HIGHLY CITED ARTICLES IN EVOLUTIONARY PSYCHIATRY: ASSESSMENT WITH A QUALITY AND ERROR RATING SCALE

Chad Beyer[1], Chanel Robinson, Dan J. Stein[2]

1 – Resident, Department of Psychiatry, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa, 7701

2 - SAMRC Unit on Risk & Resilience in Mental Disorders, Department of Psychiatry & Neuroscience Institute, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa, 7701

Corresponding author: Dan Stein

Keywords: Evolutionary psychiatry, systematic review, citation analysis, article quality, common errors, rating scale

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Evolutionary psychiatry is a rapidly growing field that emphasizes the value of evolutionary explanations for traits that make individuals vulnerable to mental disorders. Some articles that apply evolutionary theory to psychiatric disorders make errors, such as viewing a disease as if it is an adaptation. We assessed the quantity of errors in the most widely cited articles on evolutionary psychiatry and its relationship to citation frequency

Methods: Two reviewers searched PubMed, Web of Science, and Google Scholar on September 8, 2023, using specific search terms related to "evolution" and "psychiatry", in order to find the most highly cited articles in the field. Based on the work of Nesse, we developed a measure for assessing the number of errors and overall quality in evolutionary psychiatry articles. We applied the measure to the 20 most highly cited articles, and calculated the correlations between article quality and number of errors with number of citations.

Results: Twenty highly cited articles, with a mean citation count of 758.95 and publication year range from 1964 to 2011, were rated. While the most highly cited articles had good quality on average, they also made important errors. There was no significant correlation of article quality or article errors and citation count.

Conclusion: Highly cited articles in evolutionary psychiatry demonstrated strengths but also exhibited weaknesses. The lack of a relationship of quality and error scores with citation rates suggests that other factors influence such citations. Future research should focus on achieving consensus on how best to assess the quality of evolutionary psychiatry articles and on what errors should be avoided.

INTRODUCTION

Nesse and Williams 'seminal text, "Why We Get Sick" argued that evolutionary theory is useful in understanding traits that leave members of a species vulnerable to disorders (Nesse and Williams, 2012). Evolutionary medicine and evolutionary psychiatry subsequently emerged as new disciplines, with specialized conferences, textbooks, and journals (Natterson-Horowitz et al., 2023). In a recent authoritative review of evolutionary psychiatry, Nesse outlined a range of possible explanations for vulnerability to mental disorders including mismatch with current environments and tradeoffs whose benefits come at the cost of decreased robustness (Nesse, 2023). Such explanations complement proximal biological explanations that describe mechanisms with more distal evolutionary ones that describe the origins of designs vulnerable to failure (Nesse, 2023).

While many articles on evolutionary psychiatry are strong, some make fundamental conceptual errors. Nesse has emphasized what features of an evolutionary medicine article make for a high quality publications, as well as a number of conceptual errors that seem to bedevil the field (Nesse, 2007). Good articles define their questions with precision and consider multiple possible explanations of observed phenomena. Errors in evolutionary medicine include viewing disorders as adaptations, and providing explanations based on what is good for the species (Nesse, 2007).

We developed a measure of the quality of and errors in evolutionary psychiatry articles, based on Nesse's work (Nesse, 2007), and applied this to the most widely cited articles in the field. In this way, we aimed to investigate the quality of work that has been particularly

influential, and to determine empirically whether the most highly cited articles were those with particularly high quality.

METHODS

Selection of Studies

Two reviewers (CB and CR) searched Pubmed, Web of Science and Google Scholar on8 September 2023 for relevant articles using search terms curated for each database, covering "evolution" and "psychiatry". Two authors (CB and CR) reviewed the titles and abstracts of articles obtained by this search strategy. Included in this review were all articles that made evolutionary claims about particular mental disorders, excluding review articles and those focused on non-human research. The 20 most highly cited studies were included in this study.

