

Vibe Econometrics and the Analysis Contract

Lydia Ashton, Ph.D.¹ University of Wisconsin-Madison, School of Human Ecology

Working Paper. May 2026.

Abstract

“Vibe coding” and “vibe analytics” have been framed as a democratization of technical capability. This paper argues that AI-assisted methodology more broadly, or what I call “vibe methodology,” also democratizes the failure modes specific to each domain. When AI assists with methods whose validity depends on assumptions that cannot be verified from the output alone (a class I call “vibe inference”), the failure surface is structurally different: the output does not reliably signal invalidity, and when it does, recognizing the signal requires the expertise the workflow bypasses. I focus on “vibe econometrics,” the subset of AI-assisted causal analysis where identification can be named faster than it can be audited. The claim of this paper is not that AI invents inferential failures that did not previously exist, but that it changes their incidence, observability, and persuasive force enough to create a practically distinct governance problem. This results in three failure modes: method-data mismatch, where AI bypasses expertise at execution; confidence laundering, where AI amplifies the credibility of formatted output; and invisible forking, which spans both. What is new is not the failure modes but AI’s industrialization of their packaging. The barrier between naming a method and executing it has collapsed, and weak foundations, dressed as rigorous analysis, now reach audiences at a scale, speed, and polish that previously required expertise. I propose the Analysis Contract, a pre-commitment framework that adapts the logic of pre-analysis plans and the Causal Roadmap to the AI-assisted setting. The contract imposes three conditions before a causal claim is made: a method-data contract, a data audit, and a pre-commitment statement defining what would count as a disconfirming result. The framework generalizes across domains of vibe inference through domain-specific instantiation.

1. Introduction

Andrej Karpathy coined the term “vibe coding” in early 2025 to describe the practice of using AI to write code through natural language prompts, choosing to “fully give in to the vibes, embrace exponentials, and forget that the code even exists.” Michael Schrage of MIT’s Initiative on the Digital Economy extended the concept to data analysis as “vibe analytics”: the practice of collapsing “the traditional chain of define questions, structure queries, execute models, visualize results into an improvisational dialogue with data” (Schrage, 2025). Similar patterns are emerging across domains: ‘vibe lawyering’ (AI-assisted legal drafting without adequate verification of

¹*AI use disclosure:* This paper was developed with AI assistance. Claude Opus 4 and Sonnet 4 (Anthropic) were used throughout the research and writing process for drafting and revising manuscript sections, developing analytical frameworks, running simulated peer reviews, and building appendix materials. ChatGPT 5 (OpenAI) was used for additional simulated peer review. Perplexity was used to locate sources and identify DOIs for citation verification. The author downloaded primary sources independently and verified citations through institutional access. Substantive arguments, analytical framework, and methodological claims are the author’s own work. Composite case examples were developed from a combination of the author’s applied experience and AI assistance, reviewed for methodological accuracy. Given that the paper examines failure modes in AI-assisted analysis, explicit disclosure of the tools used in its production is particularly appropriate.

citations or reasoning) is documented as already reshaping federal court caseloads (Shah & Levy, 2026). Analogous dynamics are visible in strategic planning, research production, and compliance.

These are all instances of what I call “vibe methodology”: the use of AI to execute domain-specific methods through natural language prompting. The framing has been largely celebratory (democratization, speed, accessibility), and for some applications the celebration is warranted. Vibe coding has a faster feedback loop: broken code blocks progress and demands repair, and “slop,” functional code that produces wrong results, tends to surface quickly through use. Vibe analytics applied to descriptive questions (top-selling products, quarterly trends) carries familiar, catchable risks.

But not all vibe methodology carries the same risk. When AI assists with methods whose validity depends on assumptions that cannot be verified from the output alone, the failure surface is structurally different. I call this class “vibe inference.” For example, a regression may compute successfully and produce tight confidence intervals, but nothing in those numbers indicates whether the comparison groups were actually comparable, whether the outcome measure was consistent across the study period, or whether the upstream data transformations violated the method’s requirements. It includes AI-assisted causal analysis, legal reasoning, scientific claims, and strategic assessment. What unites these domains is that the output does not reliably signal whether the underlying assumptions hold, and when it does contain diagnostic clues, recognizing them requires the domain expertise the workflow bypasses.

Figure 1 maps the vibe methodology landscape along two dimensions: how observable the failure is from the output alone, and how quickly feedback loops correct the error. Vibe inference occupies the region of low observability and slow correction, the quadrant where errors persist longest and cause the most damage.

This paper focuses on one instance of vibe inference: “vibe econometrics,” the application of causal inference methods (difference-in-differences, propensity score matching, regression discontinuity, etc.) through AI-assisted prompting. I scope the analysis here because causal methods represent the sharpest version of the problem: the output is precise, the audience trusts the method name, and the assumptions live in documentation the analyst never consulted.

When someone asks an AI to “run a diff-in-diff on our program data,” the AI does it. The regression converges, the coefficient comes back significant, the confidence intervals look tight. Nothing in this workflow checks whether the data structure supports the method being applied. An analytics team receiving that estimate cannot tell, from the output, whether the data’s variance structure was corrupted by upstream aggregation, whether the comparison group was drawn from a compatible data source, or whether the parallel trends assumption was ever testable. The same pattern holds when a post-merger pay equity audit runs propensity score matching on job titles that mean different things across legacy entities, or when a state education agency runs an interrupted time series on test scores measured with a different instrument pre and post intervention. The estimate may be precise and meaningless. This is the gap methods expertise is designed to bridge. Vibe econometrics describes the context where organizations deploy AI instead, and the distinct problem is that AI packages the output with the formatting and credibility markers of expert analysis while retaining none of the expert’s assumption-checking or institutional accountability.

I identify three failure modes specific to vibe econometrics, each rooted in established literatures that have not been systematically applied to causal analysis. I then propose the Analysis Contract: a pre-commitment framework with three conditions that reintroduce the methodological friction AI has removed. The framework draws on the logic of pre-analysis plans in clinical research and the Causal Roadmap in observational epidemiology (Petersen & van der Laan, 2014; Dang et al.,




Figure 1: The Vibe Methodology Landscape.

2023), adapted for a context where analysts interact with methods through AI rather than code.

