1. Be written in paragraph form,
2. Refer specifically to the experimental design, methods, results, and conclusions that are described in the paper, and
3. Include the answers to the questions below:
4. What is your perception of the science in the paper? In other words, what does the paper describe and conclude?

The paper sets out to inspect the relationship between viewing images of weapons and aggression in children. They concluded that viewing them would increase aggression.

1. Is the work original?

Yes.

1. Is the hypothesis clear?

Yes. They have three. Children who see weapon pictures will show more aggression than those that do not. Males will have a tendency to show more aggression than females. Individuals that already have high aggressiveness will be more aggressive than don’t.

1. Is the science of high quality? In other words, are the experiments well designed to answer the questions at hand, and are the methods and results presented in sufficient detail to support the conclusions that are made?

The experiments seem designed to answer the question. However, they are not flawless. The sample size seems very small for such a study, less than 300 people. The researchers do not seem to control for different upbringings or other confounding factors. Their measurements of aggression was based on reaction time to specific words and a questionnaire. While the results are stated clearly, the methods seem a little to shaky to support their conclusion.

1. Do the tables and illustrations make sense?

Yes

1. Are the statistics adequate and appropriate? Are there any instances where the data being presented is "glossed over"? For example, data presented in a scatter plot is all over the place so the R^2 value isn't reported even though the p value is significant.

While the statistical methods appear sound, using ANCOVA and MANCOVA to inspect the relationship between variables, several values have been misreported as explained in a corrigendum. Several of their F-Values and P-Values were “misreported.” It is unclear whether this was deliberate manipulation on the part of the scientists, or an error in running the statistics. When the values were fixed, this changes the outcome of their statistical test from significant to insignificant. It was stated in the redaction notice that there were further errors in the data set.

1. Do you think that the experiments in the paper are reproducible using the information that is provided?

No.

1. What information (if any) is missing from the materials and methods section or from the provided data that would prohibit reproducibility?

Although the statistical methods are explained well, the researchers do not provide the words or images they used to measure reaction times. It would be important to use the same exact materials if trying to reproduce this study.

1. Is the work adequately discussed? Are there any conclusions that seem speculative or overstated rather than having solid support in the data?

They seem to adequately discuss their results in most cases, though they do seem to be overstated given the relatively small sample size. Their conclusions are supported by their results, but their results are wrong.

1. Is other work relating to this subject adequately cited, or do the authors only cite their own previous work?

They cited many works from other authors.

1. Should the manuscript be published in its current form? If not, what needs to be done before it would be ready for publication?

It shouldn’t be published at all. After adjusting for the faulty statistics, a large portion of their paper is invalidated.
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