Rating of Studies

Articles were assessed for quality based on Nesse's "How to test an evolutionary hypothesis about disease" (Table A – Section A) (Nesse, 2007), which lists 4 main objectives, these are: 1 - Define the object of explanation with great specificity; 2 -Specify all possible alternative hypotheses for why the trait is apparently suboptimal; 3 - Make explicit predictions from each hypothesis; 4.-Use all available evidence to test the predictions from all alternative hypotheses to arrive at a judgment about the contributions of different factors. Each objective has various provisos which are detailed in Table A.

To generate a quality score, each article was rated on each of the four objectives using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5: to what extent do you believe this paper adequately addresses the following, 1 – Strongly disagree; 2 – Disagree; 3 – Neither agree nor disagree (uncertain); 4 – Agree; 5 – Strongly agree. The four scores were summed to give a global quality score of 4 to 20. This score was then divided by 4 and assessed as follows 1-1.8 = Very poor; 1.8-2.6 = Poor; 2.6 – 3.4 = Average; 3.4-4.2 = Good; 4.2-5.0 = Very good.

Articles were then assessed for errors based on Nesse's "Some common mistakes in testing evolutionary hypotheses about disease"(Nesse, 2007) (Table A – Section B). This table lists 10 possible errors, which are paraphrased here: 1 - Attempting to explain a disease as if it is an adaptation; 2 - Proposing an explanation based on what is good for the species; 3 - Proposing adaptive functions for rare genetic conditions; 4 - Confusing proximate and evolutionary explanations; 5 - Thinking that evidence for learning influencing a trait indicates that no evolutionary explanation is needed; 6 - Thinking that evidence for environmental or cultural differences in a trait is evidence against evolutionary influences; 7 - Confusing genetic explanations, especially behavioural genetic explanations, with evolutionary explanations; 8 - Failing to consider all of the alternative hypotheses; 9 - Assuming that evidence for one hypothesis is evidence against another; 10 - Presenting all the evidence in favour of a pet hypothesis and all the evidence against other hypotheses, instead of offering a balanced consideration of all evidence for and against all hypotheses.

We assessed each article for evidence of whether each of these errors was made. As points 1-4 above seem more serious errors than points 5-10, errors from points 1-4 were each given an error score of 1, while errors from points 5-10 were each given an error score of 0.5. Thus the total possible error score could range from 2 to 7.

Finally, each article was assigned a global rating that ranged from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent) (Table B).

All articles were scored independently by 2 reviewers (CB, CR). Differences were resolved by discussion or by bringing in a third reviewer (DJS).

Statistical Analysis

Quality, error frequency, and overall impression scores were subjected to Cohen's Kappa to assess inter-rater reliability (IRR), prior to resolution by discussion or the third reviewer (DJS). These results were interpreted as follows: values ≤ 0 as indicating no agreement and 0.01–0.20 as none to slight, 0.21–0.40 as fair, 0.41– 0.60 as moderate, 0.61–0.80 as substantial, and 0.81–1.00 as almost perfect agreement. Quality, error, and overall impression scores for each article were then correlated with citation counts and significance was assess using a two-tailed T-test. Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics (version 26.0, IBM, USA) were used for analysis and differences were considered significant where $p<0.05$.

RESULTS

Included studies

We analyzed the 20 most highly cited articles in evolutionary psychiatry (Allen and Badcock, 2003, Andrews and Thomson, 2009, Bateson et al., 2011, Brüne, 2005, Crespi and Badcock, 2008, Crow, 2000, Gilbert and Allan, 1998, Hagen, 1999, Huxley et al., 1964, Jonason et al., 2009, Klein, 1993, Marks and Nesse, 1994, Nesse, 1998, Nesse, 2000, Nesse, 2001, Mealey, 1995, Nettle and Clegg, 2006, Price et al., 1994, Sloman et al., 2003, Watson and Andrews, 2002). The lowest cited article had 310 citations, while the highest cited article had 1546 citations, with a mean of 758.95 and median of 627 citations. The earliest published article was from 1964, with the most recent article being from 2011, with a mean publication year of 2000 and a standard deviation of 10.01. Table C shows the included articles, with study ID and citation number.

