

## Re: Your submission CORTEX-D-19-00852R1

Christopher Chambers <ChambersC1@cardiff.ac.uk>

Mon 2021-05-03 5:54 PM

To: Montero-Melis, Guillermo <Guillermo.MonteroMelis@mpi.nl>;

Cc: Cheryl Phillips - Cortex <cortex@ed.ac.uk>;

Dear Guillermo

Thanks for your email. This deviation is fine and you can proceed with editorial approval and IPA intact.

When you submit at Stage 2, just include this context and explanation in the Method section, and make clear the point in the research timeline that the change in inclusion criteria was applied and received editorial approval. That way the process is transparent and equips the reader with everything they need to know to assess whether this deviation increased risk of bias (my own view is that any increase in risk of bias here is negligible).

Good luck with ongoing data collection.

best, Chris

---

**From:** "Montero-Melis, Guillermo" <Guillermo.MonteroMelis@mpi.nl>

**Date:** Monday, 3 May 2021 at 14:41

**To:** Christopher Chambers <ChambersC1@cardiff.ac.uk>

**Cc:** Cheryl Phillips - Cortex <cortex@ed.ac.uk>

**Subject:** Re: Your submission CORTEX-D-19-00852R1

Dear Dr Chambers and Cortex editorial team,

I have a question about the **possibility of changing the age limit for participants in our IPA submission** in *Cortex* (CORTEX-D-19-00852R1):

We are recruiting participants at a slow rate. In our paper, we pre-registered a sequential sampling plan: We start out with N=60, run a BF analysis and add participants in batches of 12 until either the BF  $\geq 6$  or we reach our Nmax of 108.

Unfortunately, after more than 4 months of data collection by a dedicated RA, we are just about to reach 60 participants. Apart from the pandemic, another factor that makes recruitment particularly challenging is the relatively narrow age range we accept (18-30 years). We adopted this age range because it is the same as in the original study we are replicating. However, the student population in Sweden is older than in other countries (the original was conducted in the UK). Especially in these times, we are having trouble finding participants in the right age range and we have already rejected many participants in the 31-40 years range (so we know we are missing out on many potential participants).

The question is:

**Could our age criterion be relaxed somewhat**, given these difficulties? I would envisage relaxing the age limit to include participants aged 18-40. **We cannot see a *theoretical* argument for excluding people in the 31-40 range.** On the other hand, I do think increasing our N would increase our confidence in the outcome.

I want to keep it short for now to know if Cortex has a general policy concerning this type of changes. Of course we can provide a more thorough motivation if that is what is needed.

Best wishes,

Guillermo

---

**From:** Montero-Melis, Guillermo

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 31, 2021 2:40 PM

**To:** Christopher Chambers

**Cc:** Cheryl Phillips - Cortex  
**Subject:** Re: Your submission CORTEX-D-19-00852R1

Dear Chris,

I am following up on our previous correspondence regarding our IPA manuscript at Cortex.

First, a general update on data collection: things are going slowly but surely and we are now approaching our first milestone of N=60 to run our first data analysis. Our design was sequential, so we run a BF analysis first at N=60 and then continue collecting and testing in batches of 12 if the evidence is unclear (until a max of 108, according to our RR). Our current plan is to send the Stage 2 version at some point during the summer or early autumn. I'll keep you informed about the details, especially if we deviate from this plan.

Second, we have a participant that is in some kind of gray zone with regard to inclusion/exclusion. Our age range for the experiment is 18-30 years. The participant in question indicated that they were 30 years old when they signed up for the experiment but had then turned 31 in the weeks in between. So technically they were 31 at the day of the experiment, which means they were above the age limit and should therefore be excluded. At the same time, it is really a bit of a grey zone and, under the current circumstances, I would prefer not to discard data unless it is really necessary. Could you make a judgment call about whether to include or exclude this participant? We'll gladly follow your advice.

Best wishes,

Guillermo

---

**From:** Montero-Melis, Guillermo  
**Sent:** Friday, May 22, 2020 2:17:29 PM  
**To:** Christopher Chambers  
**Cc:** Cheryl Phillips - Cortex  
**Subject:** Re: Your submission CORTEX-D-19-00852R1

Dear Chris,

Thanks for your understanding and flexibility. Let's go by your suggestion, then.

Stay well,

Guillermo

---

**From:** Christopher Chambers <ChambersC1@cardiff.ac.uk>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 22, 2020 12:17:57 PM  
**To:** Montero-Melis, Guillermo  
**Cc:** Cheryl Phillips - Cortex  
**Subject:** Re: Your submission CORTEX-D-19-00852R1

Dear Guillermo

Thanks for emailing — I understand completely. The end of November is fine, but what I would like to do for now is actually grant an indefinite extension (as I'm doing for all RRs facing restrictions on data collection), and then when the worst of the pandemic is over we can decide on a more concrete plan for an expected completion date. We totally understand that not only will extensions be needed for RRs across the board, but that the exact terms of those extensions will be difficult to define at the moment — so flexibility is needed.

