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Dear Prof Fryling,

Please find attached my manuscript ‘Reply to Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) “The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition: A Case of Frankenstein’s Monster”’. I wish to submit it as a Brief Communication (word count: 2283 words).

Perspectives on Behavior Science recently published Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) “The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition: A Case of Frankenstein’s Monster”. In that article, the authors provided an account of the history of the development and use of the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP). They state (1) that the IRAP did not start out as an implicit measure, and (2) that Barnes-Holmes “lost control” of the task and others used it as one. They imply that other researchers misused the task and diverted the research agenda away from behaviorist goals. They use this account to as a springboard for suggestions for future IRAP research. Unfortunately, their core assertions are at odds with the published scientific record, including Barnes-Holmes own IRAP publications.

This reply uses a systematic review to test Barnes-Holmes & Harte’s (2022) two aforementioned claims. I show that the IRAP was consistently stated to be an implicit measure, and that Barnes-Holmes never lost control of the task but is in fact author of 48% of all IRAP publications. The credibility of Barnes-Holmes & Harte’s (2022) suggestions regarding future IRAP research are undermined by their inaccurate account of its past. Given that Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) argues for and is likely to be cited as a justification for a pivot in the use of the IRAP, I think that it is important that future research be based on an accurate representation of the facts, without revisionism, and that readers not be misinformed.

Perspectives on Behavior Science desk-rejected this manuscript on the grounds that they do not publish replies – even those that raise factual inaccuracies. This was disappointing, and is unfortunately in line with observations made elsewhere that it is too hard to publish critique of research once it has been published (e.g., Gelman 2013, ‘It’s Too Hard to Publish Criticisms and Obtain Data for Replication’). I understand that it is less typical to publish replies in a different journal to that which published the original article, the Psychological Record has published many IRAP papers, and I therefore hope that this Brief Communication is of interest to you and your readers.

Should you be willing to review it, I would request that Dermot Barnes-Holmes and Yvonne Barnes-Holmes not be involved in the editorial process, given their conflict of interest. The manuscript has not be published previously and it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

Kind regards,

Ian Hussey