Study Ratings

Table D shows the results of the quality scores, with included means and standard deviations. The overall quality score showed a mean of 3.6, standard deviation of 0.6. This falls on the low end of the good score of 3.4-4.2. Notably the highest scoring section was F1 (M = 3.9, SD = 0.6). There were varying degrees of IRR, with F4 showing the highest level (k = 0.4).

Table E shows the results of the error scoring, with total number of times the error was made and the percentage. Notably, FN8 and FN10 were found to be the most common,

each being made by ten of the articles assessed (50%). FN5 and FN6 were not found to be made in the assessed articles. The item with the highest IRR was FN1 (k = 0.857).

The mean general impression score was 3.0, with a standard deviation of 1.5. There was moderate agreement in terms of IRR (k = 0.6).

Statistical Analysis

There was no significant correlation between quality score and citation number (r(18) = -.06, p = ns), or publication year (r(18) = .22, p = 0.343). There was no significant correlation between error score and citation number (r(18) = .28, p = 0.234), or publication year (r(18) = -.32, p = 0.174). There was no significant correlation between general impression score and citation number (r(18) = -.09, p = 0.704) or publication year (r(18) = .14, p = 0.562). There was a significant correlation between quality score and general impression score (r18) = 0.728, p < 0.001), and there was a significant correlation between higher quality score and lower error score (r(18) = 0.62, p = 0.03). Specific correlations between individual quality and error scores are reported in Tables F1 and F2.

DISCUSSION

The main findings of this research were 1) the most highly cited articles have good quality on average, 2) the most highly cited articles make important errors, 3) there was no significant relationship between quality of article and number of citations.

Overall, the top 20 mostly highly cited articles achieved a mean on the low end of the "good" rating for each of the 4 positive scoring metrics (3.6-3.9; with good considered 3.4-4.2), with the overall positive score also achieving a "good" rating with 3.6, std 0.6. The

included articles scored a mean of 3.9 on F1 (Define the object of explanation with great specificity), and a mean of 3.6 on F3 (Make explicit predictions from each possible hypothesis), indicating that these areas represent strengths of the included articles. Conversely, F2 (Specify all possible alternative hypotheses for why the trait is apparently suboptimal) and F4 (Use all available evidence to test the predictions from all alternative hypotheses to arrive at a judgment about the contributions of different factors. had the lowest mean score of included articles (3.6), indicating that these are areas that future articles can improve upon.

Of the errors made, the most common were FN8 (Failing to consider all of the alternative hypotheses) and FN10 (Presenting all the evidence in favour of a pet hypothesis and all the evidence against other hypotheses, instead of offering a balanced consideration of all evidence for and against all hypotheses). 50% of the assessed articles made one or both of these errors. As F2 and FN8 cover similar ideas, their strong correlations are understandable; as are the correlations between F3, F4 and FN10. The high number of correlations of FN8 and FN10 with a range of other items suggest that these are decisive aspects of the overall assessment, and deserve particular attention in future work.

None of the top 20 articles most highly cited made FN5 (Thinking that evidence for learning influencing a trait indicates that no evolutionary explanation is needed) or FN6 (Thinking that evidence for environmental or cultural differences in a trait is evidence against evolutionary influences) as an error. These errors may, however, be more prevalent in less cited evolutionary psychiatry articles. A key limitation of the current project is that we cannot generalize from the work here to the field of evolutionary psychiatry as a whole. Furthermore, we acknowledge that different databases provide different citation rates; here we relied on Google Scholar.

Quality ratings and number of errors did not influence citation rates; possible explanations are beyond the scope of this review. Previous work suggests that in many fields quality and methodological rigor are not necessarily correlated with citation number (Lopez et al., 2017, Mackinnon et al., 2018). In neuroscience, orthopaedics and plastic surgery citation numbers are influenced by factors including age of the article, study design, level of evidence, conflict of interest disclosures, and number of authors (Jamjoom et al., 2022, Lopez et al., 2017, Okike et al., 2011).

