An important idea discussed by David Spiegelhalter in *The Art of Statistics* about performing statistical science well was a method for addressing publication bias, as discussed on page 382 in Chapter 13. Chapter 13 in general discusses methods for how we can perform statistical science better, and on page 382, Spiegelhalter discusses the importance of investigating publications for publication biases (such as questionable research methods or omissions of negative results) and discusses a method for identifying them when they occur. The method he suggests in this section is to examine what he designates as the “P-curve”, which he describes as the idea of looking at all of the P-values reported for significant test results (i.e. where P < 0.05) and investigate this data for two suspicious features – for the presence of a clear cluster of points just below the significance level cut-off, and for uniform distribution of p-values below the significance level cut-off. The presence of the former pattern, as Spiegelhalter puts it, “suggests some massaging has been done to tip some of them (the P-values) over this crucial boundary” (pg 382), and the latter pattern is likely representative of “the pattern that would occur were the null hypothesis true” (pg 382), thus implying that the only results that were reported as significant were those 1 in 20 that tipped over P < 0.05 by luck. I feel that this idea is important to consider, as it provides us with another tool that we can use to examine the statistical analyses of publications to ensure that there is truly evidence for the effect(s) examined in the study, as well as ensure that we don’t unintentionally make these errors ourselves when performing statistical analyses.