Review of PCI RR #670

I like this project and think the authors have developed a worthwhile plan. For my PCI RR review, I have been asked to assess 5 things:

1. The scientific validity of the research question(s).

Here, I find the effort worthwhile. The original result is interesting, important, and influential.

2. The logic, rationale, and plausibility of the proposed hypotheses

Yes, this obviously derives directly from Fox and Rottenstreich’s (2003) paper.

3. The soundness and feasibility of the methodology and analysis pipeline

Yes, I find the plans feasible and methodology sound.

4. Whether the clarity and degree of methodological detail is sufficient

No plan is perfect, but this one is pretty darn good.

5. Whether the authors have considered sufficient outcome-neutral conditions (e.g. absence of floor or ceiling effects; positive controls; other quality checks) for ensuring that the obtained results are able to test the stated hypotheses or answer the stated research question(s).

Yes, I think the plans are sufficient. However, I will confess that I did not download and go over their survey materials with a fine-toothed comb (or any comb for that matter).

A few other, smaller notes:

* In the PCIRR Stage 1 snapshot: LeBel’s name is incorrectly capitalized: “Lebel”
* Zwaan et al. (2018) is cited but does not appear in the references.
* Drop “the” from “the Fox and Rottenstreich (2003)’s studies.”

This is a signed review.

Don Moore