In conclusion, our results suggest that the most highly cited articles in evolutionary psychiatry have both strengths and weaknesses. Strengths include defining the research question with precision and predicting the answers based on a specific hypothesis. Weaknesses include failing to consider and specify alternate hypotheses, and presenting evidence in favour of a pet hypothesis while not using all available evidence. The lack of a relationship of quality and error scores with citation rates suggests that other factors influence such citations. While the field has significant promise, further work is needed to achieve consensus on how best to assess the quality of evolutionary psychiatry articles and on what errors should be avoided.

References

ALLEN, N. B. & BADCOCK, P. B. 2003. The social risk hypothesis of depressed mood: evolutionary, psychosocial, and neurobiological perspectives. *Psychol Bull,* 129, 887-913.

ANDREWS, P. W. & THOMSON, J. A., JR. 2009. The bright side of being blue: depression as an adaptation for analyzing complex problems. *Psychol Rev,* 116, 620-54.

BATESON, M., BRILOT, B. & NETTLE, D. 2011. Anxiety: an evolutionary approach. *Can J Psychiatry,* 56, 707-15.

BRÜNE, M. 2005. "Theory of mind" in schizophrenia: a review of the literature. *Schizophr Bull,* 31, 21-42.

CRESPI, B. & BADCOCK, C. 2008. Psychosis and autism as diametrical disorders of the social brain. *Behav Brain Sci,* 31, 241-61; discussion 261-320.

CROW, T. J. 2000. Schizophrenia as the price that homo sapiens pays for language: a resolution of the central paradox in the origin of the species. *Brain Res Brain Res Rev,* 31, 118-29.

GILBERT, P. & ALLAN, S. 1998. The role of defeat and entrapment (arrested flight) in depression: an exploration of an evolutionary view. *Psychol Med,* 28, 585-98.

HAGEN, E. H. 1999. The functions of postpartum depression. *Evolution and Human Behavior,* 20, 325-359.

HUXLEY, J., MAYR, E., OSMOND, H. & HOFFER, A. 1964. SCHIZOPHRENIA AS A GENETIC MORPHISM. *Nature,* 204, 220-1.

JONASON, P. K., LI, N. P., WEBSTER, G. D. & SCHMITT, D. P. 2009. The dark triad: Facilitating a short-term mating strategy in men. *European Journal of Personality,* 23, 5-18.

KLEIN, D. F. 1993. False suffocation alarms, spontaneous panics, and related conditions. An integrative hypothesis. *Arch Gen Psychiatry,* 50, 306-17.

MARKS, I. M. & NESSE, R. M. 1994. Fear and fitness: An evolutionary analysis of anxiety disorders. *Ethology & Sociobiology,* 15, 247-261.

MEALEY, L. 1995. The sociobiology of sociopathy: An integrated evolutionary model. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences,* 18, 523-541.

NATTERSON-HOROWITZ, B., AKTIPIS, A., FOX, M., GLUCKMAN, P. D., LOW, F. M., MACE, R., READ, A., TURNER, P. E. & BLUMSTEIN, D. T. 2023. The future of evolutionary medicine: sparking innovation in biomedicine and public health. *Frontiers in Science,* 1.

NESSE, R. 1998. Emotional disorders in evolutionary perspective. *Br J Med Psychol,* 71 (Pt 4), 397-415.

NESSE, R. 2007. The importance of evolution for medicine. *Evolutionary Medicine*, 416-432.

NESSE, R. M. 2000. Is depression an adaptation? *Arch Gen Psychiatry,* 57, 14-20.

NESSE, R. M. 2001. The smoke detector principle. Natural selection and the regulation of defensive responses. *Ann N Y Acad Sci,* 935, 75-85.

NESSE, R. M. 2023. Evolutionary psychiatry: foundations, progress and challenges. *World Psychiatry,* 22, 177-202.

NESSE, R. M. & WILLIAMS, G. C. 2012. *Why We Get Sick: The New Science of Darwinian Medicine*, Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

NETTLE, D. & CLEGG, H. 2006. Schizotypy, creativity and mating success in humans. *Proc Biol Sci,* 273, 611-5.

