)
Currently involved in research (%)	10.7%	9.1%	9.7%	9.6%
Position (%)				
Doctor	14.8%	14.5%	12.6%	15.7%
Physician Assistant	12.5%	6.9%	9.5%	7.7%
Nurse Practitioner	6.3%	2.5%	4.3%	4.7%
Nurse (RN)	51.3%	57.1%	55.6%	52.8%
Nurse (LPN)	6.3%	9.5%	8.0%	15.6%
Nurse (Other)	1.8%	1.1%	1.4%	0.6%
Genetic Counselor	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-prescribing clinician or staff without clinical credential	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medical student	5.2%	5.5%	4.6%	0.1%
Faculty or Professor	0.4%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%
Other	1.5%	2.2%	3.7%	2.6%
Years in medical field (%)				
< 1 year	2.6%	2.9%	3.2%	2.8%
1-2 years	6.3%	5.5%	6.0%	5.8%
3-5 years	15.1%	11.3%	12.6%	13.6%
6-10 years	16.6%	14.2%	15.8%	15.8%
> 10 years	59.4%	66.2%	62.5%	62.0%

*Note.* Reported here are the demographics of the clinicians who saw the Intubation Safety Checklist, Best Corticosteroid Drug, or Masking Rules vignette first (responses to the Best Vaccine vignette were collected at a different time). All clinicians who participated in this study completed all vignettes but in randomized order. In the main text, we only analyze responses to the first vignette so we report demographics similarly here.

## Results presented in main text

In Table S6A-C, we present the descriptive and inferential results for all vignettes discussed in the main text.

**Table S6A**

*Descriptive and inferential results of ratings and rankings of interventions and experiment for all vignettes*

Vignette	Variable	Descriptive Results			Inferential Results	
		Mean (SD)	% Ranking Best	% Ranking Worst	Test Description	Test Outcome
<b>Lay Sentiments About Healthcare Experimentation</b>						
Catheterization Safety Checklist (n = 343 laypeople)					A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t (342) = 9.74***, d = 0.69 ± .16 58% ± 5%
	A	3.77 (1.12)	27%	32%	Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t (342) = -9.74***, d = -0.69 ± .16 27% ± 4%
	B	4.03 (1.09)	42%	21%	Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t (342) = 3.70***, d = 0.25 ± .14 41% ± 5%
	AB	3.09 (1.40)	32%	48%	Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t (342) = -14.61***, d = -1.13 ± .20 15% ± 3%
	Mean(A,B)	3.90 (0.84)	-	-	Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	28% ± 5%
	Min(A,B)	3.42 (1.16)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	3% ± 1%
Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug (n = 357 laypeople)					A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t (356) = 6.68***, d = 0.52 ± .16 47% ± 5%
	A	3.87 (1.00)	25%	27%	Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t (356) = -6.68***, d = -0.52 ± .16 31% ± 5%
	B	3.89 (0.99)	25%	28%	Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t (356) = 5.96***, d = 0.46 ± .16 44% ± 5%
	AB	3.24 (1.47)	50%	45%	Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t (356) = -7.26***, d = -0.57 ± .17 29% ± 4%
	Mean(A,B)	3.88 (0.95)	-	-	Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	34% ± 5%
	Min(A,B)	3.82 (1.03)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	18% ± 4%

*Note.* The A/B Effect refers to the difference between the average rating of the two interventions and the rating of the A/B test. Mean(A,B) > AB is the percentage of people whose average intervention rating was higher than their rating of the A/B test. The Reverse A/B Effect refers to difference between the rating of the A/B test and the average rating of the two interventions. AB > Mean(A,B) is the percentage of people who rating of the A/B test was higher than their average intervention rating. Experiment Aversion refers to the difference between the rating of the A/B test and the lowest-rated intervention. Min(A,B) > AB is the percentage of people whose lowest-rated intervention is rated higher than their rating of the A/B test. Experiment Appreciation refers to the difference between the rating of the highest-rated intervention and the rating of the A/B test. AB > Max(A,B) is the percentage of people whose rating of the A/B test is higher than the rating of their highest-rated intervention. Experiment Rejection is the percentage of people who rated interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or more appropriate while rating the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" inappropriate. Experiment Endorsement is the percentage of people who rated the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" appropriate while rating interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or less appropriate.

\*p < .05

\*\*p < .01

\*\*\*p < .001

**Table S6B**

*Descriptive and inferential results of ratings and rankings of interventions and experiment for all vignettes*

<i>Descriptive Results</i>					<i>Inferential Results</i>	
Vignette	Variable	Mean (SD)	% Ranking Best	% Ranking Worst	Test Description	Test Outcome
<b>Lay Sentiments About Covid-19 Specific Healthcare Experimentation</b>						
Intubation Safety Checklist (n = 346 laypeople)	A	3.81 (1.10)	29%	29%	A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t(345) = 10.69***, d = 0.75 ± .16 58% ± 5%
	B	3.99 (1.13)	43%	19%	Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t(345) = -10.69***, d = -0.75 ± .16 25% ± 4%
	AB	2.98 (1.46)	29%	52%	Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t(345) = 5.28***, d = 0.35 ± .14 45% ± 5%
	Mean(A,B)	3.90 (0.88)	-	-	Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t(345) = -14.94***, d = -1.14 ± .19 14% ± 3%
	Min(A,B)	3.46 (1.19)	-	-	Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	31% ± 5%
	Max(A,B)	4.34 (0.84)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	4% ± 2%
					A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t(356) = 2.28*, d = 0.17 ± .15 34% ± 5%
					Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t(356) = -2.28*, d = -0.17 ± .15 38% ± 5%
					Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t(356) = 1.55, p = .123, d = 0.12 ± .15 31% ± 5%
					Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t(356) = -2.99**, d = -0.23 ± .15 35% ± 5%
Best Corticosteroid Drug (n = 357 laypeople)	A	3.89 (1.03)	17%	32%	Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	22% ± 4%
	B	3.90 (1.00)	18%	37%	Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	17% ± 4%
	AB	3.69 (1.37)	65%	31%	A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t(449) = 2.41*, d = 0.15 ± .12 34% ± 4%
	Mean(A,B)	3.90 (0.99)	-	-	Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t(449) = -2.41*, d = -0.15 ± .12 36% ± 4%
	Min(A,B)	3.83 (1.04)	-	-	Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t(449) = 0.61, p = .546, d = 0.04 ± .12 29% ± 4%
	Max(A,B)	3.96 (0.98)	-	-	Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t(449) = -4.06***, d = -0.25 ± .12 32% ± 4%
					Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	17% ± 3%
					Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	13% ± 3%
					A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t(449) = 2.41*, d = 0.15 ± .12 34% ± 4%
					Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t(449) = -2.41*, d = -0.15 ± .12 36% ± 4%
Best Vaccine (n = 450 laypeople)	A	3.95 (1.09)	26%	27%	Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t(449) = 0.61, p = .546, d = 0.04 ± .12 29% ± 4%
	B	3.84 (1.09)	19%	39%	Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t(449) = -4.06***, d = -0.25 ± .12 32% ± 4%
	AB	3.72 (1.34)	55%	34%	Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	17% ± 3%
	Mean(A,B)	3.90 (1.03)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	13% ± 3%
	Min(A,B)	3.77 (1.13)	-	-	A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t(449) = 2.41*, d = 0.15 ± .12 34% ± 4%
	Max(A,B)	4.03 (1.04)	-	-	Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t(449) = -2.41*, d = -0.15 ± .12 36% ± 4%
					Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t(449) = 0.61, p = .546, d = 0.04 ± .12 29% ± 4%
					Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t(449) = -4.06***, d = -0.25 ± .12 32% ± 4%
					Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	17% ± 3%
					Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	13% ± 3%