This paper contributes to the conversation on AI-era research practice, particularly on causal governance. Lin and Sohail (2026) document how generative AI risks eroding scientific expertise and propose meta-skills as a new AI-era scientific literacy. Arbour, Bojinov, Feller, and Ni (2026) argue that AI deployment decisions are inherently causal and advocate causal field evaluation as the rigorous standard. Shen and Tamkin (2026) provide randomized evidence that AI assistance impairs skill formation when human engagement is absent. The Analysis Contract addresses what these papers collectively diagnose: the structural conditions under which AI delegation becomes valid, and the pre-commitment mechanisms required to sustain analytical integrity before claims are made.

2. Three Failure Modes of Vibe Econometrics

Three failure modes are specific to vibe econometrics. Method-data mismatch: AI executes a method whose identifying assumptions the data does not meet. Confidence laundering: AI packages the output in the format and register of valid analysis regardless of the foundation. Invisible forking: AI-assisted iteration through specifications leaves no audit trail and the output conceals the selection. These failures are structural and they follow from two separable stages of the AI-assisted workflow:

Production. This is where AI executes the method. Friction used to come from the analyst having to write code, which forced at least some confrontation with the method’s assumptions before anything ran. AI removes that friction. A recognized method name, plus a dataset, plus a prompt, is enough to produce a regression output.

Reception. This is where formatted output reaches an audience that did not produce it. Friction used to come from the audience having to parse unformatted results, which forced some interpretive effort and often surfaced the analyst’s caveats. AI removes that friction. The output arrives polished: regression tables, confidence intervals, forest plots, interpretive paragraphs in the confident register of expert analysis (a publishable paper or a decision-ready report).

Invisible forking operates on both sides: iteration begins at production, where the audit trail disappears, and continues through reception, where the output conceals the absence of that trail. Figure 2 shows where each failure mode enters the workflow.

2.1 Method-Data Mismatch

Method-data mismatch occurs when a statistical method is applied to data that does not meet the method’s requirements. The resulting number is mathematically correct (i.e., the regression converged, the arithmetic is sound), but it does not answer the causal question being asked. The output is computationally valid but causally uninterpretable: the number means something, just not what was intended. The identifying assumptions (i.e., the conditions the data must meet for the method’s causal claim to hold) are where method-data mismatch most often hides. What AI changes is not the existence of this error but its frequency and invisibility. Previously, mismatch required enough technical skill to implement the method but insufficient skill to check its assumptions, a relatively narrow failure zone. AI widens this zone to include anyone who can write a prompt. The method name carries credibility (“diff-in-diff is rigorous”). The AI executes on whatever data is provided. No warning is issued because the regression converges and produces standard errors.




Figure 2: The Vibe Econometrics Workflow.

The pattern is visible in claims-data analyses, where the failure modes are documented (Mbotwa et al., 2017; Dahlen & Charu, 2023). For example, a health plan analytics team receives a vendor-provided dataset of medical claims aggregated to member-month totals. They use an AI assistant to estimate a care management program’s effect on total cost of care using difference-in-differences. The analysis produces a statistically significant cost reduction with narrow confidence intervals. The team presents this as evidence of program ROI (Return on Investment). The problem: the claims data was aggregated from claim-line detail to member-month before reaching the team. This aggregation smoothed individual-level variation in cost and utilization. Parallel trends can be violated if aggregation rules differ across groups, in ways not detectable from the aggregated data. The comparison group came from a different product line with different adjudication rules. Only two pre-periods were available, making the parallel trends assumption untestable. The coefficient is real arithmetic performed on real data. It is not a valid causal estimate.

The pattern is not specific to healthcare. A mid-size company completing a post-merger pay equity audit uses an AI assistant to run propensity score matching, comparing compensation across demographic groups after matching on job title, tenure, and department. The analysis finds no statistically significant disparity. The problem: job title classifications were not harmonized across the two legacy entities. A “Senior Analyst” in the acquired company maps to responsibilities equivalent to “Manager” in the parent company. Tenure is measured from original hire date in one entity and from most recent role change in the other. The matching balanced on variables that mean different things across the two populations being compared. The AI reported clean balance diagnostics because standardized mean differences on the nominal variables were small. The underlying constructs those variables represent were not comparable.

2.2 Confidence Laundering

I define confidence laundering as the repackaging of analytically weak evidence as methodologically rigorous, via the confidence that audiences place in formatted output. I use “confidence” here in the social rather than statistical sense: the trust an audience invests in sophisticated-looking results, not miscalibrated probability estimates.

The analyst typically believes the method is being applied correctly. The AI produces the requested output without qualification. The confidence is structural: it arises from the format and vocabulary of the output, not from the analytical foundation underneath.

This structural character distinguishes confidence laundering from adjacent phenomena in the methodology literature: HARKing (Kerr, 1998) and p-hacking (Simmons et al., 2011). HARKing is about what the analyst claimed: writing the hypothesis after seeing results. P-hacking is about what the analyst ran: many specifications, reporting the best one. Confidence laundering is about what the output looks like: authoritative presentation of an invalid analysis. HARKing and p-hacking both assume the analyst did something wrong with valid methods on adequate data. Confidence laundering operates even when the analyst does nothing wrong intentionally, on data that does not support the method, because the AI produces the authoritative format automatically.

Lin and Sohail (2026) name a related mechanism in academic research: “ritualized acceptance” of authoritative-seeming AI outputs, where users progressively disengage from critical evaluation. They propose meta-skills (strategic direction, critical discernment, systematic calibration) as the AI-era scientific literacy needed to resist it.

The phenomenon of weak evidence dressed as strong is older than AI. What AI introduces is industrial scale, making weak evidence packaged as rigorous available to anyone who can write a prompt, at speed and with default polish that used to require expertise.

