Peer Review Comments

Responses for Version 1

Reviewer A: Michèle Nuijten
Review Completed: 5 December 2013

The method section of the data paper provides sufficient detail to understand how the dataset was created. I agree with the authors that in this particular case it was not necessary to monitor incomplete submissions. After all, the goal was to gather nonsense data, so validity is of no concern here.

The dataset is correctly described.

The authors suggest that their data can be used for both teaching statistical methods and research concerned with statistical approaches. I would like to add that this data set is very useful to teach both students and researchers about the ethics in statistics, a topic that in my view deserves more attention.

Comments concerning the deposited data:

The data are deposited at Zenodo, which is in the list of recommended repositories. The data have a CC0 licence that permits unrestricted access, and are in an open, non-proprietary format. The data file itself is very clear. The column headers make sense, and the authors included a more thorough description of every variable in the data file. The data are actionable, and both studies adhere to the ethical standards.

One suggestion I would like to make is to save the data as a .txt file instead of an .xlsx file. You now run the risk that new versions of Excel will not support this file. A .txt file is more universal. When saving the data as a .txt file, I would advise to include the more thorough variable descriptions in a separate .txt file, instead of in the columns themselves.

My advice would be to accept these data for publication in the Journal of Open Psychology Data. The data are clearly described, actionable, and have high educational value.

Reviewer B: Etienne P. LeBel
Review Completed: 11 December 2013

This data paper describes data from Study 1 and 2 of Simmons, Nelson, and Simonsohn's (2011) highly-cited paper on False-Positive Psychology. The paper is well written and clearly and correctly describes the datasets, which have been properly archived and are openly accessible on http://zenodo.org. The reuse potential for these data is clearly justified in terms of teaching statistics and also for further work on inflation of false-positive rates due to undisclosed flexibility in methods.

The only issue I noticed is that the datasets are only available in a proprietary Microsoft Excel ".xlsx" file, which means they are not accessible to those without Microsoft Office. It would be ideal if the datasets were also provided in an open, non-proprietary format such as a .txt or .csv file (apparently a condition for publication at JOPD).

Some minor issues:

(1) For the first variable "aged" in both datasets, it would be clearer if the metric of the variable was indicated in the column header (i.e., age in days).

(2) In the "Materials" section, it would be great if you provided the link to the Qualtrics survey containing all of the questions participants answered. This would be particularly useful for educational purposes, given it would give students a better sense of the experiment.

(3) Under "Dataset Description", the publication date should be Nov 7, 2011 (publication date of the original article the datasets come from) rather than Nov 1, 2013 (date the datasets were published publicly).