Review of PCI RR Fox and Rottenstreich (2003) [Stage 2]

I think this project is great; the authors have done important and impressive work examining the replicability of an important and influential recent theory. Therefore, I started positively disposed toward this manuscript. I wanted to like it, but really struggled with this version of the writeup. My Stage 1 review praised the project, but I found this Stage 2 version almost unreadably complex. There are too many studies, too many details, too many mixed and complicated results. The authors could do a lot more to help readers understand what they had done and make sense of the results.

I think probably it is a mistake to present all the details on all the methods for all the studies before presenting any results. I found it demoralizing to slog through page after page of methods, data analysis strategies, deviations from original studies, and deviations from preregistrations without seeing any results. I could not keep it straight in my head and it all got mixed up in a big jumble in which I lost interest by the time I made it to the results on page 38. Then when the results finally did come, they came in a complicated blizzard in which I had trouble tracking what actually mattered and what it meant for the theories of partition dependence.

If the authors want anyone to read their paper, they might think about reorganizing it. I would humbly offer a counterexample:

* O’Donnell, M. et al. (2021). The psychological consequences of scarcity are less general and less replicable than they seem: An empirical audit and review. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118*(44), e2103313118.

O’Donnell et al. present 20 different replications crisply and succinctly, offering an overview of the results in their brief *PNAS* paper. In particular, the forest plot they present in Fig 1 is a helpful summary of the replicability of the studies they consider. Of course, there are many important details that did not fit in this brief report; they are all fully and excruciatingly reported in the supplemental materials available for interested readers. Would a model like that be viable for this paper?

Having said all of that, I will repeat that I think this is a wonderful initiative. I am grateful to the authors for all their hard work and think that this paper makes a valuable contribution to the literature. I am ready to recommend it, even in its current state. I would be even more enthusiastic if it were easier to read.

Additional notes:

What do the boxes represent in Figure 1? A note in the figure’s caption would help.

Fig 2: the resolution of the images and the stats reported with them is poor. Also, reporting *p*<.001 will be easier for readers to understand than *p*=9.176e-05.

I appreciate the quality of the paper’s online supplement. The OSF site is well organized.

This is a signed review.
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