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Dear Prof Gruber,

Perspectives on Psychological Science has a proud history of occasional satirical articles. These serve an important function of bringing levity to our otherwise serious work.

PPS has also been at the forefront of promoting several important methods to minimise *p*-hacking, such as Registered Reports, preregistration, and open materials. In order to maintain balance to both sides of the argument for and against *p*-hacking, I hope that you will consider the attached article. This argues that, for those researchers who are committed to the practices of *p*-hacking, such research could be greatly accelerated through an innovative statistical technique: rather than taking time to collect data and *p*-hack results, the same outcome can be achieved (i.e., *p* < .05) by simply generating and reporting random numbers that are < .05. This retains the key property of hacked p values (i.e., publishability) while discarding both irrelevant and undesirable properties (e.g., diagnosticity of a true effect, time and effort, respectively).

Although light-hearted, I hope that this piece conveys the important message that *p*-hacked research is not only a serious threat to the validity of research findings (e.g., Simons et al., 2011), but also serves to squander research resources which are often taxpayer funded.

Kind regards,

Ian Hussey