
SERIES POLICY

Disclosures, notices & corrections

How to read, attribute, and challenge these reviews

The Behavioral Scientist / Haystack Group LLC · Evidence cutoffs are stated in each review

This page applies to the paired reader reviews and technical appendices in this series. Each book's review and technical appendix identify the edition examined, source-access limits, relevant interests, and evidence judgments. The shared methodology explains the research and review process. Those records should be read with this shared notice.

Each reader review links to this full statement. Its qualifications should be read alongside the review. A review score is an editorial summary, not a percentage of truth or a judgment of an author's honesty.

5 min read

Purpose and scope.

This report is published for criticism, commentary, education, and discussion of matters of public interest. It evaluates the particular work, edition, claims, and evidence identified in the report. Its conclusions should not be extended to editions, claims, publications, or professional activities that it does not examine. It is not a comprehensive audit of the author's work or a certification of scientific accuracy.

Factual reporting and editorial judgment.

This review contains both factual reporting and editorial analysis. Quotations, descriptions of source material, and reported research findings are presented as factual information. Assessments of evidentiary strength, methodological quality, interpretation, balance, and practical value are the reviewer's evaluative conclusions, based on the sources, reasoning, and criteria identified in the report. Readers are encouraged to examine those materials and assess the conclusions for themselves. Evaluative judgments are not intended to imply possession of undisclosed facts concerning anyone's conduct or motives.

Meaning of critical assessments.

Descriptions such as "unsupported," "overstated," "misleading," or "inconsistent with the evidence" concern the specific claim, presentation, or evidentiary relationship discussed, for the reasons explained in the accompanying analysis. They do not, by themselves, assert that an author or other person knowingly made a false statement, intended to deceive, fabricated evidence, or engaged in professional misconduct. An assessment that the available evidence does not adequately support a claim is distinct from a finding that the claim is necessarily false.

Interpretation of scores.

Scores, grades, rankings, and recommendation categories summarize the reviewer's application of the stated rubric. They are not measurements of the author's honesty, character, intentions, or overall professional competence. They are not estimates of the percentage of a book that is true or false, probabilities that an author is correct, or representations of scientific consensus. The accompanying analysis explains the basis and limitations of each assessment.

Evidence, timing, and verification limits.

Conclusions reflect the materials examined and the state of the evidence assessed through the literature-search cutoff stated in this report. Relevant limitations—including unavailable sources, incomplete access to underlying data, and unresolved verification questions—are identified in the methodology or accompanying analysis. An inability to locate or independently verify a source does not, by itself, establish that the source does not exist or that a claim was fabricated. Evidence published after the reviewed work is distinguished from evidence available when it was written; later developments do not, by themselves, establish what an author knew or should have known at the time. Independent replication of studies, reanalysis of original datasets, and expert peer review are not claimed unless expressly documented.

Research and review process.

How we research and score these reviews explains the research process and its verification limits. The assessments include replication, reanalysis, correction and retraction evidence across the original five books, with an evidence cutoff of 13 September 2026. Each appendix explains its nine numerical inputs and criterion-level decisions.

No comprehensive literature search or independent replication is claimed.

No response from a reviewed author or publisher was solicited during preparation. Source-target, arithmetic, content-preservation and rendering tests are production checks, not scientific peer review. The extent and limits of source access are recorded in each appendix's Section 10 and references.

Relevant interests and relationships.

Jason Hreha leads The Behavioral Scientist, is the author of the commercially available behavior-change book *Real Change*, and offers behavioral-science consulting and related services. These are relevant commercial and intellectual interests, including potentially competing books, explanations or products. The publication's book page and services/contact page were checked on 8 September 2026.

The preparation record does not independently establish the presence or absence of additional relationships with the reviewed author or publisher, funding, compensation, review-copy arrangements, sponsorships or affiliate arrangements. No blanket absence-of-interests statement is made. The links included in this report are source and navigation links, not newly created affiliate links.

Affiliation and attribution.

References to individuals, organizations, institutions, publications, and trademarks identify the subjects or sources of discussion and do not, merely by their inclusion, imply sponsorship, approval, or endorsement. This is not an official Red Pen Reviews review and is not affiliated with or endorsed by Red Pen Reviews. Any use or adaptation of its publicly described approach is identified in the methodology; the ratings in this report

are not ratings issued by Red Pen Reviews. Copyright in quoted or reproduced third-party material, where applicable, remains with the respective rights holders. Its inclusion in this report does not grant permission for separate reuse.

