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# Article summary:

1. Second-order meta-analysis is a powerful tool for building theory in science by replicating and integrating findings regarding a particular research question.

2. This technique was used to investigate the impact of working-memory training on near-transfer (i.e., memory) and far-transfer (e.g., reasoning, speed, and language) measures, as well as whether it is mediated by the type of population.

3. Results showed that working-memory training does induce near transfer, but far-transfer effects are small or null regardless of the type of population and cognitive-training program.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article provides an overview of second-order meta-analysis as a tool for building theory in science by replicating and integrating findings regarding a particular research question. The authors use this technique to investigate the impact of working-memory training on near-transfer (i.e., memory) and far-transfer (e.g., reasoning, speed, and language) measures, as well as whether it is mediated by the type of population. The results show that working-memory training does induce near transfer, but far-transfer effects are small or null regardless of the type of population and cognitive-training program.

The article appears to be reliable in terms of its content; however, there are some potential biases that should be noted when considering its trustworthiness and reliability. For example, the authors do not provide any evidence for their claims about the lack of generalization of skills acquired through cognitive training programs; they simply state that this is an “invariant” without providing any supporting evidence or data to back up their claim. Additionally, while they mention other cognitive training programs such as video games, music, chess, and exergames in passing, they do not explore these further or discuss how they may affect their results; this could lead to an incomplete understanding of the topic at hand if these programs were found to have different effects than those discussed in the article. Furthermore, while they mention placebo effects and publication bias when discussing their results, they do not provide any further information about how these factors may have impacted their findings; this could lead to an incomplete understanding if these factors had a significant effect on their results. Finally, while they discuss potential risks associated with cognitive training programs such as overtraining or burnout due to excessive practice sessions or difficulty maintaining motivation over time due to lack of progress or improvement in performance levels over time; however they do not provide any further information about how these risks can be mitigated or avoided when using such programs which could lead to an incomplete understanding if readers were unaware of these potential risks associated with cognitive training programs

# Topics for further research:

* Cognitive training program efficacy
* Cognitive training program risks
* Cognitive training program generalization
* Cognitive training program motivation
* Cognitive training program placebo effects
* Cognitive training program publication bias
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