*Note.* The A/B Effect refers to the difference between the average rating of the two interventions and the rating of the A/B test. Mean(A,B) > AB is the percentage of people whose average intervention rating was higher than their rating of the A/B test. The Reverse A/B Effect refers to difference between the rating of the A/B test and the average rating of the two interventions. AB > Mean(A,B) is the percentage of people who rating of the A/B test was higher than their average intervention rating. Experiment Aversion refers to the difference between the rating of the A/B test and the lowest-rated intervention. Min(A,B) > AB is the percentage of people whose lowest-rated intervention is rated higher than their rating of the A/B test. Experiment Appreciation refers to the difference between the rating of the highest-rated intervention and the rating of the A/B test. AB > Max(A,B) is the percentage of people whose rating of the A/B test is higher than the rating of their highest-rated intervention. Experiment Rejection is the percentage of people who rated interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or more appropriate while rating the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" inappropriate. Experiment Endorsement is the percentage of people who rated the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" appropriate while rating interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or less appropriate.

\*p < .05

\*\*p < .01

\*\*\*p < .001

**Table S6B, continued**

*Descriptive and inferential results of ratings and rankings of interventions and experiment for all vignettes*

Descriptive Results					Inferential Results	
Vignette	Variable	Mean (SD)	% Ranking Best	% Ranking Worst	Test Description	Test Outcome
<b>Lay Sentiments About Covid-19 Specific Healthcare Experimentation</b>						
					A/B Effect	$t(338) = 6.42^{***}, d = 0.39 \pm .12$
					Mean(A,B) > AB	46% ± 5%
					Reverse A/B effect	$t(338) = -6.42^{***}, d = -0.39 \pm .12$
					AB > Mean(A,B)	28% ± 5%
School Reopening	A	3.45 (1.15)	17%	46%	Experiment Aversion	$t(338) = 0.47, p = .638, d = 0.03 \pm .12$
	B	3.96 (1.03)	53%	14%	Min(A,B) > AB	28% ± 5%
	AB	3.24 (1.36)	30%	40%	Experiment Appreciation	$t(338) = -11.25^{***}, d = -0.75 \pm .15$
	Mean(A,B)	3.70 (0.90)	-	-	AB > Max(A,B)	15% ± 3%
	Min(A,B)	3.28 (1.15)	-	-	Experiment Rejection	(A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2) 19% ± 4%
	Max(A,B)	4.12 (0.91)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement	(AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3) 4% ± 2%
					A/B Effect	$t(356) = 6.07^{***}, d = 0.42 \pm .14$
					Mean(A,B) > AB	45% ± 5%
					Reverse A/B effect	$t(356) = -6.07^{***}, d = -0.42 \pm .14$
					AB > Mean(A,B)	31% ± 5%
Ventilator	A	3.82 (1.09)	21%	33%	Experiment Aversion	$t(356) = 2.63^{**}, d = 0.17 \pm .13$
	B	3.96 (1.07)	36%	25%	Min(A,B) > AB	36% ± 5%
	AB	3.39 (1.38)	43%	42%	Experiment Appreciation	$t(356) = -8.927^{***}, d = -0.64 \pm .16$
	Mean(A,B)	3.89 (0.96)	-	-	AB > Max(A,B)	22% ± 4%
	Min(A,B)	3.61 (1.11)	-	-	Experiment Rejection	(A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2) 23% ± 4%
	Max(A,B)	4.17 (0.99)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement	(AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3) 6% ± 2%
					A/B Effect	$t(359) = 14.55^{***}, d = 1.07 \pm .18$
					Mean(A,B) > AB	68% ± 5%
					Reverse A/B effect	$t(359) = -14.55^{***}, d = -1.07 \pm .18$
					AB > Mean(A,B)	21% ± 4%
Masking	A	4.19 (0.95)	44%	14%	Experiment Aversion	$t(359) = 7.63^{***}, d = 0.56 \pm .15$
	B	3.80 (1.34)	38%	27%	Min(A,B) > AB	50% ± 5%
	AB	2.74 (1.38)	18%	59%	Experiment Appreciation	$t(359) = -20.85^{***}, d = -1.57 \pm .22$
	Mean(A,B)	4.00 (0.91)	-	-	AB > Max(A,B)	8% ± 2%
	Min(A,B)	3.47 (1.22)	-	-	Experiment Rejection	(A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2) 38% ± 5%
	Max(A,B)	4.53 (0.84)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement	(AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3) 3% ± 1%

*Note.* The A/B Effect refers to the difference between the average rating of the two interventions and the rating of the A/B test. Mean(A,B) > AB is the percentage of people whose average intervention rating was higher than their rating of the A/B test. The Reverse A/B Effect refers to difference between the rating of the A/B test and the average rating of the two interventions. AB > Mean(A,B) is the percentage of people who rating of the A/B test was higher than their average intervention rating. Experiment Aversion refers to the difference between the rating of the A/B test and the lowest-rated intervention. Min(A,B) > AB is the percentage of people whose lowest-rated intervention is rated higher than their rating of the A/B test. Experiment Appreciation refers to the difference between the rating of the highest-rated intervention and the rating of the A/B test. AB > Max(A,B) is the percentage of people whose rating of the A/B test is higher than the rating of their highest-rated intervention. Experiment Rejection is the percentage of people who rated interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or more appropriate while rating the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" inappropriate. Experiment Endorsement is the percentage of people who rated the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" appropriate while rating interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or less appropriate.

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

\*\*\* $p < .001$

**Table S6C**

*Descriptive and inferential results of ratings and rankings of interventions and experiment for all vignettes*

<i>Descriptive Results</i>					<i>Inferential Results</i>	
Vignette	Variable	Mean (SD)	% Ranking Best	% Ranking Worst	Test Description	Test Outcome
<b>Clinician Sentiments About Covid-19 Specific Healthcare Experimentation</b>						
Intubation Safety Checklist (n = 271 clinicians)	A	3.37 (1.26)	19%	32%	A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t (270) = 9.00***, d = 0.71 ± .17 57% ± 6%
	B	3.90 (1.12)	53%	14%	Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t (270) = -9.00***, d = -0.71 ± .17 23% ± 5%
	AB	2.74 (1.49)	28%	54%	Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t (270) = 3.98***, d = 0.30 ± .15 43% ± 6%
	Mean(A,B)	3.63 (0.96)	-	-	Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t (270) = -12.70***, d = -1.08 ± .21 16% ± 4%
	Min(A,B)	3.14 (1.23)	-	-	Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	28% ± 5%
	Max(A,B)	4.12 (1.01)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	6% ± 2%
					A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t (274) = 6.59***, d = 0.52 ± .17 48% ± 6%
					Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t (274) = -6.59***, d = -0.52 ± .17 27% ± 5%
					Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t (274) = 6.18***, d = 0.49 ± .17 46% ± 6%
					Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t (274) = -6.93***, d = -0.55 ± .17 26% ± 5%
				Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	34% ± 5%	
				Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	15% ± 4%	
Best Corticosteroid Drug (n = 275 clinicians)	A	3.76 (1.10)	28%	28%	A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t (274) = 6.59***, d = 0.52 ± .17 48% ± 6%
	B	3.74 (1.09)	23%	26%	Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t (274) = -6.59***, d = -0.52 ± .17 27% ± 5%
	AB	3.04 (1.56)	49%	46%	Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t (274) = 6.18***, d = 0.49 ± .17 46% ± 6%
	Mean(A,B)	3.75 (1.08)	-	-	Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t (274) = -6.93***, d = -0.55 ± .17 26% ± 5%
	Min(A,B)	3.71 (1.11)	-	-	Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	34% ± 5%
	Max(A,B)	3.79 (1.08)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	15% ± 4%