This industrialization operates through several mechanisms that the large language model (LLM) literature treats separately. Language models systematically miscalibrate their confidence in outputs: stated confidence does not reliably track actual accuracy across models and tasks (Steyvers et al., 2024; Cash et al., 2025). Independently, they exhibit a default register of confident, unhedged phrasing, generating strengtheners (e.g., “definitely,” “certainly”) even in incorrect responses (Rathi et al., 2025). These two tendencies are independent, and in combination they produce output that describes invalid analyses in the same register as valid ones. Ironically, one widely circulated statistic, that LLMs are “34% more likely” to use strengtheners in incorrect responses, illustrates the same pattern: a plausible-sounding number, attributed to a credible institution (“MIT research, January 2025”), repeated until it functions as established fact (propagated through industry reports).²

Format amplification compounds these. AI-generated analytical outputs include elements that signal rigor to non-expert audiences (Porter, 1995; Logg et al., 2019): properly formatted regression tables, labeled confidence intervals, and sensitivity analyses that test the wrong dimension. By “the wrong dimension” I mean robustness checks that probe the edges of the specification but not its foundation. Showing that a DiD coefficient holds under alternative functional forms (linear versus logit) is useful, for example, but it is the wrong check to report if the parallel trends assumption has never been plotted. Each rigorous-looking element increases the audience’s confidence while adding no evidential value if the foundational assumptions are violated.

²The chain bottoms out: Suprmind (2026) cites All About AI (2025), which presents the statistic without further attribution. The underlying phenomenon (calibration gaps in LLM outputs) is real and documented (Steyvers et al., 2024; Cash et al., 2025); the specific statistic is not.

The interaction between analyst and AI adds further amplification. Sycophancy operates on the model side: models amplify their confidence when they perceive the user wants a confident answer. The behavior has been documented in current LLMs (Perez et al., 2022). It is a product of Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF), the post-training step in which models are fine-tuned on human preferences; raters tend to reward confident, agreeable responses, which the model then learns to produce as a default (Sharma et al., 2023). The mechanism can generalize: sycophantic learning can shade into reward tampering more broadly (Denison et al., 2024). Cognitive surrender operates on the human side: users who consult an AI tend to adopt its outputs with minimal scrutiny (Shaw & Nave, 2026), a deeper abdication than ordinary cognitive offloading (Risko & Gilbert, 2016). Together they produce a feedback loop where the AI confidently confirms what the analyst is already disposed to believe, and the analyst stops looking for reasons to doubt (Nickerson, 1998). This matters for the Analysis Contract in Section 4: pre-commitment is necessary but not sufficient, because an analyst who has pre-committed to Condition 1 can still ask the AI “does my data meet the DiD assumptions?” and receive a confident affirmation, because the framing signals that is what the analyst wants to hear. Adversarial review and mechanical checks remain necessary alongside pre-commitment.³

Direct empirical evidence that mechanical checks catch what perception misses comes from a randomized controlled trial of experienced open-source developers (Becker et al., 2025): AI assistance increased task completion time by 19%, even though developers forecast a 24% speedup beforehand and recalled a 20% speedup afterward. Experts in economics and machine learning, surveyed as a comparison, similarly overestimated, forecasting 38-39% speedups. The mechanism illustrates why confidence in outputs, not actual validity, is what confidence laundering exploits.⁴

Consider two versions of the same underlying analysis. In the first, an analyst computes average costs before and after a program intervention for two groups and presents a table of means. The audience can see this is descriptive. In the second, the analyst prompts an AI to “run a diff-in-diff” on the same data. The AI returns a coefficient, standard errors, p-values, confidence intervals, a forest plot of subgroup effects, and an interpretive paragraph concluding the program “is associated with statistically significant reductions in total cost of care ($p < 0.01$).” The second output is more convincing. It is not more valid. A board reviewing the resulting report has no apparatus to distinguish it from a valid analysis. The format is identical.

The pattern generalizes beyond healthcare. A state education agency evaluates a reading intervention adopted by 30 districts in 2023. An analyst prompts an AI to run an interrupted time series on standardized reading proficiency rates. The AI returns a level shift estimate, a trend change estimate, confidence intervals, and an autocorrelation-corrected model with a paragraph concluding “the intervention is associated with a statistically significant improvement in reading proficiency ($p < 0.01$).” The state changed its reading assessment instrument in the same year. Pre-2023 scores are on a different scale with different cut points for “proficient.” The level shift is real arithmetic on real data. It measures the assessment change, not the curriculum. The AI’s output, formatted with proper time series diagnostics and Newey-West standard errors, is indistinguishable from a valid ITS analysis. The school board receiving the report has no way to know.

³Hallucination, the fabrication of outputs that were never computed, is a distinct mechanism from confidence laundering and is the subject of a separate and active literature (Ji et al., 2023). The three failure modes in this paper are scoped to the workflow governance problem: how AI-assisted analysis produces invalid causal conclusions even when the computation runs on real data.

⁴Becker et al. note the slowdown is specific to their setting; the perception-reality gap, which is what §2.2 leans on, held across developers and external experts.

2.3 Invisible Forking

I use the term invisible forking for the AI-accelerated version of what Gelman and Loken (2013) called both the “garden of forking paths” and “invisible multiplicity”: analysts face many legitimate choices in structuring an analysis, and when those choices are made after seeing results, the reported finding reflects selection as much as evidence. AI amplifies the problem through three mechanisms. Speed: the time cost of a new specification drops from hours to seconds, so more paths are explored and selection is more severe. Amnesia: the AI has no persistent memory across prompts, does not flag prior specifications, and creates no audit trail unless the analyst deliberately builds one. Framing as refinement: the conversational interface frames iteration as getting closer to the right answer, obscuring that each iteration is a new draw from the space of possible results. Related work has documented prompt-hacking as an adjacent problem: strategic tweaking of prompts to elicit desirable outputs, the LLM analogue of p-hacking (Kosch & Feger, 2025). Invisible forking differs in locus and mechanism: the selection operates on causal estimates rather than AI outputs, and unlike traditional specification search, where leaving no audit trail requires active effort, AI-assisted prompting generates no auditable record by default.

The limited effectiveness of policy-based disclosure is empirically documented in adjacent settings: He and Bu (2026) analyze 5,114 journals and 5.2 million papers (2021-2025), finding that only 0.1% of post-2023 papers explicitly disclose AI use despite 70% of journals having adopted disclosure policies, with no significant difference in AI uptake between journals with and without a policy. Downstream disclosure rules leave a substantial transparency gap, reinforcing the case for upstream structural commitment.

A payer analytics team is evaluating whether a new prior authorization policy reduced unnecessary imaging utilization. The lead analyst, using an AI assistant, runs a series of specifications. First, a simple pre-post comparison: 3% reduction, not significant. The analyst then adds age and sex controls: 5% reduction, $p = 0.08$. Next, the analysis excludes emergency department imaging, which falls outside the prior authorization requirement, bringing the estimate to 7% reduction, $p = 0.03$. Finally, the analysis restricts to continuously enrolled members: 9% reduction, $p = 0.01$. The team reports the final estimate, with the exclusions framed as methodological improvements. The analyst believed each step was a legitimate refinement. In aggregate, the process tested four specifications and selected the most favorable. The reported p-value does not account for this selection.