PRICE, J., SLOMAN, L., GARDNER, R., JR., GILBERT, P. & ROHDE, P. 1994. The social competition hypothesis of depression. *Br J Psychiatry,* 164, 309-15.

SLOMAN, L., GILBERT, P. & HASEY, G. 2003. Evolved mechanisms in depression: the role and interaction of attachment and social rank in depression. *J Affect Disord,* 74, 107-21.

WATSON, P. J. & ANDREWS, P. W. 2002. Toward a revised evolutionary adaptationist analysis of depression: the social navigation hypothesis. *J Affect Disord,* 72, 1-14.

HOW TO TEST AN EVOLUTIONARY HYPOTHESIS ABOUT DISEASE – RANDOLPH NESSE (2007)

SECTION A

F1. Define the object of explanation with great specificity.

a. A trait shaped by natural selection will usually be the object of explanation.
b. A disease is an appropriate object only if the hypothesis is that the "disease" is actually a defense, or otherwise increases fitness.
c. Usually the object is a trait that is universal in the species and that makes an organism vulnerable to a disease.
d. If the object is not a universal trait, justify the exception.

i. The most common exceptions are traits that reflect genetic differences in subpopulations responding to local environment, e.g., sickle cell alleles that protect against malaria.
ii. Other exceptions are facultative adaptations that explain individual differences, e.g., the number of sweat glands increases as a function of early exposure to high temperatures.
iii. If the trait is a behavior, do not explain the behavior, instead explain how selection shaped the behavior regulation system.

e. Do not propose an evolutionary explanation for why one individual gets a disease and another does not. Evolutionary explanations are about populations. They may however, predict who get a disease.
f. Evolutionary explanations are not alternatives to proximate explanations. Evidence about proximate mechanisms is often useful in assessing a hypothesis, however, especially when the hypothesis is that vulnerability to disease results from constraints or trade-offs.

F2. Specify all possible alternative hypotheses for why the trait is apparently suboptimal. There are six main possibilities:

a. The environment has changed faster than selection and the disease results from this mismatch.
b. The relevant environmental factor is a pathogen that evolves faster than host defenses.
c. Constraints, e.g., natural selection's limited ability to clear mutations or correct a fundamentally defective design, leave the organism vulnerable.
d. The trait offers trade-off compensatory benefits that account for apparently suboptimal features.
e. The trait offers benefits to reproduction or to kin that are greater than the costs to the individual.
f. The trait is not a disease at all, but a useful protective response such as pain or fever.

F3. Make explicit predictions from each possible hypothesis.

a. If relevant data from other species can be obtained and analyzed, use the comparative method.
b. Otherwise, try to make predictions about aspects of the trait or its regulation, preferably previously unrecognized and quantitative.
c. Other useful predictions may be made about the relative fitness of individuals with and without the trait in different environments.
d. Predictions about proximate aspects of the trait may be possible.

F4. Use all available evidence to test the predictions from all alternative hypotheses to arrive at a judgment about the contributions of different factors.

a. Note that multiple factors often operate together to an apparently suboptimal trait. This is quite different from proximate explanations where evidence for one alternative usually weighs against others.
b. Many hypotheses can be falsified because they are inconsistent with evolutionary theory.
c. Others can be falsified by experiments that show that a trait does not serve the proposed function.
d. Assess the overall plausibility of the proposal and the relative viability of alternative hypotheses.

SECTION B
Some Common Mistakes in Testing Evolutionary Hypotheses About Disease

The guidelines below tacitly describe a variety of possible errors, some of which are made explicit
below.

FN1. Attempting to explain a disease: Instead, reformulate the question as an explanation for vulnerability to
a disease.

FN2. Proposing an explanation based on what is good for the species: This is group selection, an elementary
error. Almost all evolutionary explanations must be based on advantages to genes or individuals.

FN3. Proposing adaptive functions for rare genetic conditions: There are sometimes evolutionary reasons
why deleterious mutations stay in the gene pool, but the explanation is hardly ever some useful function
of the disease itself.