*Note.* The A/B Effect refers to the difference between the average rating of the two interventions and the rating of the A/B test. Mean(A,B) > AB is the percentage of people whose average intervention rating was higher than their rating of the A/B test. The Reverse A/B Effect refers to difference between the rating of the A/B test and the average rating of the two interventions. AB > Mean(A,B) is the percentage of people who rating of the A/B test was higher than their average intervention rating. Experiment Aversion refers to the difference between the rating of the A/B test and the lowest-rated intervention. Min(A,B) > AB is the percentage of people whose lowest-rated intervention is rated higher than their rating of the A/B test. Experiment Appreciation refers to the difference between the rating of the highest-rated intervention and the rating of the A/B test. AB > Max(A,B) is the percentage of people whose rating of the A/B test is higher than the rating of their highest-rated intervention. Experiment Rejection is the percentage of people who rated interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or more appropriate while rating the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" inappropriate. Experiment Endorsement is the percentage of people who rated the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" appropriate while rating interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or less appropriate.

\*p < .05

\*\*p < .01

\*\*\*p < .001

Table S6C, continued

Descriptive and inferential results of ratings and rankings of interventions and experiment for all vignettes

Descriptive Results					Inferential Results		
Vignette	Variable	Mean (SD)	% Ranking Best	% Ranking Worst	Test Description	Test Outcome	
<b>Clinician Sentiments About Covid-19 Specific Healthcare Experimentation</b>							
Masking (n = 349 clinicians)	A	4.19 (1.05)	39%	15%	A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t(348) = 16.50***, d = 1.27 ± .20 72% ± 5%	
	B	4.01 (1.24)	44%	22%	Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t(348) = -16.50***, d = -1.27 ± .20 16% ± 3%	
	AB	2.61 (1.41)	17%	62%	Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t(348) = 9.72***, d = 0.74 ± .17 57% ± 5%	
	Rules	Mean(A,B)	4.10 (0.88)	-	-	Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t(348) = -22.58***, d = -1.74 ± .24 6% ± 2%
	Min(A,B)	3.58 (1.20)	-	-	Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	43% ± 5%	
	Max(A,B)	4.62 (0.82)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	2% ± 1%	
	A	3.56 (1.17)	27%	28%	A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t(1253) = 2.50*, d = 0.10 ± .07 35% ± 3%	
	B	3.40 (1.18)	17%	39%	Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t(1253) = -2.50*, d = -0.10 ± .07 34% ± 3%	
	Best	AB	3.36 (1.38)	56%	33%	Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t(1253) = -0.89, p = .375, d = -0.03 ± .07 29% ± 2%
	Vaccine (n = 1254 clinicians)	Mean(A,B)	3.48 (1.09)	-	-	Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t(1253) = -5.49***, d = -0.22 ± .08 30% ± 2%
Min(A,B)	3.32 (1.18)	-	-	Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	20% ± 2%		
Max(A,B)	3.64 (1.16)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	20% ± 2%		

Note. The A/B Effect refers to the difference between the average rating of the two interventions and the rating of the A/B test. Mean(A,B) > AB is the percentage of people whose average intervention rating was higher than their rating of the A/B test. The Reverse A/B Effect refers to difference between the rating of the A/B test and the average rating of the two interventions. AB > Mean(A,B) is the percentage of people who rating of the A/B test was higher than their average intervention rating. Experiment Aversion refers to the difference between the rating of the A/B test and the lowest-rated intervention. Min(A,B) > AB is the percentage of people whose lowest-rated intervention is rated higher than their rating of the A/B test. Experiment Appreciation refers to the difference between the rating of the highest-rated intervention and the rating of the A/B test. AB > Max(A,B) is the percentage of people whose rating of the A/B test is higher than the rating of their highest-rated intervention. Experiment Rejection is the percentage of people who rated interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or more appropriate while rating the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" inappropriate. Experiment Endorsement is the percentage of people who rated the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" appropriate while rating interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or less appropriate.

\*p < .05  
\*\*p < .01  
\*\*\*p < .001



### ***Comparisons to previously published work***

To compare these results to our previous findings reporting sentiments about experiments, as we do in the main text, please refer to Heck et al. (2020)<sup>2</sup>. For example, in the Results section “Lay Sentiments About Healthcare Experimentation,” we say, “these levels of experiment aversion near the height of the pandemic were slightly (but not significantly) higher than those we observed among similar laypeople in 2019 (41% ± 5% in 2020 vs. 37% ± 6% in 2019 for Catheterization Safety Checklist,  $p = .31$  ; 44% ± 5% in 2020 vs. 40% ± 6% in 2019 for Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug,  $p = .32$ ).” We extracted the percentage of participants who were experiment averse in 2019 from Heck et al. (2020)<sup>2</sup>. We then performed a two-sample z-test for proportions to compare the 2019 and 2020 proportions. As noted in the main text, we did not find a significant difference between the percentage of people who were experiment averse in 2019 and the percentage of people who were experiment averse in the current studies which took place in 2020 and 2021 (Catheterization Safety Checklist:  $\chi^2(1) = 1.034$ ,  $p = .309$ , Anti-Hypertensive Drug:  $\chi^2(1) = 0.998$ ,  $p = .318$ ).

### **Results not presented in the main text**

#### ***Results of Best Vaccine vignette (initial ambiguous version)***

The only vignette which showed no A/B Effect was the initial ambiguous version of Best Vaccine (see Table S6D). The two versions of Best Vaccine both presented a public health official’s decision to either distribute an mRNA-based vaccine to every county in their state, distribute an inactivated-virus vaccine to every county, or run an experiment in which counties are randomized to receive one of the two vaccine types. However, in version 1, the wording unintentionally implied that residents could choose their vaccine (by going elsewhere) if they did not wish to be subject to the official’s decision (including intervention implementation or A/B test), while in version 2 we eliminated this possible interpretation; we suspect this had the effect of making the experiment condition in version 1 less aversive, since people could effectively opt-out of it, and our goal in this research is to study pragmatic, real-world situations in which avoiding randomization is typically not a realistic option.

