|  |
| --- |
| **The WAMBS-Checklist**When to worry, and how to Avoid the Misuse of Bayesian Statistics**Depaoli & Van de Schoot (2016)** |
|  | **Did you show** **your supervisor…?** | **Should** **you worry?** | **Should you consult an expert?** |
| **To be checked before estimating the model** |  |  |  |
| **Point 1:** Do you understand the priors? | Table 1 | YES **/** NO | YES **/** NO |
| **To be checked after estimation but before inspecting model results** |  |  |  |
| **Point 2:** Does the trace-plot exhibit convergence? | Table 2, column 2 | YES **/** NO | YES **/** NO |
| **Point 3:** Does convergence remain after doubling the number of iterations? | Table 4,columns 2, 3 (i)and akin to Table 3 | YES **/** NO | YES **/** NO |
| **Point 4:** Does the histogram have enough information? | Table 2, column 3 | YES **/** NO | n/a |
| **Point 5:** Do the chains exhibit a strong degree of autocorrelation? | Table 2, column 4 | YES / NO | YES **/** NO |
| **Point 6:** Does the posterior distribution make substantive sense? | Table 2, column 5 | YES **/** NO | YES **/** NO |
| **Understanding the exact influence of the priors** |  |  |  |
| **Point 7:** Do different specifications of the multivariate variance priors influence the results? | Table 4,columns 2, 3 (ii) | YES **/** NO | YES **/** NO |
| **Point 8:** Isthere a notable effect of the prior when compared with non-informative priors? | Table 4,columns 2, 3 (iii) | NEVER | n/a |
| **Point 9:** Are the results stable from a sensitivity analysis? | Sensitivity analysis akin to Table 5 or Figure 4 | NEVER | YES **/** NO |
| **After interpretation of model results** |  |  |  |
| **Point 10**: Is the Bayesian way of interpreting and reporting model results used? *(a) Also report on: missing data, model fit and comparison, non-response, generalizability, ability to replicate, etc.* | Text – see Appendix | YES **/** NO | YES **/** NO |