

*We thank Datacolada for writing a blog about the recent set of meta-analyses in PNAS and highlighting the important issue of heterogeneity. We fully agree that many of these nudges are too different to be meaningfully summarized by one number. However, we did not combine them into one meta-analysis. We started with the Mertens et al. study as reported, as did Datacolada, in order to critically evaluate it. Such are the demands of any fair critique.*

*Nevertheless, we believe that our publication bias-adjusted meta-analysis is useful and, in fact, allows us to answer some of the questions posed in Datacolada's post. The three main benefits of meta-analyzing the body of literature are that it allows us to: (1) apply shrinkage (Efron & Morris, 1977, [.htm](#)); (2) estimate the degree of heterogeneity; (3) estimate the expected effect size and the strength of evidence for a body of literature. For a more detailed explanation of the three reasons why we think the meta-analysis is useful and how we can address questions regarding inferences about individual studies, see our blog post on Bayesian spectacles.*