**Table S6D**

*Descriptive and inferential results of ratings and rankings of interventions and experiment for all vignettes*

<i>Descriptive Results</i>					<i>Inferential Results</i>	
Vignette	Variable	Mean (SD)	% Ranking Best	% Ranking Worst	Test Description	Test Outcome
Best Vaccine (initial ambiguous version; n = 350 laypeople)	A	3.58 (1.08)	21%	29%	A/B Effect Mean(A,B) > AB	t (349) = -0.72, p = .473, d = -0.05 ± .15 33% ± 5%
	B	3.47 (1.10)	21%	40%	Reverse A/B effect AB > Mean(A,B)	t (349) = 0.72, p = .473, d = 0.05 ± .15 45% ± 5%
	AB	3.59 (1.37)	58%	31%	Experiment Aversion Min(A,B) > AB	t (349) = -2.28*, d = -0.17 ± .15 29% ± 5%
	Mean(A,B)	3.53 (1.02)	-	-	Experiment Appreciation AB > Max(A,B)	t (349) = -0.84, p = .399, d = -0.07 ± .15 40% ± 5%
	Min(A,B)	3.38 (1.11)	-	-	Experiment Rejection (A,B = 3,4,5; AB = 1,2)	21% ± 4%
	Max(A,B)	3.67 (1.05)	-	-	Experiment Endorsement (AB = 4,5; A,B = 1,2,3)	24% ± 4%

### *Order effect in clinician study*

For the clinician study of the Catheterization Safety Checklist, Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug, and Masking Rules vignettes, participants were randomly assigned to one of these three vignettes and then completed the remaining two vignettes in random order. For consistency with the rest of this project and with our previous approach (Meyer et al., 2019)<sup>1</sup>, we analyze data from this study as a between-subjects design where we only consider the first vignette that every participant completed.

While conducting an interim analysis on the data for this study, we observed an intriguing and unexpected order effect of presentation.

For the first 601 complete responses we received, we observed an effect of presentation order on participants' appropriateness ratings of the A/B test condition within the Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug vignette. Participants who received the Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug vignette first rated the A/B test an average of 2.95 (SD = 1.57), participants who received this vignette second rated the A/B test an average of 3.48 (SD = 1.39), and participants who received this vignette last rated the A/B test an average of 3.78 (SD = 1.41). This suggests that participants who read about other policies and A/B tests before considering the Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug vignette found the A/B test in the Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug vignette to be less objectionable than participants who received this vignette earlier in the survey. The relationship between presentation order (1, 2, or 3) and appropriateness rating of the A/B test was  $r = .23$ . This order effect did not emerge for the other two vignettes or for ratings of either intervention (A or B).

After observing this order effect but before examining any additional data, we preregistered this order effect with the goal of replicating it in an independent sample. 294 new participants completed the study after this interim analysis, and we analyzed the data from this sample independently from the sample that generated the order effect. Table S7 displays ratings of the A/B condition within each scenario grouped by the order in which participants received them.

The order effect observed with the Best Anti-Hypertensive Drug A/B test condition replicated ( $r = .15$ ), as did the absence of any similar order effect for the other conditions.

**Table S7**

*Ratings of A/B test in Clinician Sample*

Exploratory Sample (N = 601)	Best Corticosteroid Drug	Intubation Safety Checklist	Masking Rules
	A/B Rating (SD)	A/B Rating (SD)	A/B Rating (SD)
Target Scenario First	2.95 (1.57)	2.79 (1.49)	2.63 (1.43)
Target Scenario Second	3.48 (1.39)	2.53 (1.35)	2.66 (1.44)
Target Scenario Last	3.78 (1.41)	2.78 (1.38)	2.57 (1.29)

Confirmatory Sample (N = 294)	Best Corticosteroid Drug	Intubation Safety Checklist	Masking Rules
	A/B Rating (SD)	A/B Rating (SD)	A/B Rating (SD)
Target Scenario First	3.22 (1.54)	2.63 (1.50)	2.58 (1.38)
Target Scenario Second	3.49 (1.51)	2.76 (1.39)	2.38 (1.42)
Target Scenario Last	3.77 (1.33)	2.69 (1.15)	2.51 (1.38)

***Heterogeneity in experiment aversion***

In both the lay participant sample and the clinician sample, associations between demographic variables, including educational attainment, having a degree in a STEM field, years of experience in the medical field, and role in the healthcare system, and sentiment about experimentation (e.g., A/B effect, experiment aversion, experiment appreciation) are consistently small ( $r < |.13|$ ), therefore explaining less than 2% of the variance; Tables S8–11).

In the lay sample, women show larger AB and experiment aversion effects (e.g., larger difference between mean intervention rating/lowest-rated intervention rating and AB test rating;  $r = .067-.068$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and a smaller experiment appreciation effect (e.g., smaller difference between AB test and highest-rated intervention rating;  $r = -.064$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Lay participants who are more conservative (in general and with respect to social and economic issues) or more likely to be strong Republicans show lower levels of an AB effect and experiment aversion (i.e., smaller difference between mean intervention rating/lowest-rated intervention rating and AB test rating; all  $r_s < -.094$ ,  $p_s < .0001$ ). These participants also show significantly more experiment appreciation, though the strength of the association is weaker ( $r_s = .037-.046$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). Finally, we find that people who are non-religious show a larger degree of experiment aversion ( $r = .061$ ,  $p < .001$ ; they also show a larger AB effect,  $r = .051$ , but  $p = .007$  which is greater than  $p < .005$ , the standard proposed in Benjamin et al. (2018)<sup>17</sup> for exploratory analyses without a priori hypotheses). For all other variables, we find no significant associations between the individual difference measures and experiment sentiments (all  $r_s < |.051|$ , all  $p_s > .005$ ).

In the clinician sample, the strongest association was between self-reported comfort with research methods and statistics and experiment aversion—clinicians who report being more comfortable with research methods and statistics are more likely to appreciate the A/B test ( $r = .070$ ,  $p = .001$ ).

Table S8

*Correlations between lay participant characteristics and sentiments about experiments*

