ReproHack

The ReprohackNL organizers
Email: reprohack.nl@gmail.com
Homepage: https://reprohacknl.github.io/ReproHack/

December 02, 2019

Dear **Richard Morey**:

Thank you so much for sharing your paper **Use of significance test logic by scientists in a novel reasoning task** to be reproduced at our ReprohackNL event last Saturday 30th of November !!

As you may know, Reprohack's participants are encouraged to fill a "Feedback Form" after their attempt of reproducing the picked paper. Given that you agreed to receive a copy of any feedback on the paper, we would like to share this feedback letter with you!

During your paper submission you answered **Yes** to the Question: *Can we make the paper available for future ReproHacks?*. We would like to remind you that you can change your mind at any point, and/or update your paper, just send us an email to let us know.

With warm regards,

The organizers.

Feedback response:

- Name of participant(s):

Iris Smal & Myrthe Veenman

- Did you manage to reproduce it?:

Yes

- On a scale from 1 to 10, how much of the paper did you manage to reproduce?:

10

- Briefly, describe the procedure followed/tools used to reproduce it:

We used the package they provided which included the license, description, README, data, shiny-app, materials, and the code. First, we ran the functions included in the package and tried to find the figures and tables from the article. In our second approach, we downloaded the data and used the code for the functions provided on GitHub. This way we could examine the code further, and extract the results.

- What were the positive features of this approach?:

With the package, it is really easy to reproduce the results and the plots.

- Any other comments/suggestions on the reproducibility approach?:

NA

- How well was the material documented?:

8

- How could the documentation be improved?:

Although the material is really well documented, and the package is easy to use, we would recommend to add descriptions. We would recommend to add which functions of the package relate to which plots/results from the paper. For instance, the plot with response evidence was really hard to find. You could add this information in the README file. Also, we found it more difficult to extract the results for Table 1 and the descriptives.

- What did you like about the documentation?:

First of all, we like the setup of the GitHub page. Especially, all the extra information that is available, as the shiny-app and the example of the experiment. In addition, most of the files are clearly named.

- After attempting to reproduce, how familiar do you feel with code and method used in the paper?:

6

- Any suggestions on how the analysis could be more transparent?:

Because everything is in the package, you are not motivated to go through code yourself. Going through the code yourself could be more useful, especially if there are informative comments in the code. One small but important note, there is a typo in the installation code line: instead of 'dependencies' it is now stated as 'depedencies'.

- Rate the project on reusability of the material:

9

- Are materials clearly covered by a permissive enough license to build on?:

NA

- Any suggestions on how project could be more reusable?:

NA

- Any final comments?:

NA

- Contact email:

myrthe.veenman@student.uva.nl, irissmal1996@gmail.com