So I think the best thing for now is to just keep us in the loop as the situation clarifies at your end, and we'll take it step by step.

thanks and stay well, Chris

On 22 May 2020, at 11:07, Montero-Melis, Guillermo <[Guillermo.MonteroMelis@mpi.nl](mailto:Guillermo.MonteroMelis@mpi.nl)> wrote:

Dear Dr Chambers and Cortex editorial office,

A quick update about our IPA manuscript:

Due to the current coronavirus situation **we will not be able to meet our initial timeline of submitting the stage 2 manuscript by the end of July** (see previous correspondence below). Confinement measures started just when we were about to start data collection and so we haven't been able to collect any data so far.

It is difficult to make exact plans at this point, but we could perhaps **preliminarily set 31 November as a realistic goal for Stage 2 submission?**

What do you think?

Best wishes,  
Guillermo

---

**From:** Montero-Melis, Guillermo  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 3, 2020 12:09:28 PM  
**To:** Christopher Chambers  
**Cc:** Cheryl Phillips - Cortex  
**Subject:** Re: Your submission CORTEX-D-19-00852R1

Hi Chris,  
Thanks for the positive reply. Will do as you suggest.  
Best,  
Guillermo

---

**From:** Christopher Chambers <[ChambersC1@cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:ChambersC1@cardiff.ac.uk)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 3, 2020 11:22:51 AM  
**To:** Montero-Melis, Guillermo  
**Cc:** Cheryl Phillips - Cortex  
**Subject:** Re: Your submission CORTEX-D-19-00852R1

Hi Guillermo

Thanks for emailing and I'm glad you found the RR experience positive.

re 1: this deadline is fine. If you think you are going to miss it, just let the journal office know.

re 2: it's perfectly ok to change the title at Stage 2 and you are welcome to change it to reflect the results too if you want

re 3: these updates at Stage 2 are fine and are sufficiently minor that you can just change the text without having to flag them as deviations from the registered protocol.

If you have any further questions as the research unfolds don't hesitate to contact me via the Cortex journal office.

best, Chris

---

**From:** Montero-Melis, Guillermo <[Guillermo.MonteroMelis@mpi.nl](mailto:Guillermo.MonteroMelis@mpi.nl)>  
**Sent:** 02 March 2020 17:55  
**To:** JOURNAL Cortex <[cortex@ed.ac.uk](mailto:cortex@ed.ac.uk)>  
**Subject:** Re: Your submission CORTEX-D-19-00852R1

Dear Prof. Chambers,

On behalf of the whole team, I would like to thank you for handling our submission in a very efficient and constructive way. Both your guidance and the reviewers' feedback made this a very instructive and enjoyable experience. We are all extremely excited to proceed with data collection!

A few points:

1) We would like to suggest **31 July as the deadline for submitting our Stage 2 manuscript**. This seems like a realistic timeline to us at this moment.

2) After re-submitting we became aware that the appropriate label for our project is a "Registered Replication Report" (e.g., Finkel, 2016; Bishop, 2018). **We would therefore like to slightly change the title of our submission** from

"Does the motor system functionally contribute to keeping words in working memory? A preregistered replication of Shebani and Pulvermüller (2013, Cortex)"

to

"Does the motor system functionally contribute to keeping words in working memory? Registered Replication Report of Shebani and Pulvermüller (2013, Cortex)"

Would this still be possible and, if so, at which point?

3) There are some **minor edits/corrections we would like to do in the intro**:

- p.9: "Our simulations equally suggest that the original study was underpowered to detect the very effect they reported (Appendix C)." --> Add a cross-reference to the relevant section in the ms: "Our simulations equally suggest that the original study was underpowered to detect the very effect they reported (see section Sample size rationale and Appendix C)."

- On p.14 and on p.16 (Fig 2 caption), it should say we ran "at least 10 000 simulations" rather than "10 000 simulations".

- On p.28, our BF thresholds should be BFs ">= 6" (rather than "> 6"), for consistency with the rest of the manuscript.

Will these changes still be possible at Stage 2 submission?

Best wishes,  
Guillermo

---

**From:** [em.cortex.0.699ede.03cd099f@editorialmanager.com](mailto:em.cortex.0.699ede.03cd099f@editorialmanager.com) <[em.cortex.0.699ede.03cd099f@editorialmanager.com](mailto:em.cortex.0.699ede.03cd099f@editorialmanager.com)> on behalf of Cortex <[em@editorialmanager.com](mailto:em@editorialmanager.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 29, 2020 1:19 PM  
**To:** Montero-Melis, Guillermo  
**Subject:** Your submission CORTEX-D-19-00852R1

Manuscript number: CORTEX-D-19-00852R1

Article title: Does the motor system functionally contribute to keeping words in working memory? A pre-registered replication of Shebani and Pulvermüller (2013, Cortex)  
Journal title: Cortex

Dear Dr. Montero-Melis,

Thank you for submitting your work to Cortex for consideration as a Registered Report (Stage 1). We are pleased to award in-principle acceptance (IPA) of your paper. Please read the following letter carefully. As noted in the Registered Report author guidelines, the journal has now registered your approved protocol on the OSF at the following link: <https://osf.io/v5zm7>

Please ensure that your Stage 2 manuscript, when submitted, states the URL to this approved protocol in the main text (see author guidelines for further details). Depending on the selections you made in the Stage 1 submission checklist, your approved Stage 1 protocol has been registered either publicly or under a private embargo. If you opted for a private embargo, note that the embargo will be released and the registered protocol made public when any one of the following conditions are met: submission of the Stage 2 manuscript; withdrawal of the submission and consequent triggering of a Withdrawn Registration; or natural expiry of the embargo at the end of the period you selected in the Stage 1 submission checklist.

