**Feedback form written report version 3**

**Statistical Consulting**

**(filled in by tutor)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Criteria (three in total):*** | Feedback in words |
| ***1. Client specific:*** (practiced in the client meetings)  INTRODUCTION section:  - relevance and formulation of research question(s) is(are) written from a client perspective;  METHOD section:  -explanation of the variables and analysis in client terms  RESULTS section:  -presentation of the results is understandable to the client;  DISCUSSION section (optional for version 3):  - research question(s) of introduction section is(are) answered satisfactorily in the language of the client  - reflection on the results is from a client perspective (e.g., suggestions for future research; also see lecture 9). | * ~~Nice general intro.~~ * ~~The step that signals the gap in the literature and how you close it could be clearer. It should be absolutely clear to the reader: What is missing, why it is important to fill this gap, how exactly are you filling the gap. As an example, you signal that it is not clear whether SAD causes or is caused by changes in metacognition. It was not clear to me whether your metaanalysis can address this. For this, longitudinal data are needed, right?~~ * ~~The results section reads rather statistical. I lost the connection to the research question often.~~ * ~~The discussion section misses it’s main content: An answer to your research question and the implications of this.~~ |
| ***2. Statistically sound:***  METHOD section (Statistical analysis paragraph):  ***-***choice of the method(s) is motivated and well connected to the research question(s) (lectures 1&2);  -statistical analysis (including initial data analysis) is correctly described (lectures 4, 5, and 8) and explained; it is described how assumptions were checked;  RESULTS section:  - results of statistical analyses are presented correctly (lectures 6 and 7);  DISCUSSION section (optional for version 3)  - valid conclusion(s) is(are) drawn taking into account potential limitations of the design of the study (lectures 8 and 9).  - Appendix (not needed for version 3) | * It was not clear to me how you addressed that different studies used different effect sizes; say F-test vs. correlation coefficient. It’s probably not a good idea to put those all in the same model, right? * ~~Can you make the search criteria for finding papers more specific? What search strings have you used in the databases mentioned?~~ * ~~I got a bit confused by the raters: first two raters, then after a second rater, then two additional raters.~~ * ~~“were found to be not suitable”: what makes them not suitable?~~ * ~~Might be nice to include a graph explaining the full screening process of papers~~ * ~~The first part of the statistical analysis section reads a bit too much like a summary of an R script. Try to explain this more on a higher level. It should be understandable for people without knowledge of R.~~ * ~~Generally, do not refer to R code or functions or only at the very end. For example: We compared groups using Welch’s t-test. Instead of, “we used t.test to compare groups.”~~ * Explain better what the results variables are. Correlation coefficients, F-statistics etc. for what tests? ~~Correlation between SAD and metacognition?~~ * ~~After reading your section about the model, I got the impression that you model individual data points of a study (your Level 1 model) but this is not the case, right?~~ * ~~The assumption of normality is never perfectly met.~~ * ~~It was not clear to me what the restricted Model 1 is: “a simple random effects model”. More generally: suggest including the~~ formulas for all models ~~and describing more clearly how they address the different research questions.~~ * ~~Include a result table containing the results of all models~~ |
| ***3. Scientific communication - general:***  - writing style: correct grammar, correct wording, no typos  - writing style: easy to understand, logical flow and concise (no repeats of information);  - scientific structure (appropriate headings and matching content of different sections according to syllabus Chapter 5 and lecture 3);  - format of the tables/figures: stand alone (lecture 7)  - format of the references in compliance with APA or Vancouver style (lecture 3) | * ~~Generally: good scientific language~~ * ~~The instructions ask you to not use two-column layout~~ * ~~Your first citation should be “[1,2]”. Checkout how to cite multiple resources in Vancouver style.~~ * ~~Normally, there is not background chapter in scientific reports. Suggest merging this with the intro section.~~ * ~~Very minor but the “ before worry on page 2 is incorrect~~ * ~~At the end of the Metacognition and Social Anxiety subsection, you summarize the current state of research without refering to relevant papers.~~ * ~~Same applies to the 2~~~~nd~~ ~~background subsection~~ * ~~In the beginning of the methodology section you write: “researchers first compiled”. I suggest formulating it in such a way that it is clear whether this was you (or the client) or other people.~~ * ~~The data information section might could profit from a table summarizing the variables.~~ * ~~Figure 1 contains relatively little information for the amount of space it takes.~~ * ~~Figure 2 needs a longer caption. Remember that figures need to be standalone.~~ |

To do

* Add Citations to the bibliography. Make sure to note the keyword tags when adding them so that the new ones show up in the main bibliography, not the list of primary studies
* Figure out if we’ve really described where all the papers go/ when they were removed (We didn’t mention the weird one we deleted)
* Figure out if the studies were standardized
* Ask ruya if she really randomly subsetted the original dataset or how we go from 105 papers to 34 (I wrote it because it’s the only explanation I could come up with)
* Add conversion formulas into the appendix
* ~~We should check how many of the single measures are actually originally a global measure, and how many just use e.g. positive/negative~~
* ~~Make sure forest and z-score plots are up to date~~
* Abstract
* ~~The warning “Warning: Redundant predictors dropped from the model.” Comes from the fact that we turn our predictors into factors before we remove some papers, so there are factor levels in there that no longer have any rows that correspond to them in the dataframe. We can ignore it.~~
* Describe how the continuous predictors can be interpreted
* What is the base level for instrument simplified?
* The results might need us to talk more about the other measures listed in the table (e.g. Tau)
* The model results table caption needs to be stand alone
* We also should talk about the heterogeneity measures etc of model 1 in the discussion.
* Anywhere where XX occurs, something is missing
* Check that all oft he citatations show up where they are supposed to, and delete duplicates (make sure the tags still work in the document)
* Format so that the figures don’t take up a full page on their own
* Cleanup and comment code
* Figure out how Ruya can include heart rate variability
* Upload data and analysis in github, make github for final documents accessible throught th link
* Test the link
* Read through the whole thing and make sure we agree
* The conclusion should use the citations from the introduction where we repeat statements