

Response to Stefan Schmidt's Open Peer Comment

Patrizio Tressoldi, University of Padova

Lance Storm, University of Adelaide

As supporters of the Open Peer Review system that has been adopted by many scientific journals to serve both the reviewers' important task and let readers form an independent opinion about the strengths and limitations of a paper, we take this opportunity to reply to the comments raised by Stefan Schmidt regarding our paper.

With respect to Schmidt's criticism that DMILS/remote staring meta-analyses are excluded, our response is that we did not intend this study to be a theoretical exercise into the suitability and validity of a study based on psi terminology or processes underlying psi for which there is no broad consensus. We went by the current working hypotheses in parapsychology. DMILS is not generally argued to be a form of ESP (anomalous perception).

With respect to Schmidt's criticism that the quality of the results of a meta-analysis can be assessed by using several criteria, our reply is that we preferred to refer to the MARS (Meta-Analysis-Reporting Standards) of the American Psychological Association guidelines and not to build new criteria.

With respect to Schmidt's suggestion to delete table 2, our response is that it is the main table of the study summarizing the relevant information we used for our moderators analysis.

With respect to Schmidt's comments about effect size metric, on page 62 of our paper we expanded the description of the effect sizes and why they can be considered compatible.

With respect to Schmidt's suggestion to omit the line in figure 1, our reply is that the legend clarifies that the effect sizes are in decreasing order of magnitude with re-



spect to the various experimental designs. The line is useful for conveying the overall decreasing slope but does not imply missing designs.

With respect to Schmidt's comments related to the moderators analyses our reply is that the choice of how to combine the two moderators did not derive from theoretical reasoning, but was tested empirically. The suggestion to test the effect of each moderator separately does not allow one to test their joint effect in particular with a correlation test given the limited range of the moderators values, from 1 to 2 for the consciousness status and from 1 to 3 for the type of response.