Table 1. Verifications of power analyses for 80% power.

| Test | Tails | Estimated using\* |  | Original *N* | Recalculated *N* | Discrepancy |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pearson’s *r* | One-tailed | Point estimate | 0.45 | 29 | 29 |  |
| Pearson’s *r* | One-tailed | Lower bound of 95% CI | 0.40 | 37 | 37 |  |
| Pearson’s *r* | Two-tailed | Point estimate | 0.45 | 36 | 36 |  |
| Pearson’s r | Two-tailed | Lower bound of 95% CI | 0.40 | - | 46 |  |
| Independent *t*-test (Cohen’s *d*)\*\* | One-tailed | Point estimate | 1.01 | 26 | 26 |  |
| Independent *t*-test (Cohen’s *d*) \*\* | One-tailed | Lower bound of 95% CI | 0.87 | 36 | 34 | \* |
| Dependent *t*-test (Cohen’s *d*) \*\* | One-tailed | Point estimate | 1.01 | 8 | 8 |  |
| Dependent *t*-test (Cohen’s *d*) \*\* | One-tailed | Lower bound of 95% CI | 0.87 | 10 | 10 |  |
| *Notes:*  \* Researchers often use the point estimate of the meta-effect size. Perugini et al. (2014) recommended the lower bound of the 95% CI instead. Vahey et al. (2015) used both for power analyses. \*\* Necessary conversions from *d* to *r* were not reported in Vahey et al. (2015), but are recalcalculated here using the effectsize R package’s r\_to\_d function. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  | Vahey et al. (2015) | | Verified | New meta-analysis | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Test | Tails | Estimated using\* |  | *N* | *N* |  | *N* |
| Pearson’s *r* | One | Point estimate | 0.45 | 29 | 29 | .22 | 126 |
| Pearson’s *r* | One | Lower bound of 95% CI | 0.40 | 37 | 37 | .15 | 273 |
| Pearson’s *r* | Two | Point estimate | 0.45 | 36 | 36 | .22 | 160 |
| Pearson’s *r* | Two | Lower bound of 95% CI | 0.40 | - | 46 | .15 | 346 |
| Independent *t*-test (Cohen’s *d*)\*\* | One | Point estimate | 1.01 | 26 | 26 | .45 | 124 |
| Independent *t*-test (Cohen’s *d*) \*\* | One | Lower bound of 95% CI | 0.87 | 36 | 34\*\*\* | .30 | 270 |
| Dependent *t*-test (Cohen’s *d*) \*\* | One | Point estimate | 1.01 | 8 | 8 | .45 | 32 |
| Dependent *t*-test (Cohen’s *d*) \*\* | One | Lower bound of 95% CI | 0.87 | 10 | 10 | .30 | 69 |
| *Notes:*  \* Researchers often use the point estimate of the meta-effect size. Perugini et al. (2014) recommended the lower bound of the 95% CI instead. Vahey et al. (2015) used both for power analyses. \*\* Necessary conversions from *d* to *r* were not reported in Vahey et al. (2015), but are recalculated here using the effectsize R package’s ‘r\_to\_d’ function.  \*\*\* Discrepancy between result reported in Vahey et al. (2015) and recalculated result | | | | | | | |

Table 2. Verification attempts for the meta-analysis.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | 95% CI | | 95% CR | | 95% PI | |
| Label | Implementation | Modifications from original code |  | Lower | Upper | Lower | Upper | Lower | Upper |
| Vahey et al. (2015) | Vahey stated in personal corrispondance that they employed Field & Gillett’s code. | Unkown. | .45 | .40 | .54 | .23 | .67 | - | - |
| Verification attempt 1 | Hunter & Schmidt method using Field & Gillett’s (2010) "h\_s\_syntax.sps" | All reliabilities set to 0. | .47 | .20 | .74 | .47 | .47 | - | - |
| Verification attempt 2 | Hunter & Schmidt method using Field & Gillett’s (2010) “Meta\_Basic\_r.sps” | Set variance in population correlations to zero if it is negative, as in "h\_s\_syntax.sps" | .46 | - | - | .46 | .46 | - | - |
| Verification attempt 3 | Hunter & Schmidt method using Viechtbauer’s (2022) implementation in R and metafor. | Credibility intervals implemented using Field & Gillett’s (2010) equations 2 to 5. | .47 | .40 | .54 | .47 | .47 | .40 | .54 |
| Verification attempt 4 | Mix of Hunter & Schmidt and Hedges methods using Viechtbauer’s (2022) implementation in R and metafor. | Credibility intervals implemented using Field & Gillett’s (2010) equations 2 to 5. Fisher’s *r*-to-*z* transformations and *z*-to-*r* back transformations. | .47 | .40 | .54 | .47 | .47 | .40 | .54 |
| *Notes:* CI = Confidence Interval. CR = Credibility Interval. PI = Prediction Interval. Although PIs were not reported in Vahey et al. (2015), they are were calculated where possible in the verification attempts to see if they corrisponded with the original CRs on the basis that the CRs could have been mislabelled. Cells shaded in grey match those reported in Vahey et al. (2015) within ±.01. | | | | | | | | | |
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