	Size of A/B effect		A/B effect		Size of experiment aversion		Experiment aversion		Experiment rejection		Size of experiment appreciation		Experiment appreciation		Experiment endorsement	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Age	-0.008	0.662	-0.020	0.286	-0.020	0.270	-0.038	0.043	-0.046	0.012	-0.004	0.809	-0.016	0.389	-0.033	0.073
Sex (1 = male, 2 = female)	0.068	<.001	0.048	0.010	0.067	<.001	0.039	0.035	0.059	0.002	-0.064	<.001	-0.071	<.001	-0.036	0.053
Race (0 = all other, 1 = Nonhispanic White)	-0.004	0.814	-0.017	0.360	-0.001	0.945	-0.016	0.388	0.003	0.867	0.007	0.706	0.001	0.937	-0.012	0.533
Education	0.047	0.011	0.033	0.075	0.049	0.008	0.051	0.006	0.029	0.114	-0.042	0.024	-0.023	0.216	-0.019	0.298
Income	0.020	0.293	0.005	0.787	0.020	0.273	0.011	0.571	0.005	0.777	-0.017	0.353	-0.025	0.184	-0.026	0.158
Political Ideology (1 = Very Liberal, 5 = Very Conservative)	-0.114	<.0001	-0.087	<.0001	-0.118	<.0001	-0.101	<.0001	-0.091	<.0001	0.101	<.0001	0.043	0.022	0.045	0.015
Political Ideology (Social) (1 = Very Liberal, 5 = Very Conservative)	-0.123	<.0001	-0.099	<.0001	-0.128	<.0001	-0.118	<.0001	-0.106	<.0001	0.109	<.0001	0.039	0.036	0.052	0.005
Political Ideology (Economic) (1 = Very Liberal, 5 = Very Conservative)	-0.094	<.0001	-0.065	<.001	-0.095	<.0001	-0.082	<.0001	-0.073	<.0001	0.085	<.0001	0.046	0.013	0.040	0.031
Political Party (1 = Strong Democrat, 7 = Strong Republican)	-0.096	<.0001	-0.073	<.0001	-0.098	<.0001	-0.075	<.0001	-0.075	<.0001	0.087	<.0001	0.037	0.050	0.035	0.063
Conservatism (mean of z-scored Political Ideology, Political Ideology (Social), Political Ideology (Economic), and Political Party)	-0.117	<.0001	-0.089	<.0001	-0.121	<.0001	-0.103	<.0001	-0.095	<.0001	0.105	<.0001	0.045	0.015	0.047	0.012
Non-religious (0 = Religious (any religion), 1 = Non-religious)	0.051	0.007	0.027	0.150	0.061	<.001	0.049	0.009	0.046	0.015	-0.036	0.053	-0.013	0.496	-0.021	0.266
STEM degree (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0.023	0.208	0.016	0.399	0.027	0.154	0.026	0.157	0.027	0.142	-0.019	0.318	0.016	0.403	0.024	0.205

*Note.* Size of the A/B effect refers to the magnitude of the difference between the mean intervention rating and the A/B test rating. A/B effect refers to the presence or absence of an A/B effect -- people who have a positive difference between their mean intervention rating and their A/B test rating show the A/B effect, people who have no difference or a negative difference between their mean intervention rating and their A/B test rating do not show an A/B effect. Size of experiment aversion refers to the magnitude of the difference between the worst intervention rating and the A/B test rating. Experiment aversion refers to the presence or absence of experiment aversion -- people who have a positive difference between their rating of their least-preferred intervention and their A/B test rating are experiment averse, people who have no difference or a negative difference are not experiment averse. Experiment rejection refers to the presence or absence of experiment rejection -- people who rate interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or more appropriate while rating the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" inappropriate reject the experiment. Size of experiment appreciation refers to the magnitude of the difference between the A/B test rating and the best intervention. Experiment appreciation refers to the presence or absence of experiment appreciation -- people who have a positive difference between their rating of the A/B test and their rating of their most-preferred intervention are experiment appreciative. Experiment endorsement refers to the presence or absence of experiment endorsement -- people who rate the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" appropriate while rating interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or less appropriate endorse the experiment.

**Table S9***Means and percentages of sentiments about experiments by demographic variable in lay participants*

	Size of A/B effect		A/B effect	Size of experiment aversion		Experiment aversion	Experiment rejection	Size of experiment appreciation		Experiment appreciation	Experiment endorsement
	mean	SD	%	mean	SD	%	%	mean	SD	%	%
Sex											
Male	0.479	1.620	45.6	0.183	1.650	35.7	23.2	-0.775	1.730	25.0	9.8
Female	0.703	1.630	50.4	0.408	1.680	39.5	28.4	-0.998	1.710	19.1	7.8
Other	0.571	1.880	28.6	0.429	1.810	28.6	28.6	-0.714	1.980	28.6	0.0
Prefer not to answer	0.900	1.880	60.0	0.800	1.920	40.0	20.0	-1.000	1.870	20.0	0.0
Race											
Black/African-American	0.504	1.597	49.8	0.149	1.647	37.2	21.8	-0.858	1.681	21.5	9.6
Hispanic or Latino	0.692	1.646	50.2	0.429	1.675	38.8	28.8	-0.954	1.726	20.1	7.8
White	0.601	1.631	47.7	0.309	1.671	37.2	26.2	-0.893	1.724	21.7	8.4
Asian	0.594	1.634	47.1	0.296	1.645	39.2	26.1	-0.892	1.757	23.2	10.5
Other	0.679	1.730	48.7	0.256	1.831	38.5	23.1	-1.103	1.818	25.6	5.1
Prefer not to answer	1.200	1.623	60.0	0.933	1.624	40.0	33.3	-1.467	1.767	13.3	6.7
Education											
Less than high school	1.580	1.440	75.0	1.330	1.610	58.3	41.7	-1.830	1.400	0.0	0.0
High school degree	0.403	1.550	42.2	0.093	1.650	30.6	22.0	-0.713	1.610	20.9	9.0
Some college	0.524	1.690	47.5	0.216	1.720	36.3	25.2	-0.831	1.790	24.2	10.2
Four-year college degree	0.643	1.620	48.7	0.361	1.650	38.4	26.7	-0.925	1.710	21.4	8.0
Some graduate school	0.673	1.600	50.0	0.379	1.640	37.9	28.2	-0.968	1.700	20.2	6.5
Graduate degree	0.713	1.590	50.6	0.419	1.620	41.7	27.8	-1.010	1.690	19.8	8.2
Prefer not to answer	0.750	1.720	50.0	0.667	1.750	33.3	16.7	-0.833	1.720	16.7	0.0
Income											
< \$20,000	0.672	1.570	47.8	0.380	1.650	37.7	26.8	-0.964	1.640	17.4	6.9
\$20,000-\$40,000	0.480	1.700	46.6	0.215	1.730	37.1	25.0	-0.745	1.790	27.8	10.8
\$40,000-\$60,000	0.592	1.630	49.4	0.220	1.670	36.9	25.4	-0.930	1.750	20.5	8.9
\$60,000-\$80,000	0.629	1.620	49.5	0.376	1.640	38.0	27.4	-0.883	1.710	20.9	10.5
\$80,000-\$100,000	0.741	1.520	50.0	0.488	1.530	41.3	27.2	-0.994	1.640	18.9	6.0
> \$100,000	0.608	1.620	47.2	0.302	1.680	37.5	25.7	-0.914	1.700	21.0	7.4
Prefer not to answer	0.861	1.940	47.2	0.556	2.080	38.9	36.1	-1.170	1.930	19.4	2.8
No response	-0.250	0.866	25.0	-0.500	1.000	0.0	0.0	0.000	0.816	25.0	0.0

Table S9, continued

*Means and percentages of sentiments about experiments by demographic variable in lay participants*