FN4. Confusing proximate and evolutionary explanations: This is a common and serious mistake. Knowledge
about how the body works can be very useful in assessing an evolutionary hypothesis, but it is no substitute for an evolutionary explanation.

FN5. Thinking that evidence for learning influencing a trait indicates that no evolutionary explanation is needed:
Learning is a capacity shaped by natural selection, and the pathologies that arise from learning mechanisms, such as phobias, are likely to harm fitness.

FN6. Thinking that evidence for environmental or cultural differences in a trait is evidence against evolutionary influences: Natural selection shaped the behavioral mechanisms that give rise to culture, and environments and culture influence human behavior and fitness strongly. An evolutionary approach to behavior does not imply that behavior is somehow "determined by the genes," only that the mechanisms that give rise to behavior and culture were shaped by natural selection. These mechanisms obviously are capable of profound flexibility, with attendant major benefits and costs.

FN7. Confusing genetic explanations, especially behavioral genetic explanations, with evolutionary explanations:
Traits need evolutionary explanations whether or not individual variations arise from genetic variations.

FN8. Failing to consider all of the alternative hypotheses: This is very common and very serious. All too often
an author will propose one possibility without making the alternatives explicit

FN9. Assuming that evidence for one hypothesis is evidence against another: Multiple factors may all contribute
to a complete explanation and they may interact in complex ways. Correct explanations often incorporate multiple explanatory factors.

FN10. Presenting all the evidence in favor of a pet hypothesis and all of the evidence against other hypotheses, instead of offering a balanced consideration of all evidence for and against all hypotheses: This is rhetoric, not science. It is observed commonly, for good reasons arising from human nature, not just in testing evolutionary hypotheses but across the range of sciences. Nonetheless, such advocacy should be avoided.

1	Poor	Makes an elementary mistake about evolutionary theory (attempts to explain a disease, proposes an explanation based on what is good for the species, proposes adaptive functions for rare genetic conditions, confuses proximate and evolutionary explanations).
2	Problematic	Makes no elementary mistakes about evolutionary theory, but does not represent the best of evolutionary theory (focused on proximal explanations rather than evolutionary ones).
3	Middling	Is consistent with good evolutionary theory, but defines the object of explanation with limited specificity, with limited discussion of alternate hypotheses or explicit predictions, or without clearly demonstrating clinical implications.
4	Good	Defines the object of explanation with some specificity, and has some discussion of alternative hypothesis or explicit predictions, and has clear discussion of the clinical implications.
5	Excellent	Defines the object of explanation with great specificity (a trait shaped by natural selection, that makes an organism vulnerable to disease), specifies alternate hypotheses about why the trait is suboptimal, make explicit predictions from the hypotheses, and if true promises to change clinical practice.

Table C – Included articles

Article ID	Citations	Pub. Year
Allen2003	587	2003
Andrews2009	728	2009
Bateson2011	325	2011
Brune2005	1483	2005
Crespi2008	667	2008
Crow2000	492	2000
Gilbert1998	1113	1998
Hagen1999	411	1999
Huxley1964	493	1964
Jonason2009	1107	2009
Klein1993	1546	1993
Marks1994	882	1994
Mealey1995	1453	1995
Nesse1998	310	1998
Nesse2000	1205	2000
Nesse2005	534	2005
Nettle2006	402	2006
Price1994	749	1994
Sloman2003	320	2003
Watson2002	372	2002

Table D – Positive scores

	F1	F2	F3	F4	FP
	5	4	4	4	4.25
	4	3	3	4	3.5
	4	2	4	3	3.25
	4	3	4	4	3.75
	3	4	3	3	3.25
	5	4	4	4	4.25
	4	4	4	3	3.75
	4	4	4	4	4.00
	3	2	3	3	2.75
	3	3	3	3	3.00
	4	3	3	3	3.25
	4	4	4	4	4.00
	4	3	3	3	3.25
	4	4	4	4	4.00
	4	5	5	5	4.75
	4	5	4	4	4.25
	3	3	3	2	2.75
	3	3	3	3	3.00
	4	4	3	4	3.75
	4	4	4	4	4.00
Mean	M = 3.85	M= 3.55	M= 3,60	M= 3.55	M= 3.64
SD	SD = 0.59	SD= 0.83	SD= 0,60	SD= 0.69	SD= 0.56

