# Response to "Moving to a World Beyond p < 0.05"

Wasserstein, Schirm, and Lazar argue against using "statistically significant" terminology because this dichotomous framing has led to serious misinterpretations and misuses of p-values in research. The bright-line threshold (typically p < 0.05) creates an artificial binary where results are either "significant" or "not significant," which oversimplifies complex findings and promotes publication bias.

They recommend several improvements:

1. \*\*Report precise p-values\*\* along with effect sizes and confidence intervals rather than simply stating whether a threshold was crossed. This provides more nuanced information about the strength of evidence.

2. \*\*Embrace uncertainty\*\* by acknowledging that scientific conclusions should not hinge on single studies or arbitrary thresholds. Researchers should present the full context of their findings.

3. \*\*Consider multiple approaches\*\* to data analysis, including Bayesian methods and alternative frequentist techniques, which can provide complementary perspectives on the research question.

These changes aim to shift focus from binary decision-making based on p-values toward thoughtful interpretation of evidence within the broader scientific context.