



## Content Analysis Report

### Abstract

- ✓ The problem or question addressed by the paper is clearly stated.

While the abstract mentions “declining attention spans and reduced long-term memory,” which is perfectly fine, you could strengthen this claim by providing a specific negative consequence of this trend that has occurred in society.

- ✓ The research objective is stated.
- ✓ The research methods are briefly described.
- ✓ The main research results are summarized.

- ✗ The main conclusions of the study are provided.

While this element of the abstract is included, I feel that it could be improved. As it is, the description of the conclusion is somewhat vague. It is stated that “this study contributes to ongoing debates about how reading influences cognition,” which may leave readers wondering, ‘In what way does the study contribute to the debate?’

With that in mind, I recommend integrating into your abstract this key detail from your paper’s conclusion section: “The results highlight that the cognitive processes involved in reading fiction may interact differently with the reading medium than those involved in processing nonfiction.”

## Introduction

- ✓ The introduction begins by indicating the research topic and providing necessary background information.
- ✓ In addition to summarizing previous studies, an effort is made to interpret these works and relate them to the current study's objective.

This is a very strong point of your paper. I can tell you were very intentional in selecting which previous studies to include in your review of the literature.

- ✓ The motivation for conducting the present study (e.g., a gap in the literature) and its relevance and importance (e.g., expected implications) are clear.
- ✓ The research objective is clearly stated.
- ✗ The research question(s) and/or hypotheses are presented clearly.

Currently, the final paragraph of the introduction section is a little thin, as it presents only the general aim of the paper, without providing any specific research questions or hypotheses. Although the introduction section provides enough context for readers to infer the question you intend to answer with your research, I recommend making this explicit with a sentence such as the following:

The primary question this study aims to answer is, "Compared to digital reading, does reading on paper facilitate adults' long-term recall of narrative details in works of fiction?"

## Methodology

- ✓ It is clear how many participants took part in the study and how they were found and selected.
- ✓ The criteria used for including/excluding participants are provided.

✓ All necessary details about informed consent are provided.

✗ It has been described where, when, and how the test was conducted.

It is not stated when (what day of the year, what time of day) the study was conducted. Also, while it is mentioned that “participants were instructed to read the story at their own pace,” your readers will want to know how long it generally took participants to read the story.

✗ No important details are missing that would be required for other researchers to replicate the current study.

I feel that the description of the short story that participants were asked to read, on its own, is not sufficient for this study to be replicated. The easiest fix would be to include the full story as an appendix and direct readers to it in the main text.

Other than this, the methods are described very clearly throughout this section.

✓ The method used to record responses is stated.

✗ It is explained how the data were processed and analyzed, including the mention of the specific data analysis technique employed.

I noticed that some of the information that would typically be included in a methodology section regarding data processing is included in the results section instead. For example, one sentence in the results section states that “a mixed-design ANOVA was conducted with reading condition (print vs. digital) as a between-subjects factor and detail type (names, events, descriptions) as a within-subjects factor.”

Since the results section should stick to presenting the raw data, I recommend moving sentences like this to the methodology section. I have left in-text comments throughout the results section to indicate which sentences should be moved.

✓ The criteria used to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings are clear.

- ✘ It is argued why the employed methodology was used over other possible techniques.

While this isn't crucial, you can make your methodology appear more robust in readers' eyes by stating that you considered other methods and explaining why you decided that your chosen methodology is the best one. For example, has it been used in previous studies, with its reliability and validity confirmed? Was it the most convenient, given your study's setting?

## Results

- ✓ The results section is organized in a logical way (e.g., by topic or theme).
- ✓ General results related to each theme/topic are stated clearly and succinctly.
- ✘ Each result is clearly linked to the research objective.

I was surprised to read the result describing the correlation between participants' self-reported engagement and recall score, given that engagement isn't mentioned as a variable of interest in the introduction. Therefore, I recommend adding some material to the introduction section to mention that, as a secondary objective, your study examined the link between reading engagement and recall.

- ✓ Specific observations are used effectively to support the general results.

Throughout this section, you've done a very good job of describing a result in general terms, then immediately backing up that description with data gathered during your study. This makes it very easy to understand your findings.

- ✘ The results section refrains from interpreting the findings (since this should be done in the discussion section).

I noticed a few sentences in the results section that lean into interpretation territory (e.g., "This greater variability in the digital group may be due to the fact that individual differences play a larger role when reading from screens"). I have flagged these in your document using in-text comments.

## Discussion

- ✓ The discussion section starts by restating the research problem and summarizing the most notable findings.
- ✗ The discussion clarifies how the findings support or conflict with the extant literature and what insights they contribute to the current body of knowledge.

I noticed a few instances where it is mentioned that a current result contrasts with a previous study, but no possible explanation is given for the inconsistency. I have left in-text comments to indicate where such explanations could be included.

- ✓ The findings are discussed in such a way that their importance to the body of knowledge is clear.
- ✓ The theoretical and practical implications of the findings are discussed.
- ✓ The discussion refrains from presenting raw data (this is the purpose of the results section).

## Conclusion

- ✗ The conclusion begins by restating the main research question or problem and providing the answer to it.

Standard practice is to start the conclusion section by restating the research question and/or the problem addressed in the current study, as this is beneficial to readers who skip ahead to the conclusion before reading the entire paper.

With this in mind, I recommend starting this section with a sentence saying something like, "The present study was conducted to examine whether print reading (vs. digital reading) improves adults' long-term recall of narrative details in fictional stories."

- ✓ The most noteworthy results are briefly summarized (as opposed to being restated from the results section).
- ✗ The most important contributions of the study are highlighted (without simply being repeated from the discussion section).

While it's not a major issue, I felt that, at times, the conclusion section went into a little too much detail in covering material that was already presented in the discussion section. I've highlighted potentially redundant passages in your document using in-text comments.

- ✓ The study's limitations are acknowledged, and steps that future research could take to mitigate these limitations are provided.

You have done a good job of presenting the limitations of the present study and suggesting how future research could overcome them.

However, I noticed that some limitations were mentioned in the discussion section. While it is acceptable to provide a study's limitations in either section, it is inadvisable to split the limitations across sections. Therefore, I recommend moving the limitations from the discussion section to the conclusion, as this appears to be what your target journal prefers based on articles published in recent issues.