Questions:
- a. Would it be okay if the bulk of writing is the introduction and methods? At this point, I am in the process of replicating Germani et al. (2025) and running their scrips (and trying to debug), so I'm not sure if the current plan is too ambitious.
- b. For the discussion, is it okay to include more subjective reflections on the process of learning? Or should it be solely technical (4.a)

1. Introduction
    - a. Review of the problem for multiverse
        - i. fMRI preprocessing and analysis steps overview
        - ii.
2. Methods
    - a. Dataset: Human Connectome Project
    - b. Detailed explanation of Germani et al. (2025), which is an attempt of multiverse analysis
        - i. 12 pipelines for 2 softwares (FSL, SPM) on the motor task
    - c. Current project
        - i. Replicating Germani et al. (2025)
        - ii. 12 pipelines for 1 software (FSL) on the gambling task
3. Results
    - a. Replicating Germani et al. (2025)
        - i. Issues with repository on github
            1. Data structure
            2. Errors in script
        - ii. Efficiency
    - b. Gambling task
        - i. New findings
4. Discussion
    - a. Reflection on current project
        - i. What the current project has achieved
        - ii. Data science ethics
        - iii. Multiverse analysis' issue
    - b. Next steps of the project
        - i. 12 pipelines for both FSL and SPL on gambling task
        - ii. Optimizing the script for easier accessibility