Reviewer 1:

Doesn’t seem like there’s much to say to Reviewer 1, other than that (s)he has favored the most optimistic estimator (PEESE, *r* = .15) over the others (PET, p-curve). Even so, Reviewer 1 may find it important that a decrease from *r* = .21 to *r* = .15 implies a twofold loss of explanatory power (R­2 falls from 4.4% to 2.3%) and the need for a twofold increase in sample size (80% one-tailed power at 136 vs. 270).

I can’t speak to theory. Perhaps effects are similarly overstated in other forms of media research, or perhaps the methodologies used in video-game studies are uniquely insufficient for detecting effects.

We hasten to clarify our position: We do not consider this meta-analysis, nor do we argue, that these biases necessarily imply that there is no relationship between violent games and aggressive behavior at all. Rather, we confirm that there is a correlation in cross-sectional research, retain the longitudinal relationships as reported, and leave it to empirical research to determine exactly how robust the experimental effects are.

Reviewer 2:

Reviewer 2 made a number of valuable suggestions where our rhetoric grew sloppy, e.g., in our unqualified claim that PET, PEESE, and *p*-curve “provide better adjustments” for publication bias. We have softened such claims and used more precise rhetoric as advised.

We have