

Cognitive psychologists sometimes testify as expert witnesses on the probative value of memory reports in criminal trials. Experts educate jurors on current theories regarding memory and describe evidence regarding strengths and weaknesses of witnesses' memory reports under various conditions. I've done this myself a time or two in years past, but I believe that expert psychological witnesses must be modest/cautious in their presentations. In research to date, samples were often small and it is likely that questionable research practices and publication bias led to exaggerated estimates of effect size. Most of the experimental evidence relied on toy models that differ in many ways from real-world situations of forensic relevance. Most extant theories of memory are vague and open to debate. The paucity of strong, formal theory greatly limits our ability to extrapolate from the conditions of the studies to the conditions of any individual case. Even if we could estimate the  $p$  of a false report under a particular set of conditions, we would also need to know the base rates of true and false cases to apply that information. Further research and theory development are needed.