

Solutions

2.1 Twelve adults; the abstract only.

2.2 Award B1 each for two: 2025 instead of 2024; forty instead of twelve; children instead of adults. Invented percentages are unsupported rather than contradicted by a supplied numerical result.

2.3 Award B1 each for three distinct relevant fields: query/tool/date; candidate title; named author/year; accessed part; outcome/task; access or relevance limit; inclusion/rejection reason. Do not invent a journal or URL.

2.4 Adult location-choice task differs from class four-item sorting. N is promotion without a participant accuracy outcome. Refine contextual terms and inspect accessible real methods/sources.

3.1 Award 2 per proposal: correction, reason. Inspect relevance/evidence: rank is not a measured result. State totals unknown: no numerical errors were supplied. Use real read/verifiable sources: the cards are explicitly fictional and cannot substantiate an actual published citation.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times$ B1: M's supplied group/date corrected; abstract-only access; unknown numerical/method details; different-task limit; N's promotion/outcome distinction; fictional-card boundary; traceable real-source next search; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: "Card M is a limited candidate because its abstract describes separated labels and location-choice errors among twelve adults. It is dated 2024, not 2025, and supplies neither numerical totals nor the full assignment procedure. Its task also differs from our class sorting question. Card N is an undated advertisement without a measured accuracy outcome, so I will not treat it as an independent experiment. Both cards are fictional teaching materials. For an actual proposal I will refine the search around label alignment and paper sorting, inspect accessible real sources and record bibliographic details, accessed sections, measured outcomes and limits before making a claim."