## Introduction

A major effort among psychological researchers and methodologists in recent years in psychological research has been the movement away from focusing entirely on binary outcome statistical significance testing. These figures have argued against focusing on the presence or absence of effects, but rather on the size and direction of effects and precision in estimation. Under conditions where results are selectively reported based on characteristics related to the size of the effect (e.g., statistical significance), the literature no longer provides an unbiased estimate of the true outcome effect. An essential question for the purposes of understanding our scientific literature, as well as for planning future studies, is assessing the degree to which effect sizes are inflated in the published literature.

### Publication bias

There are several main mechanisms by which publication bias may inflate effect sizes in psychological research. The first is by

### Accounting for publication bias in meta-analysis

However, in the current environment, selective re

One of the most underappreciated issues in psychological research is the question of th

One of the major difficulties in using formal sample size planning in psychological research is appropriately selecting effect sizes for publication. In order to be able to accurately estimate effect sizes from the literature, having an accurate estimate of the degree to which effect sizes are typically inflated is essential.

## Methods

SEE MARKDOWN DOC

## Results

A paper hoping to estimate the average effect of publication bias in psychology using what effect sizes