

CODECHECK certificate 2024-005

Codechecker: Lukas Röseler (University of Münster, Münster Center for Open Science)

Report DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13945051>
Check time: 2024-10-15



Prerequisites

I conducted a codecheck of the git repository <https://github.com/eduardklap/sample-size-codecheck.git>, which was created by the author. As suggested in the community-workflow, this document is strongly based on the codecheck example by Daniel Nüst of Hopfield-1982 (<https://github.com/codecheckers/Hopfield-1982/blob/master/codecheck/codecheck.Rmd>) as suggested by the community workflow guide.

- README file exists
- LICENSE file exists
- `codecheck.yml` file exists
- Citation of the original report: Klapwijk, E. T., Jongerling, J., Hoijsink, H., & Crone, E. (2024, July 9). Sample size estimation for task-related functional MRI studies using Bayesian updating. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/cz32t>
- Citation of the this report: Röseler, L. (2024). CODECHECK certificate 2024-005. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13945051>

The CODECHECK

This report checks the code of the article *Sample size estimation for task-related functional MRI studies using Bayesian updating*. (<https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/cz32t> (currently under review at Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience)). See section Notes for details about running the code.

The CODECHECK was successful. The created figures `figures_cohens_d.html` and `figures-correlations.html` are visually very close to the one in the repository.

The reproduction of the figures from the repository was easy due to the workflow and integration with Quarto and RStudio.

Codechecker notes

The following files are uploaded to a deposit on Zenodo from the directory `codecheck/` in the repository:

1. I agreed to do the codecheck and read the CODECHECK process and the README.md from the associated project.
2. As suggested under *Workflow*, I created a new RStudio project (Version control) and entered the URL of the forked repository to clone it. This was my R version at that time:

```
print(sessionInfo())

## R version 4.4.0 (2024-04-24 ucrt)
## Platform: x86_64-w64-mingw32/x64
## Running under: Windows 11 x64 (build 22631)
##
## Matrix products: default
##
## locale:
## [1] LC_COLLATE=German_Germany.utf8  LC_CTYPE=German_Germany.utf8
## [3] LC_MONETARY=German_Germany.utf8 LC_NUMERIC=C
## [5] LC_TIME=German_Germany.utf8
##
## time zone: Europe/Berlin
## tzcode source: internal
##
## attached base packages:
## [1] stats      graphics  grDevices  utils      datasets  methods   base
##
## other attached packages:
## [1] yaml_2.3.10 here_1.0.1
##
## loaded via a namespace (and not attached):
## [1] compiler_4.4.0    fastmap_1.2.0     rprojroot_2.0.4   cli_3.6.3
## [5] tools_4.4.0       htmltools_0.5.8.1 rstudioapi_0.16.0 rmarkdown_2.28
## [9] knitr_1.48        xfun_0.46         digest_0.6.36     rlang_1.1.4
## [13] evaluate_0.24.0
```

3. I installed the packages. Both failed to install due to my folder having a 00LOCK folder. I deleted the folder which led to the package successfully installing. `neuroUP` also installed dependency ‘bootstrap’. I later also installed the `float` package hoping that this would result in the Codecheck image being displayed but it did not.

```
# # not run
# install.packages("neuroUp")
# install.packages("patchwork")
# install.packages("float")
```

4. I opened `figures-cohens_d.qmd` and clicked on render at **11:33 CEST**. During the runtime I went back to the CODECHECK documentation. The Background Job quickly stalled at 16% [fig-1a]. It increased to 48% by 13:46 CEST. It was still 48% at 15:47 CEST (after ~3.5 hours). A markdown file opened itself “**Code for Figures 1-2 based on Cohen’s d**” after ~8 hours. The background job kept running. I stopped the job after more than 8 hours (8:33:40). I do not know why the background job kept running despite the files already being created.
5. I started rendering the code of the **figures-correlations** at 21:11 CEST. The rendering was finished at 22:47 CEST.
6. I created a directory `codecheck` and saved this file in it.

7. Visual inspection of the figures: I compared the four files fig-X-total-1 that include all other figures (see below). I switched between the original and the reproduced file, respectively. They differed with respect to the line width of the dashed lines and some other minor parts of the format. Besides these difference, I could successfully reproduce the results.

Here are the original figure from the directory `code/` and the reproduced figure from the directory `codecheck/`:

Original and Reproduced Figures




Figure 1: Original figure 1




Figure 2: Reproduced figure 1




Figure 3: Original figure 2




Figure 4: Reproduced figure 2




Figure 5: Original figure 3




Figure 6: Reproduced figure 3




Figure 7: Original figure 4




Figure 8: Reproduced figure 4