	Size of A/B effect		A/B effect	Size of experiment aversion		Experiment aversion	Experiment rejection	Size of experiment appreciation		Experiment appreciation	Experiment endorsement
	mean	SD	%	mean	SD	%	%	mean	SD	%	%
Political Ideology											
Very liberal	0.888	1.740	54.3	0.590	1.780	44.1	31.1	-1.190	1.830	19.8	6.1
Liberal	0.753	1.650	51.6	0.491	1.680	42.3	29.8	-1.010	1.740	20.2	8.2
Moderate	0.557	1.570	47.5	0.247	1.600	36.2	25.4	-0.867	1.670	21.1	8.1
Conservative	0.380	1.600	43.8	0.058	1.650	33.1	21.4	-0.703	1.700	25.0	11.2
Very conservative	0.307	1.520	39.0	0.026	1.570	27.7	18.6	-0.589	1.500	24.2	9.5
Prefer not to answer	0.684	1.680	57.9	0.263	1.560	31.6	21.1	-1.110	1.940	21.1	15.8
No response	0.625	0.750	50.0	0.250	0.957	50.0	50.0	-1.000	0.816	0.0	0.0
Political Ideology (Social)											
Very liberal	0.927	1.720	55.7	0.628	1.760	46.3	33.3	-1.230	1.810	19.1	5.5
Liberal	0.714	1.610	51.2	0.445	1.640	41.1	28.5	-0.983	1.710	20.9	8.2
Moderate	0.498	1.600	45.2	0.205	1.660	35.2	25.0	-0.791	1.680	22.1	9.4
Conservative	0.321	1.590	42.5	-0.016	1.630	30.6	19.8	-0.658	1.710	25.1	12.1
Very conservative	0.362	1.500	40.6	0.059	1.550	28.9	18.8	-0.665	1.590	22.6	8.0
Prefer not to answer	0.528	1.540	55.6	0.222	1.560	33.3	11.1	-0.833	1.650	16.7	11.1
No response	-1.000	NA	0.0	-2.000	NA	0.0	0.0	0.000	NA	0.0	0.0
Political Ideology (Economic)											
Very liberal	0.795	1.760	49.4	0.514	1.770	40.5	28.6	-1.080	1.870	19.9	6.7
Liberal	0.800	1.630	53.8	0.512	1.670	43.7	31.5	-1.090	1.730	18.9	7.8
Moderate	0.594	1.600	48.2	0.307	1.650	38.0	25.5	-0.882	1.670	21.4	8.4
Conservative	0.401	1.580	44.2	0.076	1.620	33.5	22.4	-0.726	1.710	25.5	10.4
Very conservative	0.435	1.600	42.9	0.165	1.650	30.7	21.7	-0.705	1.660	22.7	9.6
Prefer not to answer	0.783	1.540	65.2	0.435	1.530	39.1	21.7	-1.130	1.660	13.0	8.7
No response	-1.000	0.000	0.0	-1.500	0.707	0.0	0.0	0.500	0.707	50.0	0.0
Political Party											
Strong Democrat	0.869	1.710	54.6	0.582	1.720	43.9	28.7	-1.160	1.820	19.6	7.6
Democrat	0.701	1.630	50.7	0.411	1.690	39.7	29.9	-0.990	1.700	19.9	6.7
Independent (but lean Democrat)	0.755	1.620	51.9	0.470	1.640	42.0	29.6	-1.040	1.730	21.0	8.6
Independent	0.468	1.590	43.7	0.173	1.630	34.0	23.3	-0.762	1.670	22.1	9.2
Independent (but lean Republican)	0.437	1.720	42.4	0.144	1.730	33.9	24.7	-0.731	1.830	28.8	14.8
Republican	0.387	1.550	44.8	0.076	1.610	33.4	20.9	-0.699	1.640	22.5	8.8
Strong Republican	0.432	1.500	44.0	0.130	1.570	32.6	20.7	-0.734	1.580	21.7	7.6
Prefer not to answer	0.615	1.580	56.4	0.282	1.490	41.0	23.1	-0.949	1.790	20.5	10.3
No response	-1.000	NA	0.0	-2.000	NA	0.0	0.0	0.000	NA	0.0	0.0

**Table S9, continued***Means and percentages of sentiments about experiments by demographic variable in lay participants*

	Size of A/B effect		A/B effect	Size of experiment aversion		Experiment aversion	Experiment rejection	Size of experiment appreciation		Experiment appreciation	Experiment endorsement
	mean	SD	%	mean	SD	%	%	mean	SD	%	%
Religion											
Christian - Protestant	0.515	1.620	45.9	0.212	1.680	34.9	24.3	-0.818	1.700	22.5	10.0
Christian - Catholic	0.483	1.510	46.7	0.176	1.550	34.4	21.6	-0.790	1.610	20.7	6.4
Christian - Other	0.589	1.650	48.3	0.298	1.690	37.3	25.4	-0.881	1.740	22.9	9.7
Jewish	0.868	1.720	54.7	0.453	1.840	43.4	32.1	-1.280	1.770	13.2	7.6
Muslim	0.357	1.700	45.7	-0.057	1.800	28.6	20.0	-0.771	1.780	31.4	17.1
Buddhist	0.840	1.690	54.0	0.520	1.570	48.0	32.0	-1.160	1.940	24.0	14.0
Hindu	-0.129	1.550	38.7	-0.452	1.570	29.0	16.1	-0.194	1.620	35.5	19.4
Non-religious	0.704	1.650	49.9	0.435	1.680	40.7	28.5	-0.973	1.750	21.1	8.0
Other	0.673	1.780	49.0	0.337	1.810	40.4	31.7	-1.010	1.880	22.1	8.7
Prefer not to answer	1.090	1.570	58.8	0.794	1.650	41.2	38.2	-1.380	1.600	11.8	0.0
No response	1.250	1.770	50.0	1.000	1.410	50.0	50.0	-1.500	2.120	0.0	0.0
STEM degree											
No	0.587	1.620	47.9	0.289	1.650	37.2	25.6	-0.885	1.720	21.3	8.4
Yes	0.680	1.680	49.8	0.397	1.740	40.3	28.5	-0.963	1.750	22.9	10.0
Prefer not to answer	0.400	1.510	40.0	0.200	1.510	30.0	15.0	-0.600	1.570	25.0	0.0
No response	0.250	1.060	50.0	-0.500	0.707	0.0	0.0	-1.000	1.410	0.0	0.0

Note. If there is an NA in the SD column, that indicates that there was only 1 respondent in that group so there is no variability in responses to report. Size of the A/B effect refers to the magnitude of the difference between the mean intervention rating and the A/B test rating. A/B effect refers to the presence or absence of an A/B effect -- people who have a positive difference between their mean intervention rating and their A/B test rating show the A/B effect, people who have no difference or a negative difference between their mean intervention rating and their A/B test rating do not show an A/B effect. Size of experiment aversion refers to the magnitude of the difference between the worst intervention rating and the A/B test rating. Experiment aversion refers to the presence or absence of experiment aversion -- people who have a positive difference between their rating of their least-preferred intervention and their A/B test rating are experiment averse, people who have no difference or a negative difference are not experiment averse. Experiment rejection refers to the presence or absence of experiment rejection -- people who rate interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or more appropriate while rating the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" inappropriate reject the experiment. Size of experiment appreciation refers to the magnitude of the difference between the A/B test rating and the best intervention. Experiment appreciation refers to the presence or absence of experiment appreciation -- people who have a positive difference between their rating of the A/B test and their rating of their most-preferred intervention are experiment appreciative. Experiment endorsement refers to the presence or absence of experiment endorsement -- people who rate the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" appropriate while rating interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or less appropriate endorse the experiment.