The same dynamic operates outside healthcare. A subscription SaaS company launches an annual billing experiment: offering a 12-month plan at 15% discount compared to cumulative monthly charges. The product analytics team works with an AI assistant to estimate the experiment’s impact on customer acquisition cost (CAC). The analyst starts with an intention-to-treat specification across all users randomized to the annual offer: 4.2% reduction in blended CAC, not significant ($p = 0.12$). The team then restricts to the paid-conversion cohort, since trial users have different baseline commitment signals, yielding a 6.8% CAC reduction, $p = 0.06$. A further exclusion removes users acquired through affiliate networks and reseller channels, since their contract structures differ from direct-sales customers, bringing the estimate to 8.1% reduction, $p = 0.02$. Finally, instead of measuring CAC over the first 12 months, the analyst shifts to a 6-month window, arguing that annual billing decisions are more visible in the early-adoption period. The 6-month window yields a 10.3% CAC reduction, $p = 0.001$. The team reports the final estimate to the finance team, framing it as a methodological refinement that removes “noise from users who convert after initial onboarding.” The analyst believed each step improved the analysis. In aggregate, the process tested

four specifications and selected the most favorable. The reported p-value does not account for this selection.

2.4 Interactions and Boundary Conditions

The three failure modes are analytically distinct but could co-occur; in the worst case, an invalid method on inappropriate data, iterated to a favorable result and packaged as authoritative output, combines all three.

This paper examines these failure modes as they arise in AI-assisted causal inference: where the output is precise, the method name carries credibility, and the identifying assumptions live in documentation the analyst may never have consulted. The framework does not address descriptive analytics errors, intentional fraud, or model selection for prediction.

3. Related Work

This paper contributes to several literatures that have not been systematically applied to AI-assisted causal analysis.

The most direct antecedent is the literature on statistical analysis plans (SAPs) and pre-analysis plans (PAPs). SAPs, the clinical trials standard, impose pre-commitment with regulatory formality, requiring exact estimator specifications, missing data rules, and multiplicity adjustments before unblinding (Watson, 2025). PAPs, their social science counterpart, require registering hypotheses and analysis procedures before data collection (Casey, Glennerster, & Miguel, 2012). Both are designed to prevent the kind of contingent analytic flexibility that AI-assisted workflows can now accelerate. The Analysis Contract adapts this pre-commitment logic for a different setting.

While SAPs and PAPs form the natural conceptual antecedent, the Analysis Contract addresses a fundamentally different setting along three dimensions:

- **Institutional context.** SAPs are legally required in clinical trials; PAPs are increasingly standard in development economics through organizations such as J-PAL. Both operate within contexts that provide pre-registration infrastructure and methodological review. The Analysis Contract is designed for organizational analytical workflows where no such infrastructure exists: a company evaluating a pay equity claim using historical payroll data, a health plan assessing program ROI from claims data, a state education agency running an impact analysis on test scores.
- **Execution environment.** They are written before execution, and the effort required to write analysis code acts as a natural limit on specification search. The Analysis Contract addresses an AI-mediated execution context that removes this limit: an analyst querying a dataset via natural language, iterating at machine speed without writing code.
- **Expertise assumption.** They assume the analyst has sufficient methodological expertise to correctly specify the analysis, which is why they focus on preventing researcher degrees of freedom rather than checking assumptions. The Analysis Contract is explicitly designed for the context where no methodologist is in the loop, and where diagnostic checks that do not require specialist training must substitute for that expertise.

The Analysis Contract supplies the structure SAPs and PAPs assume already exists.

The paper also builds on Gelman and Loken’s (2013) work on the “garden of forking paths,” which demonstrated that researcher degrees of freedom create a multiple comparisons problem even in single-analysis settings. Invisible forking is the AI-accelerated version of this problem, operating at a scale and speed the original formulation did not anticipate. The most direct adjacent work, Kosch & Feger (2025), documents prompt-hacking as the LLM analogue of p-hacking; invisible forking is distinct in operating through specification choices rather than prompt manipulation, and unlike traditional specification search, AI-assisted analysis generates no auditable record by default.

The biostatistics literature names “discrepancy between statistical analysis method and study design” as a recognized error class (Mbotwa et al., 2017). Method-data mismatch extends this concept to the AI-assisted context, where the barrier to entry for applying a method has dropped from technical skill to a natural language prompt.

The Analysis Contract draws on the Causal Roadmap (Petersen & van der Laan, 2014; Dang et al., 2023), developed for healthcare and policy evaluation. The Causal Roadmap structures observational analysis through a multi-step sequence in which causal model specification, target quantity, and identifiability assessment are committed to before any estimation begins. It is the most developed spec-driven framework in observational research, but it lives in academic epidemiology and has rarely crossed into applied analytical settings. The Analysis Contract adapts its logic for the context where AI removes the technical friction that previously enforced assumption checking.

In contemporary work on causal evaluation of AI systems, Arbour, Bojinov, Feller, and Ni (2026) argue that AI deployment decisions are inherently causal (does the system work, for whom, and under what circumstances) and advocate causal field evaluation as the rigorous standard (lab versus field; preference versus outcome data). The Analysis Contract extends this framework from deployment-side evaluation to production-side governance, specifying conditions for valid causal claims when AI participates in the analysis, not just when AI is the analyzed object.

A broader governance landscape has emerged around AI-assisted analytical work. An early and foundational contribution, A Manifesto for Reproducible Science (Munafò et al., 2017), set out pre-registration, open data, and reporting standards as a unified reproducibility agenda. Model cards (Mitchell et al., 2019) and datasheets for datasets (Geburu et al., 2021) introduced documentation practices for models and data provenance. The NIST AI Risk Management Framework (2023) provides organizational-level mapping, measurement, and management of AI risk. The AI Fluency Framework (Dakan, Feller & Anthropic, 2025) names four human competencies, notably discernment and diligence, that the Conditions below operationalize. These frameworks share a structural logic: reintroduce friction at points AI has removed; document the interface between execution and claim. The Analysis Contract translates this logic into causal inference, method by method.

