Moon Phases and Online Tests of Precognition

Julia Mossbridge, Ph.D.[1]

University of San Diego Dept. of Physics and Biophysics

In an article in this volume, "*State, trait, and target parameters associated with accuracy in two online tests of precognitive remote viewing*," my co-authors and I present several exploratory and some confirmatory analyses of data from two online remote viewing experiments. After the article was accepted for publication, my colleague Dean Radin reminded me that in 2020 I had written a note on a blog post about moon effects on remote viewing (https://adventuresofgreg.com/blog/2020/04/19/does-the-moon-effect-our-ability-to-make-decisions/). In It, I said I would like to analyze remote viewing data according to moon phase, but needed a reliable algorithm to do so. After Dean's reminder, I found a PHP script to turn UNIX timestamps into moon phases (https://minkukel.com/en/various/calculating-moon-phase/), translated that script into Matlab, and analyzed data from the first experiment in this study. I chose this experiment because it had enough participant-instigated trials spread over enough moon phases (two years) to make the analysis meaningful.

Using a Matlab script (available on request), I examined trials for targets presented in the second (non-biased) position in each of eight moon phases grouped into four composite phases with equal likelihood: new/waxing crescent, first quarter/waxing gibbous, full/waning gibbous, and last quarter/waning crescent. The analysis revealed that participants were more likely than expected by chance to instigate a trial during the last quarter/waning crescent phases, and less likely than chance to do so during the full/waning gibbous phases. This pattern held and was significant for both data batches (batch 1, n = 1,452: last qtr/waning crescent: proportion of trials .33, $p < 1 \times 10^{-6}$ [binomial test, chance = .25]; full/waning gibbous: .21, $p < .0005$; batch 2, n = 2,659; last qtr/waning crescent: .35, $p < 1 \times 10^{-6}$; full/waning gibbous: .19, $p < 1 \times 10^{-6}$).

---

1 Address correspondence to **jmossbridge@sandiego.edu**

A similar trend occurred for trials that matched the randomly selected targets, which also held for both data batches. During the moon phases when participants were more likely to choose to instigate a trial, they were also more likely to perform better, in contrast to the moon phases when participants were less likely to instigate trials (batch 1, last qtr/waning crescent: 220 hits, 266 misses, ratio = .83; full/waning gibbous: 112 hits, 194 misses, ratio = .58; $\chi^2_{(2, N=792)}$ = 5.79, p < .017; batch 2, last qtr/waning crescent: 443 hits, 490 misses, ratio = .90; full/waning gibbous: 204 hits, 301 misses, ratio = .68; $\chi^2_{(2, N = 1438)}$ = 6.65, p < .01).

Although it is not surprising that participants chose not to participate in the task during times when they did not perform well and chose instead to participate when they would perform better, it is surprising that these times were correlated so consistently with phases of the moon. The finding suggests a potential gravitational or geomagnetic influence on psi. I encourage other scientists studying precognition and psi phenomena in general to consider this type of simple but potentially revealing analysis.