**Table S10***Correlations between clinician characteristics and sentiments about experiments*

	Size of A/B effect		A/B effect		Size of experiment aversion		Experiment aversion		Experiment rejection		Size of experiment appreciation		Experiment appreciation		Experiment endorsement	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex (1 = male, 2 = female)	0.016	0.453	0.016	0.457	0.000	0.991	-0.011	0.619	-0.021	0.326	-0.030	0.165	-0.026	0.226	-0.032	0.134
Number of research methods/statistics training units	-0.005	0.812	0.000	0.992	0.000	0.999	0.016	0.471	0.017	0.428	0.010	0.659	0.019	0.382	0.010	0.643
Comfort with research methods/statistics	-0.036	0.100	-0.018	0.410	-0.039	0.071	-0.021	0.335	-0.016	0.446	0.030	0.165	0.070	0.001	0.045	0.035
Number of research methods/statistics activities	-0.019	0.375	-0.022	0.301	-0.006	0.796	0.006	0.778	0.020	0.360	0.031	0.157	0.041	0.056	0.023	0.279
Currently involved in research	-0.002	0.912	-0.012	0.570	-0.009	0.691	-0.016	0.470	-0.022	0.309	-0.004	0.870	-0.024	0.267	0.009	0.693
Position (0 = non-prescriber, 1 = prescriber)	0.033	0.121	0.029	0.176	0.040	0.061	0.042	0.050	0.052	0.016	-0.025	0.250	-0.020	0.347	-0.021	0.338
Years in medicine	0.016	0.452	-0.004	0.865	0.011	0.599	-0.007	0.734	0.006	0.792	-0.020	0.362	0.029	0.185	-0.003	0.879

Note. Size of the A/B effect refers to the magnitude of the difference between the mean intervention rating and the A/B test rating. A/B effect refers to the presence or absence of an A/B effect -- people who have a positive difference between their mean intervention rating and their A/B test rating show the A/B effect, people who have no difference or a negative difference between their mean intervention rating and their A/B test rating do not show an A/B effect. Size of experiment aversion refers to the magnitude of the difference between the worst intervention rating and the A/B test rating. Experiment aversion refers to the presence or absence of experiment aversion -- people who have a positive difference between their rating of their least-preferred intervention and their A/B test rating are experiment averse, people who have no difference or a negative difference are not experiment averse. Experiment rejection refers to the presence or absence of experiment rejection -- people who rate interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or more appropriate while rating the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" inappropriate reject the experiment. Size of experiment appreciation refers to the magnitude of the difference between the A/B test rating and the best intervention. Experiment appreciation refers to the presence or absence of experiment appreciation -- people who have a positive difference between their rating of the A/B test and their rating of their most-preferred intervention are experiment appreciative. Experiment endorsement refers to the presence or absence of experiment endorsement -- people who rate the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" appropriate while rating interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or less appropriate endorse the experiment.



**Table S11***Means and percentages of sentiments about experiments by demographic variable in clinician sample*

	Size of A/B effect		A/B effect	Size of experiment aversion		Experiment aversion	Experiment rejection	Size of experiment appreciation		Experiment appreciation	Experiment endorsement
	mean	SD	%	mean	SD	%	%	mean	SD	%	%
Sex											
Male	0.456	1.800	43.9	0.270	1.800	38.5	28.2	-0.642	1.890	26.5	17.2
Female	0.529	1.750	45.9	0.271	1.750	37.2	25.8	-0.786	1.890	23.6	14.2
Other	0.000	1.870	40.0	0.000	1.870	40.0	20.0	0.000	1.870	20.0	20.0
Source of research methods/statistics training											
Undergraduate coursework	0.483	1.755	44.2	0.258	1.753	37.7	26.5	-0.707	1.870	25.0	14.1
Professional school instruction	0.571	1.767	46.0	0.314	1.756	38.2	27.1	-0.828	1.916	22.8	14.7
Postgraduate coursework	0.624	1.818	49.4	0.402	1.809	41.5	29.4	-0.847	1.936	24.5	14.5
CME/CEU courses	0.463	1.788	47.1	0.217	1.767	38.6	26.6	-0.708	1.925	25.7	16.7
Self-instruction via peer-reviewed literature	0.333	1.820	41.2	0.097	1.798	32.9	23.2	-0.569	1.949	27.3	16.6
Other	0.722	1.902	46.7	0.478	1.915	41.1	32.2	-0.967	1.986	22.2	14.4
Comfort with research methods/statistics											
Not at all	0.682	1.760	45.8	0.432	1.780	37.7	26.3	-0.932	1.870	18.2	12.7
Somewhat	0.516	1.710	45.7	0.282	1.690	37.8	26.8	-0.750	1.840	22.5	14.0
Moderately	0.482	1.770	46.5	0.237	1.770	38.3	26.6	-0.727	1.880	26.8	15.1
Very	0.491	1.910	43.9	0.203	1.900	34.0	23.1	-0.778	2.070	29.2	17.9
Extremely	0.105	2.020	31.6	-0.079	2.050	28.9	23.7	-0.289	2.100	26.3	23.7
Research methods/statistics activities											
Read results of RCT in peer-reviewed journal article	0.521	1.772	45.5	0.284	1.762	38.0	27.2	-0.758	1.898	24.7	15.0
Changed typical prescription/recommendation after personally reading results of RCT in peer-reviewed journal article	0.430	1.813	43.3	0.217	1.814	36.8	26.3	-0.643	1.921	26.6	16.7
Published scientific paper in peer-reviewed journal	0.530	1.692	43.3	0.339	1.681	38.2	29.9	-0.720	1.802	22.8	13.4
Conducted or worked on a team conducting an RCT	0.371	1.745	42.9	0.114	1.725	35.1	20.9	-0.628	1.902	25.8	16.3
Took a course/class in statistics, biostatistics, research methods	0.505	1.775	45.0	0.277	1.770	37.8	27.3	-0.732	1.892	25.4	15.2
Analyzed data for statistical significance outside of course requirement	0.470	1.781	43.7	0.251	1.766	36.7	26.2	-0.690	1.912	26.2	15.4
Used statistical software	0.588	1.803	49.3	0.389	1.795	42.5	31.7	-0.787	1.915	26.7	14.9

**Table S11, continued***Means and percentages of sentiments about experiments by demographic variable in clinician sample*

	Size of A/B effect		A/B effect	Size of experiment aversion		Experiment aversion	Experiment rejection	Size of experiment appreciation		Experiment appreciation	Experiment endorsement
	mean	SD	%	mean	SD	%	%	mean	SD	%	%
Currently involved in research											
Yes	0.526	1.740	47.4	0.316	1.720	39.7	29.2	-0.737	1.860	27.3	13.9
No	0.512	1.760	45.3	0.265	1.760	37.2	25.9	-0.759	1.890	23.8	14.9
Position											
Doctor	0.556	1.730	45.5	0.374	1.720	39.9	28.7	-0.738	1.840	23.1	13.7
Physician Assistant	0.757	1.780	53.0	0.508	1.780	44.3	34.4	-1.010	1.890	21.9	13.1
Nurse Practitioner	0.500	1.910	45.9	0.184	1.970	36.7	25.5	-0.816	2.030	23.5	14.3
Nurse (RN)	0.436	1.720	43.8	0.181	1.720	35.2	23.9	-0.690	1.850	25.3	15.1
Nurse (LPN)	0.410	1.790	42.1	0.150	1.760	33.5	22.6	-0.669	1.960	24.8	17.3
Nurse (Other)	1.180	1.910	65.0	0.800	1.910	55.0	35.0	-1.550	2.060	10.0	10.0
Genetic Counselor	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Non-prescribing clinician or staff without clinical credential	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Medical student	1.170	1.770	65.2	0.935	1.790	56.5	45.7	-1.410	1.830	15.2	8.7
Faculty or Professor	1.120	2.050	62.5	0.875	2.030	50.0	37.5	-1.380	2.200	25.0	12.5
Other	0.727	2.000	45.5	0.618	1.980	41.8	32.7	-0.836	2.060	25.5	16.4
Years in medical field											
< 1 year	0.582	1.540	47.5	0.377	1.540	39.3	32.8	-0.787	1.660	24.6	8.2
1-2 years	0.560	1.720	48.4	0.333	1.710	41.3	29.4	-0.786	1.840	23.8	14.3
3-5 years	0.392	1.570	44.8	0.140	1.570	36.0	21.3	-0.643	1.690	23.4	13.6
6-10 years	0.423	1.730	43.3	0.205	1.760	36.5	24.6	-0.641	1.830	26.4	15.1
> 10 years	0.555	1.820	45.9	0.303	1.810	37.5	27.1	-0.807	1.950	23.7	15.3