4. The Analysis Contract

The Analysis Contract is a structured pre-commitment to the data requirements of a method before using AI to execute it. It applies wherever identification is claimed and assumptions cannot be verified from the output alone: standard and staggered difference-in-differences (DiD), propensity score methods (PSM), regression discontinuity (RDD), instrumental variables (IV), and interrupted time series (ITS). The methods examined in this paper are illustrative rather than exhaustive; they were selected for their prevalence in applied analytical work. Three conditions, each mandatory. Condition 1 is method-specific; Condition 2 is both method- and domain-specific, since data threats

vary by source as much as by estimator; Condition 3 travels more easily across both.

4.1 Condition 1: Method-Data Contract

Before any AI execution: write down what the method requires of the data.

This is a checklist of assumptions and data requirements specific to the chosen method. Every causal inference method has identifying assumptions, and each assumption implies a data requirement. For difference-in-differences, this means documenting what unit the data is in and what aggregation was applied, how many pre-intervention periods are available, how treatment and control groups are defined, and whether pre-period trends can be inspected. For propensity score matching, it means documenting what variables are available for matching, whether the selection mechanism operates on observables, and whether overlap exists across treatment and control groups. For interrupted time series, it means documenting whether the outcome measure is consistent across the pre and post periods and whether concurrent interventions could confound the level shift. For staggered-treatment designs, the modern DiD literature identifies further requirements: two-way fixed effects estimators can produce biased weighted averages with negative weights under heterogeneous treatment effects (Goodman-Bacon, 2021; de Chaisemartin & D’Haultfoeuille, 2020), and standard event-study coefficients can be contaminated across cohorts (Sun & Abraham, 2021). A current checklist should incorporate heterogeneity-robust alternatives (Callaway & Sant’Anna, 2021) and the practical guidance in Roth et al. (2023) and Wang et al. (2024). When treatment timing varies across units, the standard two-way fixed effects estimator can produce biased estimates due to negative weighting of already-treated cohorts; practitioners should implement the heterogeneity-robust estimators proposed by Callaway and Sant’Anna (2021) or Sun and Abraham (2021), which allow treatment effects to vary by cohort and timing, a specification decision the Analysis Contract should flag before estimation begins.

Each requirement carries a classification: a stop, a flag, or a branch. A stop means the analysis cannot proceed as specified: the analyst must obtain different data, choose a different method, or present the analysis as descriptive rather than causal. A flag means documented sensitivity analysis is required before proceeding. A branch redirects to additional requirements specific to the design. A fully developed Condition 1 checklist for DiD is provided in Appendix A, with supplementary notes on healthcare claims data; Section 4.5 explains the case selection.

4.2 Condition 2: Data Audit

Before any AI execution: verify the data against the contract.

Condition 1 establishes what the method needs. Condition 2 checks whether the specific dataset delivers it. The analyst documents data provenance (who produced the dataset, what transformations were applied, whether documentation exists), verifies the unit of observation matches the method’s requirements, confirms the temporal structure, compares baseline characteristics across treatment and control groups, and inspects the outcome variable for coding changes, compression artifacts, and floor or ceiling effects.

The single most important diagnostic in Condition 2 is a visual inspection of the raw data against the method’s requirements. For DiD, this means plotting the outcome variable over time, separately for treatment and control groups. If the analyst does nothing else, they should produce this plot. It makes the parallel trends assumption visible in a way that no regression output can. Equivalent diagnostics exist for other methods: covariate balance plots for PSM, level and trend inspection for ITS. A fully developed Condition 2 checklist for DiD on healthcare claims is provided in Appendix

B.

4.3 Condition 3: Pre-Commitment Statement

Before any AI execution: define what would make you distrust your own result.

Condition 3, the pre-commitment, gives the result its interpretive authority. It requires the analyst to specify a primary specification (one analysis, chosen before seeing results), falsification criteria (conditions pre-specified for distrusting the result), and reporting commitments (what will be disclosed regardless of outcome). For example, an analyst running DiD would commit in advance that if the parallel trends plot shows divergence before the program launched, or if the effect disappears under a plausible alternative control group, the result is untrustworthy, and would disclose all specifications attempted regardless of outcome.

Condition 3 also includes a conflict of interest disclosure: does the team conducting the analysis have a stake in the result? This is not an ethics checkbox. It calibrates how much scrutiny the result needs. When the team producing the ROI analysis reports to the same leadership that launched the program, the invisible forking risk is elevated. Condition 3’s commitments become the primary safeguard.

Without Condition 3, Conditions 1 and 2 are necessary but insufficient. The data can meet the method’s requirements and the analyst can still produce a misleading result by selecting among specifications. Condition 3 breaks the confidence laundering loop by requiring pre-commitment to what counts as evidence and what counts as failure. A fully developed Condition 3 template is provided in Appendix C.

4.4 Mapping Conditions to Failure Modes

The production-side conditions (method-data contract, data audit) directly prevent method-data mismatch; the commitment-side condition (pre-commitment) directly prevents invisible forking and confidence laundering; additionally each also affects the remaining failure modes indirectly. “Direct” means the condition targets the failure at its mechanism. “Indirect” means the condition affects the failure only through a different pathway.

Table 1: Failure modes and the conditions that directly address them.

Failure mode	Condition 1: Method-Data Contract	Condition 2: Data Audit	Condition 3: Pre-Commitment
Method-data mismatch	Direct. Documents what the method requires before execution.	Direct. Verifies the dataset against those requirements.	<i>Indirect.</i> Acknowledged mismatches must be reported or the analysis reframed as descriptive.

Failure mode	Condition 1: Method-Data Contract	Condition 2: Data Audit	Condition 3: Pre-Commitment
Invisible forking	<i>Indirect.</i> Constrains defensible specifications but not iteration.	<i>Indirect.</i> Audits data, not specifications attempted.	Direct. Pre-specification of primary analysis and falsification criteria prevents post-hoc selection.
Confidence laundering	<i>Indirect.</i> Forces confrontation with requirements but does not affect output format.	<i>Indirect.</i> Visual inspection counter-weights polish.	Direct. Pre-committed reporting regardless of outcome breaks the appearance-of-rigor loop.

