### Dropped as it is too complicated to explain, with little added value

### Verification attempt 3

On close inspection, the “Meta\_Basic\_r.sps” script applies an Overton correction (REF) to the correlations prior to meta-analysing them. This is likely an error as, according to Field & Gillett (2010) themselves, this correction is intended to be applied prior to a Fisher’s *r*-to-*z* transformation, which the Hunter & Schmidt style meta-analysis does not employ. Note that this implies that verification attempt 2 should not be considered as a valid estimate of the true effect size, as it involves an inappropriate correction. To cover the possibility that Vahey et al. (2015) also noticed this error in Field’s code and corrected it, the third verification attempt was identical to the second other than employing the weighted-average effect sizes without an Overton transformation. As shown in Table XX, this verification attempt also did not reproduce the original results. The point estimate was again off by a small amount ( = 0.02), and was now identical to the result found in verification attempt 1. Credibility Intervals again had zero width because was negative.