*Note.* Size of the A/B effect refers to the magnitude of the difference between the mean intervention rating and the A/B test rating. A/B effect refers to the presence or absence of an A/B effect -- people who have a positive difference between their mean intervention rating and their A/B test rating show the A/B effect, people who have no difference or a negative difference between their mean intervention rating and their A/B test rating do not show an A/B effect. Size of experiment aversion refers to the magnitude of the difference between the worst intervention rating and the A/B test rating. Experiment aversion refers to the presence or absence of experiment aversion -- people who have a positive difference between their rating of their least-preferred intervention and their A/B test rating are experiment averse, people who have no difference or a negative difference are not experiment averse. Experiment rejection refers to the presence or absence of experiment rejection -- people who rate interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or more appropriate while rating the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" inappropriate reject the experiment. Size of experiment appreciation refers to the magnitude of the difference between the A/B test rating and the best intervention. Experiment appreciation refers to the presence or absence of experiment appreciation -- people who have a positive difference between their rating of the A/B test and their rating of their most-preferred intervention are experiment appreciative. Experiment endorsement refers to the presence or absence of experiment endorsement -- people who rate the A/B test as "very" or "somewhat" appropriate while rating interventions A and B as "neither inappropriate nor appropriate" or less appropriate endorse the experiment.

## References

1. Meyer MN, Heck PR, Holtzman GS, et al. Objecting to experiments that compare two unobjectionable policies or treatments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2019;116(22):10723–8.
2. Heck PR, Chabris CF, Watts DJ, Meyer MN. Objecting to experiments even while approving of the policies or treatments they compare. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2020;117(32):18948–50.
3. Mislavsky R, Dietvorst BJ, Simonsohn U. The minimum mean paradox: A mechanical explanation for apparent experiment aversion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2019;116(48):23883–4.
4. Dunlap WP, Cortina JM, Vaslow JB, Burke MJ. Meta-analysis of experiments with matched groups or repeated measures designs. *Psychological Methods* 1996;1:170–7.
5. Westfall J. effect size | Cookie Scientist [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2023 Mar 30]; Available from: <http://jakewestfall.org/blog/index.php/category/effect-size/>
6. Pronovost P, Needham D, Berenholtz S, et al. An Intervention to Decrease Catheter-Related Bloodstream Infections in the ICU. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2006;355(26):2725–32.
7. Urbach DR, Govindarajan A, Saskin R, Wilton AS, Baxter NN. Introduction of Surgical Safety Checklists in Ontario, Canada. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2014;370(11):1029–38.
8. Arriaga AF, Bader AM, Wong JM, et al. Simulation-Based Trial of Surgical-Crisis Checklists. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2013;368(3):246–53.
9. The ROMP Ethics Study [Internet]. ROMP Ethics Study. [cited 2023 Mar 7]; Available from: <https://www.iths.org/rompethics/>
10. Sinnott S-J, Tomlinson LA, Root AA, et al. Comparative effectiveness of fourth-line anti-hypertensive agents in resistant hypertension: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2017;24(3):228–38.
11. Turner JS, Bucca AW, Propst SL, et al. Association of Checklist Use in Endotracheal Intubation With Clinically Important Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Network Open* 2020;3(7):e209278.
12. Wagner C, Griesel M, Mikolajewska A, et al. Systemic corticosteroids for the treatment of COVID-19: Equity-related analyses and update on evidence. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* [Internet] 2022 [cited 2023 Apr 3];(11). Available from: <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD014963.pub2/full>

13. Elharrar X, Trigui Y, Dols A-M, et al. Use of Prone Positioning in Nonintubated Patients With COVID-19 and Hypoxemic Acute Respiratory Failure. *JAMA* 2020;323(22):2336–8.
14. Sartini C, Tresoldi M, Scarpellini P, et al. Respiratory Parameters in Patients With COVID-19 After Using Noninvasive Ventilation in the Prone Position Outside the Intensive Care Unit. *JAMA* 2020;323(22):2338–40.
15. Caputo ND, Strayer RJ, Levitan R. Early Self-Prone in Awake, Non-intubated Patients in the Emergency Department: A Single ED’s Experience During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 2020;27(5):375–8.
16. Fretheim A, Flatø M, Steens A, et al. COVID-19: we need randomised trials of school closures. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2020;74(12):1078–9.
17. Fretheim A. ISRCTN44152751: School opening in Norway during the COVID-19 pandemic [Internet]. [cited 2023 Apr 3]; Available from: <https://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN44152751>
18. The TRAiN study group, Helsingen LM, Løberg M, et al. Randomized Re-Opening of Training Facilities during the COVID-19 pandemic [Internet]. *Public and Global Health*; 2020 [cited 2023 Apr 3]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.06.24.20138768>
19. Angrist N, Bergman P, Brewster C, Matsheng M. Stemming Learning Loss During the Pandemic: A Rapid Randomized Trial of a Low-Tech Intervention in Botswana [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Apr 3]; Available from: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3663098>
20. Kolata G. Did Closing Schools Actually Help? [Internet]. *The New York Times*. 2020 [cited 2023 Apr 3]; Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/02/sunday-review/coronavirus-school-closings.html>
21. Abaluck J, Kwong LH, Styczynski A, et al. Impact of community masking on COVID-19: A cluster-randomized trial in Bangladesh. *Science* 2021;375(6577):eabi9069.
22. Jefferson T, Dooley L, Ferroni E, et al. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* [Internet] 2023 [cited 2023 Apr 3];(1). Available from: <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD006207.pub6/full?s=08>
23. Bundgaard H, Bundgaard JS, Raaschou-Pedersen DET, et al. Effectiveness of Adding a Mask Recommendation to Other Public Health Measures to Prevent SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Danish Mask Wearers. *Ann Intern Med* 2021;174(3):335–43.
24. Bach PB. We can’t tackle the pandemic without figuring out which Covid-19 vaccines work the best [Internet]. *STAT*. 2020 [cited 2023 Apr 1]; Available from: <https://www.statnews.com/2020/09/24/big-trial-needed-determine-which-covid-19-vaccines-work-best/>