You may now progress to Stage 2 and complete the study as approved. We would be grateful if you could now update the journal office as to the anticipated completion date of your study. This deadline can be readily altered in consultation with the editors (e.g. in case of delays requiring additional time to complete the research). However, in the event that you should fail to submit the Stage 2 manuscript within 6 months of the mutually agreed deadline and also become non-responsive during this period to editorial enquiries, then the manuscript will be considered by the journal to be de facto withdrawn, triggering publication of a Withdrawn Registration. For technical reasons, your manuscript may appear on the system as rejected. Please disregard any such information. Following completion of your study, we invite you to resubmit your paper for peer review as a Stage 2 Registered Report.

Please note that your manuscript can still be rejected for publication at Stage 2 if the editors consider any of the following conditions to be met:

- \* The results were unable to test the authors' proposed hypotheses by failing to meet the approved outcome-neutral criteria
- \* The authors altered the Introduction, rationale, or hypotheses, as approved in the Stage 1 submission
- \* The authors failed to adhere to the registered experimental procedures or pre-registered analyses (and see below)
- \* Any post hoc (unregistered) analyses were either unjustified, insufficiently caveated, or overly dominant in shaping the authors' conclusions
- \* The authors' conclusions were not justified given the data obtained

Please note that any deviation from the registered study procedures could lead to rejection of your manuscript at Stage 2.

Please note that in cases where the pre-registered protocol must be altered after IPA due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g. change of equipment or unanticipated technical error), you must consult the editorial board immediately for advice, and PRIOR to the completion of data collection. Minor changes to the protocol may be permitted according to editorial discretion. In such cases, IPA would be preserved and the deviation reported in the Stage 2 submission. We encourage you to read the complete guidelines for authors concerning Stage 2 submissions here. Please especially note the requirements for data sharing and that withdrawing your manuscript will result in publication of a Withdrawn Registration.

To submit your Stage 2 Registered Report, please go to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/CORTEX/default.aspx> and enter your login details, then upload your Report as a New Submission. We look forward to receiving your manuscript.

Yours sincerely,  
Chris Chambers  
Reports Editor

Comments from the Reviewers:

Reviewer #1: I think that the authors have provided satisfying responses to my comments, and that this experiment is in good position to provide strong evidence for or against the embodied cognition hypothesis.

Reviewer #2: The authors have done a fine job addressing my concerns; I'm now happy to support this being accepted.

The new power analysis is great, and gives you a lot of valuable information. I'm glad my concerns were enough to get you moving on this issue, and I commend you on how seriously you took it all. The end result is great.

I'm happy with the paradiddle monitoring; it's perfectly appropriate for the concerns of the task and, as you note, if you want to get into details of the execution for some exploratory analyses later, you will now be able to. But I agree with the authors about the fact specific details of execution may not be that interesting here. I'm glad you were able to find a solution you could implement, though, I think it helps.

I'm really looking forward to seeing the final paper! Good luck with this study, I stand by my view that come what may, this paper will be serve as an excellent point of reference for how to go after this type of embodied effect.

\*\*\*\*\*

For further assistance, please visit our customer support site at <http://help.elsevier.com/app/answers/list/p/7923>. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions and learn more about EM via interactive tutorials. You will also find our 24/7 support contact details should you need any further assistance from one of our customer support representatives.

---

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/cortex/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.  
The University of Edinburgh is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, with registration number SC005336.

---

Chris Chambers BSc PhD CPsychol FBPSS  
Professor of Cognitive Neuroscience  
School of Psychology  
Cardiff University  
CF10 3AT  
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)29-208-70331  
Email: [chambersc1@cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:chambersc1@cardiff.ac.uk)  
Official site: <https://www.cardiff.ac.uk/people/view/133632-chambers-chris>  
Blog: <http://www.theguardian.com/science/head-quarters>  
Twitter: @chrisdc77

---

---

Chris Chambers BSc PhD CPsychol FBPSS  
Professor of Cognitive Neuroscience  
School of Psychology  
Cardiff University  
CF10 3AT  
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)29-208-70331  
Email: [chambersc1@cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:chambersc1@cardiff.ac.uk)  
Official site: <https://www.cardiff.ac.uk/people/view/133632-chambers-chris>  
Blog: <http://www.theguardian.com/science/head-quarters>  
Twitter: @chrisdc77

---