Table E – Negative scores

	FN1	FN2	FN3	FN4	FN5	FN6	FN7	FN8	FN9	FN10	FTN
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3.5
	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	2.5
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.5
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1.5
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.5
Times made	4	1	3	2	0	0	2	10	4	10	
% articles	20%	5%	15%	10%	0%	0%	10%	50%	20%	50%	

Table F1 – Positive score correlates

F1	• Correlated with F3 (r(18) = .569, p = 0.009), F4 (r(18) = .607, p = 0.005); • Negatively correlated with FN3 (r(18) = -.624, p = 0.003), FN8 (r(18) = -.612, p = 0.004), F9 (r(18) = -.522, p = 0.022)), FN10, (r(18) = -.612, p = 0.004), and FTN (r(18) = -.477, p = 0.033).
F2	• Correlated with F3 (r(18) = .575, p = 0.008), F4 (r(18) =.646, p = 0.002); • Negatively correlated with FN3 (r(18) = -.461, p = 0.041), FN8 (r(18) = -.559, p = 0.010), FN10 (r(18) = -.684, p = 0.001) and FTN (r(18) = -.465, p = 0.039).
F3	• Correlated with F2 (r(18) = .575, p = 0.008), F4 (r(18) = .692, p = 0.001); • Negatively correlated with FN8 (r(18) = .692, p = 0.001), and FTN (r(18) = -.544, p = 0.013)
F4	• Correlated with F2 (r(18) =.646, p = 0.002), F3 (r(18) = .692, p = 0.001); • Negatively correlated with FN3 (r(18) = -.555, p = 0.011), FN4 (r(18) = -.523, p = 0.018), FN8 (r(18) = -.673, p = 0.001), FN10 (r(18) = -.822, p = 0.000) and FTN (r(18) = -.581, p = 0.007).
FP	• Negatively correlated with FN3 (r(18) = -.620, p = 0.004), FN8 (r(18) = -.711, p = 0.000), FN10 (r(18) = -.849, p = 0.000) and FTN (r(18) = -.621, p = 0.003).

Table F2 – Negative score correlates

FN1	• Correlated with FN3 (r(18) = .490, p = 0.028)
FN2	• Correlated with publication year (r(18) = -.842, p = 0.000), FN3 (r(18) = .546, p = 0.013) and FN9 (r(18) = .456, p = 0.049)
FN3	• Correlated with FN1 (r(18) = .490, p = 0.028) and FN2 (r(18) = .546, p = 0.013); • Negatively correlated with F1 (r(18) = -.624, p = 0.003), F2 (r(18) = -.461, p = 0.041), F4 (r(18) = -.555, p = 0.011), FP (r(18) = -.620, p = 0.004)
FN4	• Correlated with FN7 (r(18) = .444, p = 0.050) • Negatively correlated with F4 (r(18) = -.523, p = 0.018)
FN5	• No correlations to report, as this error was not made
FN6	• No correlations to report, as this error was not made
FN7	• Correlated with FN4 (r(18) = .444, p = 0.050)
FN8	• Correlated with FN10 (r(18) = .800, p = 0.000); • Negatively correlated with F1 (r(18) = -.612, p = 0.004), F2 (r(18) = -.559, p = 0.010), F3 (r(18) = -.514, p = 0.020), F4 (r(18) = -.673, p = 0.001), and FP (r(18) = -.711, p = 0.000).
FN9	• Correlated with FN2 (r(18) = .456, p = 0.049); • Negatively correlated with F1 (r(18) = -.522, p = 0.022).
FN10	• Correlated with FN8 (r(18) = .800, p = 0.000); • Negatively correlated with F1 (r(18) = -.612, p = 0.004), F2 (r(18) = -.684, p = 0.001), F3 (r(18) = -.686, p = 0.001), F4 (r(18) = -.822, p = 0.000), and FP (r(18) = -.849, p = 0.000).