The Analysis Contract is the minimum governance layer for high-stakes AI-assisted causal claims. It operationalizes discernment and diligence as concrete commitments before identification is claimed.

In practice, the Analysis Contract functions as a lightweight governance checkpoint completed before any AI-assisted causal analysis is run. The analyst completes all three conditions before execution: Conditions 1 and 2 establish method-data fit; Condition 3 locks the primary specification and falsification criteria. In organizational settings, the resulting record can be reviewed by a manager, methods lead, or independent reviewer before findings are disseminated. Its purpose is not bureaucratic expansion. It is to create a minimal record of what the method required, whether the data met those requirements, and what the team committed to treat as disconfirming evidence before seeing the output.

4.5 Implementation: The Appendix Checklists

The three conditions are operationalized in appendices applied to DiD on healthcare claims data. DiD is the most widely used quasi-experimental method in applied economics and policy evaluation (Roth et al., 2023), and healthcare claims data concentrates four properties that make it econometrics especially consequential: structural complexity invisible to non-experts, methods that function as credibility amplifiers, incentive structures that run against falsification, and audiences that cannot evaluate the output. While none of these are unique to healthcare, they co-occur frequently in that setting.

Condition 1 is method-specific: a fully developed checklist for DiD is provided in Appendix A, with supplementary notes on healthcare claims data; extension to other methods requires adapting the checklist to the method’s specific identifying assumptions. Condition 2 is both method- and domain-specific: a fully developed checklist for DiD on healthcare claims is provided in Appendix B; extension to other datasets requires adapting the audit to the domain’s specific data threats. Condition 3 travels more easily across both: a template applicable across methods and domains is provided in Appendix C.

5. The Vibe Inference Landscape

The three failure modes are structural consequences of how analysts interact with AI in causal inference workflows, not features of any single domain. The common structure is: a method whose validity depends on identifying assumptions or design conditions, data that may violate those conditions in ways invisible to the analyst, and an interaction that removes both the friction that previously forced assumption checking and the moment where the analyst would have pushed back. The following table is illustrative rather than exhaustive. It shows several domains in which the same workflow structure may recur.

Table 2: Selected domains where the vibe inference failure structure recurs.

Domain	Common Causal Methods	Typical Data Source	Key Vulnerability	Stakes
Healthcare program evaluation	DiD, PSM, ITS	Claims, EHR, enrollment	Aggregation destroys variance; coding changes mimic outcome shifts	Coverage decisions, program funding
Compensation / pay equity	Oaxaca decomposition, PSM, regression adjustment	HRIS, payroll	Variable definitions not comparable across merged entities; selection into roles unobserved	Legal liability, pay disparities
Clinical trials / pharma	RCTs, intention-to-treat analysis, subgroup analysis	EHR-linked trial records, CRFs	Differential attrition; non-compliance not modeled; AI-assisted post-hoc subgroup mining; primary endpoint switching	Regulatory approval, drug labeling, patient outcomes
Education policy	ITS, DiD, RDD	Assessment scores, enrollment	Instrument changes mid-panel; non-random adoption of interventions	Funding allocation, curriculum decisions

Domain	Common Causal Methods	Typical Data Source	Key Vulnerability	Stakes
Field experiments / development	RCTs, cluster RCTs, encouragement designs	Survey, administrative, mobile-money	Spillovers across treatment and control units; differential attrition; AI-assisted heterogeneous-effect mining	Program scaling, policy adoption
Marketing effectiveness	Holdout comparison, uplift modeling, DiD	Behavioral / clickstream	Post-treatment sample selection; endogenous holdout definition	Budget allocation

Note: DiD = difference-in-differences; PSM = propensity score matching; ITS = interrupted time series; RDD = regression discontinuity design; RCT = randomized controlled trial; EHR = electronic health records; CRF = case report form; HRIS = human resources information system.

Healthcare anchors the appendix checklists because it concentrates the failure conditions in their most consequential form; the same structure recurs across the domains in the table above.

6. Discussion

Beyond the workflow-level governance problem addressed here, repeated instances of vibe econometrics may also have broader epistemic consequences.

At sufficient scale, vibe econometrics is not just a workflow problem; it is an evidence quality problem. When the analyst-AI interaction industrializes the production of credible-looking but invalid estimates, the downstream consequence is not only bad individual decisions but a degradation of the evidentiary standards on which organizational and policy choices depend.

An expert panel convened by the National Academy of Sciences articulates the broader policy stakes in a 2024 PNAS editorial (Blau et al.): generative AI challenges core scientific norms (accountability, transparency, replicability, and human responsibility), and the panel recommends transparent disclosure of AI use as a baseline principle.

The Analysis Contract is designed to reintroduce that friction at the minimum viable level. It does not require analysts to become statisticians. It requires them to answer a bounded set of verifiable questions about the method and data before prompting the AI. The conditions are structured so that a non-expert can recognize when the data does not support the causal claim being made, even if they cannot independently evaluate every assumption in formal methodological terms.

Several limitations should be noted. The framework is developed conceptually and illustrated with composite cases; it has not been systematically field-tested. Condition 1 is method-specific and

requires adaptation for other estimators; Condition 2 is both method- and domain-specific and requires adaptation for other data sources; Condition 3 travels more easily across both.

In organizations that strongly reward favorable findings, pre-analysis plans are likely to operate as psychologically fragile commitment devices. The same incentives that encourage specification search also create pressure to treat pre-committed analysis choices as revisable when they threaten desirable outcomes: a form of incentive-induced motivated reasoning in which actors preserve an appearance of methodological rigor while relaxing their own *ex ante* commitments (Kunda, 1990).

A methods check that the analyst cannot self-administer is therefore a necessary complement to the contract. The design space spans lightweight to heavyweight options. Lighter, embedded forms include peer audit (a colleague spot-checks the contract and outputs), red-team passes (an adversarial reviewer, human or AI, tasked with finding where the analysis is confidently wrong), and rotating reviewer assignment so no analyst repeatedly self-validates. Heavier forms include a designated methods lead outside the analyst’s reporting line, or an internal audit or governance function for high-stakes contracts (regulatory exposure, board-facing claims, public disclosures). The paper does not prescribe a single model. Review intensity should match the stakes: lighter for routine analyses, heavier when consequences are larger. What matters is that the check exists, reports independently of the analysis sponsor, and is calibrated to the cadence of the work.

