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Dear Prof Molina Cobos,

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”’.

Around two months ago, Perspectives on Behavior Science published Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) “The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition: A Case of Frankenstein’s Monster”. In this 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.

I have already submitted this reply to Perspectives on Behavior Science, who rejected it on the grounds that they do not publish replies even when they raise factual inaccuracies. This was disappointing. While it is less regular to publish replies in journals other than the original articles, given that PoBS has stated they are not interested in any reply, I therefore looked to other journals with a demonstrated interest in the IRAP. The International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy has published many IRAP papers, and I therefore hope that this short article 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.

Submission declaration: the manuscript has not be published previously and it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

Kind regards,

Ian Hussey