

JOIBS: May 2026. ISSN 2992-9253

JOIBS © 2026 Brown

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Review of Eren (2026)

Mitch Brown, University of Arkansas, USA. E-mail: mb103@uark.edu

Funding: None.

Competing interests: None.

Citation: Brown, M. (2026). Review of Eren (2026). *Journal of Open Inquiry in the Behavioral Sciences*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.58408/issn.2992-9253.2026.05.03.0002>

I have completed my review of the manuscript and find myself excited at its eventual dissemination. These are the kind of findings that should be published broadly, as they should certainly inform policy. The literature review was relevant and informative with the data being clear-cut. Any commentary I have for this paper will center around my interest in making things more readable with an eye toward best practices in reporting.

1. The introduction relies too heavily on quotes and the attribution of ideas to people. These are certainly the right people to credit for their discussion, but I fear this may create a "great person approach" to knowledge for a reader. I recommend the authors (1) minimize the number of quotations in their writing in favor of paraphrasing (unless the essence of the words are imperative, which is doubtful for many of these) and (2) find ways to relegate the authors in their introduction to citations where they can so as to preserve the idea that these ideas can exist beyond an author.

2. The authors should describe their methodology more clearly in their paper beyond their recruitment efforts. I would like to see a discussion of the measures baked into the paper. As it stands, I should not have to go to the appendices to understand the survey instruments at their most minimum. I am glad we have these items in here, but the reader should have context from reading the document proper. This includes discussion of psychometric properties of the measures, coding, anchoring, just to name a few potential pieces of information to provide for a reader. For their section on checking inferential statistics, that information could be provided in the Method section to orient the reader instead of being presented with them in the results for the first time.

3. Is there a way to communicate whether your sample had adequate power. The authors are gracious in admitting their issues with representation in the sample, but I feel like they could buy themselves some latitude by communicating that they had sufficient power to detect potential effects.

4. Did the authors make any corrections for the volume of comparisons they made? I trust the

findings with how low the p-values are, but there should be care given to ensure the reader knows how conservative these estimates are that may be prone to Type I Errors.

5. There is no such thing as a p-value of 0.00. These values are asymptotic to where p never reaches 0. Simply replace the p-values reported as 0 as being $< .001$. This is an easy fix but one that will bolster presentation of important findings.

6. Were there any specific methods used for the qualitative analysis? As presented, it seems rather piecemeal, although I know that's not entirely true. Just clarifying your methodological decisions should suffice.