General information, not individualized advice.

This report does not provide individualized medical, psychological, legal, financial, or other professional advice, and reading it does not establish a professional-client relationship. Discussion of a recommendation's evidentiary support does not establish its suitability for any particular person or circumstance.

Corrections and substantive responses.

The publisher welcomes factual corrections, relevant additional evidence, and substantive responses from authors, publishers, researchers, and readers. Please send submissions through **The Behavioral Scientist contact form**, identifying the passage at issue, the proposed correction or clarification, and supporting sources. The publisher will assess submissions and correct substantiated factual errors. Material corrections and updates made after first publication will be dated and explained on the public page. Internal draft revisions are not public updates. A person's failure to respond to a request for comment is not treated as agreement with the review.

Book-specific records

The linked appendices identify the book edition, research and verification limits, relevant interests, and current evidence assessment. The record for *Hooked* additionally discloses Jason Hreha's appearance in its acknowledgments and the site's prior criticism of the model.

- [How to Change: disclosures and evidence assessment](#)
- [Grit: disclosures and evidence assessment](#)
- [Originals: disclosures and evidence assessment](#)
- [Hooked: disclosures and evidence assessment](#)
- [The Let Them Theory: disclosures and evidence assessment](#)
- [Range: disclosures and evidence assessment](#)
- [The Psychology of Money — book-specific record](#)
- [Emotional Intelligence: disclosures and evidence assessment](#)
- [Influence, New and Expanded: disclosures and evidence assessment](#)
- [Good Habits, Bad Habits: disclosures and evidence assessment](#)

Publication dates. A review's first-publication date is the date it first appears on the public site. The evidence-assessment date describes the research cutoff, not publication. Subsequent material changes to a public review will carry a dated correction or update notice.

Each reader review is paired with a technical appendix containing the detailed evidence and score calculations. The methodology describes scoring and evidence appraisal.

How to Change: housekeeper evidence

The *How to Change* assessment includes the 2011 occupational replication attempt, its mixed outcomes, and its design limits. The book-specific evidence assessment records those findings, source-access limits, and the reasons for the 72% rating.

Evidence assessment of the original five books

The *Let Them Theory* assessment includes the direct 2023 belief-updating response, the reward comparison, and source-access and quotation context. See the book-specific evidence assessment.

The assessment includes research available before the books, newer studies, favorable follow-ups, and corrected publication versions. Formal retraction, close replication failure, changed-protocol nulls, theoretical disagreements, and minor reference corrections are identified separately. These findings are not judgments about an author's honesty or intent.

- **How to Change:** gives no affirmative support to the Ariely/Wertenbroch deadline paper following its 2 September 2026 retraction; considers its close replication and bounded voter, clinician-poster, norm, affirmation, fresh-start and checklist evidence. Evidence assessment.
- **Grit:** uses the deliberate-practice figures from the 2018 correction notice and considers the passion critique and response, plus later school, feedback, reference-bias, and job-crafting evidence. Evidence assessment.
- **Originals:** identifies narrow replication limits for dominance judgments, expert certainty, and speech reappraisal; includes favorable Japanese noun-language evidence and keeps entrepreneurship comparisons distinct. Evidence assessment.
- **Hooked:** records access to the original computer-reciprocity report, credits independent IKEA valuation evidence, and preserves limits on mechanism, clinical transfer, habit timing, and the complete four-stage model. Evidence assessment.
- **The Let Them Theory:** gives immediate-reward timing its warranted supporting credit and includes outcome-specific breathing, therapy, family-intervention and belief evidence without treating different clinical comparisons as identical tests. Evidence assessment.

The evidence cutoff is 13 September 2026. All 45 numerical inputs for those five books are assessed under the common criteria. The five overall ratings are 72%, 64%, 58%, 50%, and 33%, respectively; the appendices explain the criterion-level judgments. The scoped *Let Them* immediate-reward claim has a **Partly supported** navigation verdict; that label is not an additional score. The audit covers the studies and claims discussed in these reports, not all original book endnotes or all studies within their cited syntheses.

Full publication records and selected primary texts, notices, replications, reanalyses and syntheses were checked. Access is source-specific and sometimes limited to an abstract. Original participant-level analyses were not independently rerun. Absence of a notice hit is not scientific clearance.