



# Music is appreciated cross-modally, but is culture- and context-dependent

A recommendation by [Yuki Yamada](#)  based on peer reviews by [Kyoshiro Sasaki](#)  and 1 anonymous reviewer of the STAGE 2 REPORT:

Gakuto Chiba, Yuto Ozaki, Shinya Fujii, Patrick E. Savage (2023) Sight vs. sound judgments of music performance depend on relative performer quality: Cross-cultural evidence from classical piano and Tsugaru shamisen competitions [Stage 2 Registered Report]. Missing preprint\_server, ver. 11, peer-reviewed and recommended by Peer Community in Registered Reports. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/xky4j>

Submitted: 30 November 2022, Recommended: 13 February 2023

#### Cite this recommendation as:

Yamada, Y. (2023) Music is appreciated cross-modally, but is culture- and context-dependent. *Peer Community in Registered Reports*, 100351. <https://doi.org/10.24072/pci.rr.100351>

Published: 13 February 2023

Copyright: This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

---

Music is not merely limited to the aural experience we garner through our auditory faculties, as commonly perceived. Rather, various studies have explored the cross-modal impact of visual stimuli on the evaluation of music. These previous studies have been confined exclusively to Western music. Hence, Chiba et al. (2023) designed a study with a focus on the Tsugaru shamisen, a renowned folk instrument indigenous to Japan, and of which the first author is an outstanding player.

The study methodology was an improved version of previous endeavors, wherein actual musical material sourced from concours performances was displayed through audio-only, video-only or both modalities. A sample of Japanese participants were then asked to evaluate the concours performances on both the piano and the Tsugaru shamisen. The results, obtained through pre-registered protocols, revealed that for both concours performances, the participants displayed a cross-modal impact of visual information on their aural evaluation of music. This effect was also found to be contingent on cultural and contextual factors. These outcomes furnish valuable evidence towards the generalizability of the interplay between sight and sound in the assessment of music. The study underwent rigorous peer-review processes in both Stage 1 and Stage 2, with three experts specializing in Japanese folk music, open science, and statistics, respectively, providing their critical assessments. Following multiple rounds of revision, the final manuscript was deemed fit for recommendation. **URL to the preregistered Stage 1 protocol:** <https://osf.io/ry2b6> **Level of bias control achieved:** Level 6. *No part of the data or evidence that was used to answer the research question was generated until after IPA.* **List of eligible PCI RR-friendly journals:**

- [Peer Community Journal](#)

- [PeerJ](#)
- [Royal Society Open Science](#)
- [Swiss Psychology Open](#)

### **References:**

Chiba G., Ozaki Y., Fujii S., & Savage P.E. (2023). Sight vs. sound judgments of music performance depend on relative performer quality: Cross-cultural evidence from classical piano and Tsugaru shamisen competitions [Stage 2 Registered Report]. Acceptance of Version 2 by Peer Community in Registered Reports. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/xky4j>

## **Reviews**

### **Evaluation round #1**

DOI or URL of the preprint: <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/xky4j>  
Version of the preprint: 9

### **Authors' reply, 13 February 2023**

[Download author's reply](#)  
[Download tracked changes file](#)

### **Decision by [Yuki Yamada](#) , posted 26 January 2023, validated 26 January 2023**

#### **Minor Revision**

Thank you for submitting a Stage 2 manuscript with very intriguing results and discussion. I think this paper needs only minor revisions.

As you can see, we received peer review comments from two experts.

One gave detailed advice on how to graphically present and describe the results, and how to treat claims in the discussion. These would benefit the manuscript from serious consideration.

The second reviewer was also quite satisfied with the manuscript, but commented on the multiple comparisons. This comment calls for a change in Section 2.4.3, which is locked in Stage 1 and cannot be directly revised. Therefore, this point can be mentioned in the discussion if necessary or added to the results section as an unregistered analysis. Alternatively, you may want to simply disagree with the reviewer. Whichever approach you choose, please let us know why in your reply.

Please see the individual peer review comments for details. We look forward to your corrections and re-submission.

Yuki Yamada, Recommender

Reviewed by **Kyoshiro Sasaki** , 17 January 2023

[Download the review](#)

Reviewed by anonymous reviewer 1, 16 January 2023

[Download the review](#)