The deeper obstacle is structural. AI-assisted analysis lowers the cost of producing analysis but does not lower the cost of being wrong. In corporate settings, the incentive to add review typically appears only after a visible failure attributable to unaudited output, by which point workflows, dashboards, and downstream decisions have already been built on it. The Analysis Contract’s value is therefore in making errors visible *before* they become costly: a lightweight pre-commitment mechanism organizations can adopt proactively rather than reactively. Academic settings are not exempt; the same confirmation incentives operate, and the removal of friction makes them easier to act on. The framework also assumes some mechanism for preserving an audit trail of specifications attempted, because pre-commitment is weaker when iteration cannot be reconstructed.

Empirical work testing the three failure modes against existing causal-inference datasets is planned as a companion paper. The companion will (i) prompt one or more frontier LLMs to execute DiD, PSM, and ITS on canonical datasets where the correct identification status is known, including the LaLonde benchmark, the Oregon Health Insurance Experiment, and synthetic data with deliberately introduced violations of parallel trends or common support; and (ii) assess whether LLM-generated output reliably differentiates valid from invalid analyses in its language, hedging, or numerical presentation. The companion will provide the empirical evidence the present paper does not.

The condition appendices have a secondary use beyond the per-analysis contract. They can serve as a starting point for organizational training documents or internal analytics guidelines and standards. The fill-in structure invites teams to ask where their own workflows stand: What would your organization write in Condition 2b? Who would review it before estimation begins?

This paper operates at the workflow level: how AI-assisted causal analysis changes how inferential failures enter and move through the analytic process, and what governance minimum can address them. The broader epistemic consequences are consistent with prior work at multiple levels. Shumailov et al. (2024) show that recursively training models on model-generated content can degrade the quality of successor systems. Acemoglu, Kong, and Ozdaglar (2026) describe a complementary human-side risk: when agentic AI substitutes for human effort, the incentives that sustain collective general knowledge can erode. Shen and Tamkin (2026) document this dynamic at the individual

scale: AI assistance impairs conceptual understanding and debugging ability among learners who rely on AI during practice. Becker et al. (2025) extend the evidence to experienced practitioners: AI tools slowed task completion by 19% despite developers and external experts forecasting 24-39% speedups. When weak analyses are repeatedly produced, accepted, and reused as credible evidence, the consequence is not just bad individual decisions. At scale, such workflows may also erode the habits of scrutiny, falsification, and methodological restraint on which reliable knowledge production depends.

The Analysis Contract does not solve *vibe econometrics*. It makes the problem visible, and visibility is the prerequisite for accountability.

Code and Data Availability

Reproducible figure scripts (Python source for Figures 1 and 2), appendix templates (DOCX with build scripts), and license files are available at [lydiaashton/vibe-econometrics-supp](https://github.com/lydiaashton/vibe-econometrics-supp) under MIT (code) and CC-BY-4.0 (templates).

References

Acemoglu, D., Kong, D., & Ozdaglar, A. (2026). AI, Human Cognition and Knowledge Collapse. *NBER Working Paper No. 34910*.

All About AI. (2025). AI Hallucinations: Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.allaboutai.com/resources/ai-statistics/ai-hallucinations/>

Arbour, D., Bojinov, I., Feller, A., & Ni, T. (2026). Toward causal field evaluations of AI systems. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 8(2). DOI: 10.1162/99608f92.7d74e33e.

Becker, J., Rush, N., Barnes, B., & Rein, D. (2025). Measuring the impact of early-2025 AI on experienced open-source developer productivity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09089*.

Blau, W., Cerf, V. G., Enriquez, J., Francisco, J. S., et al. (2024). Protecting scientific integrity in an age of generative AI. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(22), e2407886121. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2407886121.

Callaway, B., & Sant’Anna, P.H.C. (2021). Difference-in-differences with multiple time periods. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2), 200–230. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.12.001.

Casey, K., Glennerster, R., & Miguel, E. (2012). Reshaping institutions: Evidence on aid impacts using a preanalysis plan. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(4), 1755–1812. DOI: 10.1093/qje/qje027.

Cash, T. et al. (2025). Quantifying uncertainty: Testing the accuracy of LLMs’ confidence judgments. *Memory & Cognition*. DOI: 10.3758/s13421-025-01755-4.

de Chaisemartin, C., & D’Haultfoeulle, X. (2020). Two-Way Fixed Effects Estimators with Heterogeneous Treatment Effects. *American Economic Review*, 110(9), 2964–2996. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20181169.

Dahlen, A., & Charu, V. (2023). Analysis of Sampling Bias in Large Health Care Claims Databases. *JAMA Network Open*, 6(1), e2249804. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.49804. PMC: PMC9857613.

Dakan, R., Feller, J., & Anthropic. (2025). *The AI Fluency Framework*. Anthropic. CC BY-NC-SA 4.0.

Dang, L.E., Gruber, S., Lee, H., Dahabreh, I.J., Stuart, E.A., Williamson, B.D., Wyss, R., Díaz, I., et al., van der Laan, M., & Petersen, M. (2023). A causal roadmap for generating high-quality real-world evidence. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science*, 7, e212.

Denison, C., MacDiarmid, M., Barez, F., Duvenaud, D., Kravec, S., Marks, S., Schiefer, N., Soklaski, R., Tamkin, A., Kaplan, J., Shlegeris, B., Bowman, S.R., Perez, E., & Hubinger, E. (2024). Sycophancy to Subterfuge: Investigating Reward Tampering in Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10162*.

Gebru, T., Morgenstern, J., Vecchione, B., Vaughan, J.W., Wallach, H., Daumé, H. III, & Crawford, K. (2021). Datasheets for datasets. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(12), 86–92. DOI: 10.1145/3458723.

Gelman, A., & Loken, E. (2013). The Garden of Forking Paths: Why Multiple Comparisons Can Be a Problem, Even When There Is No “Fishing Expedition” or “p-Hacking” and the Research Hypothesis Was Posited Ahead of Time. Columbia University.

Goodman-Bacon, A. (2021). Difference-in-differences with variation in treatment timing. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2), 254–277. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2021.03.014.

He, Y., & Bu, Y. (2026). Academic journals’ AI policies fail to curb the surge in AI-assisted academic writing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2526734123.

