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## 0.1 input

We now have a dataset that tested a nudge effect versus a non nudge. It contains 50 observations.

# 1. MA

We now have a dataset that tested a transparent nudge effect versus a non nudge. It contains 45 observations.

# 2. Non-transparent nudge versus non nudge

Positive

Multivariate Meta-Analysis Model (k = 41; method: REML)  
  
Variance Components:  
  
 estim sqrt nlvls fixed factor   
sigma^2.1 0.0225 0.1501 15 no reference   
sigma^2.2 0.0418 0.2046 24 no reference/study\_id   
  
Test for Heterogeneity:  
Q(df = 40) = 193.0192, p-val < .0001  
  
Model Results:  
  
estimate se tval df pval ci.lb ci.ub   
 0.2234 0.0664 3.3648 40 0.0017 0.0892 0.3576 \*\*   
  
---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Negative

Multivariate Meta-Analysis Model (k = 8; method: REML)  
  
Variance Components:  
  
 estim sqrt nlvls fixed factor   
sigma^2.1 0.0014 0.0370 3 no reference   
sigma^2.2 0.0000 0.0000 6 no reference/study\_id   
  
Test for Heterogeneity:  
Q(df = 7) = 5.4584, p-val = 0.6042  
  
Model Results:  
  
estimate se tval df pval ci.lb ci.ub   
 0.1060 0.0422 2.5133 7 0.0402 0.0063 0.2058 \*   
  
---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

# 3. Forest plots effect of a nudge versus control
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# 4. transparent nudge versus non nudge

Positive

Multivariate Meta-Analysis Model (k = 44; method: REML)  
  
Variance Components:  
  
 estim sqrt nlvls fixed factor   
sigma^2.1 0.3030 0.5505 15 no reference   
sigma^2.2 0.0175 0.1322 26 no reference/study\_id   
  
Test for Heterogeneity:  
Q(df = 43) = 275.8865, p-val < .0001  
  
Model Results:  
  
estimate se tval df pval ci.lb ci.ub   
 0.3575 0.1494 2.3928 43 0.0212 0.0562 0.6587 \*   
  
---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Negative

Multivariate Meta-Analysis Model (k = 8; method: REML)  
  
Variance Components:  
  
 estim sqrt nlvls fixed factor   
sigma^2.1 0.0092 0.0958 3 no reference   
sigma^2.2 0.0028 0.0527 6 no reference/study\_id   
  
Test for Heterogeneity:  
Q(df = 7) = 12.9880, p-val = 0.0724  
  
Model Results:  
  
estimate se tval df pval ci.lb ci.ub   
 0.1097 0.0720 1.5222 7 0.1718 -0.0607 0.2800   
  
---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

# 5. Forest plots effect of a transparent nudge versus control
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Comparison of hedge’s g To compare the hedge’s g , we will use the formula

z=(d1−d2)/sqrt(v1+v2)

## 5.1 Desirable outcomes

the p-value for the difference between transparent and non-transparent nudge is 0.794

## 5.2 Undesirable outcomes

the p-value for the difference between transparent and non-transparent nudge is 0.517

# 6. Robustness check

## 6.1 Choice outcome

### 6.1.1 Desirable outcomes

the p-value for the difference between transparent and non-transparent nudge is 0.739

### 6.1.2 Undesirable outcomes

the p-value for the difference between transparent and non-transparent nudge is 0.517

## 6.2 Decision Structure

### 6.2.1 desirable outcomes

the p-value for the difference between transparent and non-transparent nudge is 0.838

### 6.2.2 Undesirable outcomes

the p-value for the difference between transparent and non-transparent nudge is 0.517.
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