

NOTE: I am assuming the aggregate variables were calculated correctly

As described in the original paper, a general linear model was conducted with one within-subject factor (man's availability: single v. attached) and two between-subjects factors (participant's relationship status: single v. attached and participant's conception risk: high v. low). The effect of interest was the result of the 2x2x2 ANOVA examining the interaction between man's availability, participant's conception risk and participant's partnership status. The interaction was non-significant, $F(1, 314) = .105$, $p = .746$, $\eta_p^2 = .0003$. Given that the overall interaction was not statistically significant it would generally be inappropriate to interpret the subsequent main effects, however, in order to report the results as they were presented in the original paper we will report the observed main effects here. As in the original study, male faces were rated as more attractive by women without a partner ($M=5.48$, $SE=.12$) than by women with a partner ($M=5.00$, $SE=.14$), $F(1, 314) = 7.164$, $p = .008$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$ and there was no significant main effect of participant's conception risk $F(1, 314) = .362$, $p = .548$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$ or of man's availability, $F(1, 314) = 16.90$, $p = .091$, $\eta_p^2 = .009$.

As depicted in Chart 1, the original Bressan et al. results show that there was an interaction between man's availability and participant's conception risk for partnered women but this interaction was non-existent for unpartnered women. In contrast, as is evident from Chart 3, in the online study we did not find such an interactive pattern, but did find a main effect of the participant's relationship status (but not of man's availability as in the lab study).

The results of the online study...

Attractiveness ratings for women with and without a partner (means, F test)

2x2x2 interaction: $F(1, XXX) = XXX$

interaction between man's availability and conception risk (for partnered and unpartnered women)

main effect of man's availability on attractiveness ratings (for partnered and unpartnered women)

Open the discussion section with a paragraph summarizing the primary result from the confirmatory analysis and the assessment of whether it replicated, partially replicated, or failed to replicate the original result.

Commentary

Add open-ended commentary (if any) reflecting (a) insights from follow-up exploratory analysis, (b) assessment of the meaning of the replication (or not) - e.g., for a failure to replicate, are the differences between original and present study ones that definitely, plausibly, or are unlikely to have been moderators of the result, and (c)

discussion of any objections or challenges raised by the current and original authors about the replication attempt. None of these need to be long.