Ji, Z., Lee, N., Frieske, R., Yu, T., Su, D., Xu, Y., Ishii, E., Bang, Y.J., Madotto, A., & Fung, P. (2023). Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12), 1–38. DOI: 10.1145/3571730.

Karpathy, A. (2025). Vibe Coding. [X post, February 2025.] <https://x.com/karpathy/status/188619218480814938>

Kerr, N.L. (1998). HARKing: Hypothesizing After the Results are Known. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2(3), 196-217.

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3), 480–498. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.480.

Kosch, T., & Feger, S. (2025). Prompt-Hacking: The New p-Hacking? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14571*.

Lin, Z., & Sohail, A. (2026). Recalibrating academic expertise in the age of generative AI. *Patterns*, 7(1), 101473. DOI: 10.1016/j.patter.2025.101473.

Logg, J.M., Minson, J.A., & Moore, D.A. (2019). Algorithm appreciation: People prefer algorithmic to human judgment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 151, 90–103. DOI: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.12.005.

Mbotwa, J., Singini, I., & Mukaka, M. (2017). Discrepancy Between Statistical Analysis Method and Study Design in Medical Research: Examples, Implications, and Potential Solutions. *Malawi Medical Journal*, 29(1), 56–59. DOI: 10.4314/mmj.v29i1.12. PMC: PMC5442496.

- Mitchell, M., Wu, S., Zaldivar, A., Barnes, P., Vasserman, L., Hutchinson, B., Spitzer, E., Raji, I.D., & Gebru, T. (2019). Model Cards for Model Reporting. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT '19)*, 220–229. arXiv:1810.03993.
- Munafò, M.R., Nosek, B.A., Bishop, D.V.M., Button, K.S., Chambers, C.D., Percie du Sert, N., Simonsohn, U., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Ware, J.J., & Ioannidis, J.P.A. (2017). A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1, 0021. DOI: 10.1038/s41562-016-0021.
- Nickerson, R.S. (1998). Confirmation Bias: A Ubiquitous Phenomenon in Many Guises. *Review of General Psychology*, 2(2), 175–220. DOI: 10.1037/1089-2680.2.2.175.
- NIST. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0)*. NIST AI 100-1. <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/nist.ai.100-1.pdf>
- Perez, E., Ringer, S., Lukošūtė, K., Nguyen, K., Chen, E., Heiner, S., Pettit, C., Olsson, C., Kundu, S., Kadavath, S., Jones, A., Chen, A., Mann, B., Israel, B., Seethor, B., McKinnon, C., et al. (2022). Discovering Language Model Behaviors with Model-Written Evaluations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09251*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2212.09251.
- Petersen, M.L., & van der Laan, M.J. (2014). Causal Models and Learning from Data: Integrating Causal Modeling and Statistical Estimation. *Epidemiology*, 25(3), 418–426. DOI: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000000078.
- Porter, T.M. (1995). *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*. Princeton University Press. JSTOR: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7sp8x>
- Rathi, N., Jurafsky, D., & Zhou, K. (2025). Humans overrely on overconfident language models, across languages. *Proceedings of the Conference on Language Modeling (COLM) 2025*. arXiv:2507.06306.
- Risko, E.F., & Gilbert, S.J. (2016). Cognitive Offloading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(9), 676–688. DOI: 10.1016/j.tics.2016.07.002.
- Roth, J., Sant’Anna, P.H.C., Bilinski, A., & Poe, J. (2023). What’s Trending in Difference-in-Differences? A Synthesis of the Recent Econometrics Literature. *Journal of Econometrics*, 235(2), 2218–2244. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2023.03.008.
- Schrage, M. (2025). Vibe Analytics: Vibe Coding’s New Cousin Unlocks Insights. *MIT Sloan Management Review*. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/vibe-analytics-vibe-codings-new-cousin-unlocks-insights/>
- Shah, A.V., & Levy, J.Y. (2026). Access to Justice in the Age of AI: Evidence from U.S. Federal Courts. Working Paper, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and University of Southern California. https://avshah1.github.io/assets/pdf/papers/pro-se/Pro_Se_Automation.pdf
- Sharma, M., Tong, M., Korbak, T., Duvenaud, D., Askill, A., Bowman, S.R., et al. (2023). Towards Understanding Sycophancy in Language Models. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) 2024*. arXiv:2310.13548.
- Shaw, S.D., & Nave, G. (2026). Thinking—Fast, Slow, and Artificial: How AI is Reshaping Human Reasoning and the Rise of Cognitive Surrender. *Wharton School Working Paper*. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.6097646.
- Shen, J. H., & Tamkin, A. (2026). How AI impacts skill formation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.20245v2*.

Shumailov, I., Shumaylov, Z., Zhao, Y., Papernot, N., Anderson, R., & Gal, Y. (2024). AI models collapse when trained on recursively generated data. *Nature*, *631*, 755–759. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-024-07566-y.

Simmons, J.P., Nelson, L.D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-Positive Psychology: Undisclosed Flexibility in Data Collection and Analysis Allows Presenting Anything as Significant. *Psychological Science*, *22*(11), 1359-1366.

Steyvers, M., Tejada, H., Kumar, A., Belem, C., Karny, S., Hu, X., Mayer, L.W., & Smyth, P. (2024). What large language models know and what people think they know. *Nature Machine Intelligence*. DOI: 10.1038/s42256-024-00976-7.

Sun, L., & Abraham, S. (2021). Estimating dynamic treatment effects in event studies with heterogeneous treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics*, *225*(2), 175–199. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.09.006.

Suprmind (2026). AI Hallucination Statistics: Research Report 2026. Suprmind.ai.

Wang, G., Hamad, R., & White, J.S. (2024). Advances in Difference-in-Differences Methods for Policy Evaluation Research. *Epidemiology*, *35*(5), 628–637. DOI: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000001630. PMC: PMC11305929.

Watson, H.J. (2025). A Statistical Analysis Plan Template for Observational Studies: Promoting Quality and Rigor in Research. *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice*, *19*(4). DOI: 10.1007/s42519-025-00504-9.

Appendices

Appendix A: Condition 1 Checklist: Method-Data Contract for Difference-in-Differences on Healthcare Claims Data

Appendix B: Condition 2 Checklist: Data Audit Before Analysis

Appendix C: Condition 3 Template: Pre-Commitment Statement

[Appendices contain the full checklist and template documents developed as part of this framework.]