Personality and compliance – response to second PCI RR peer review

Peer review received date: 18.07.2024

Manuscript revised date: "encouraged to revise promptly"

Editor: Andrew Jones

We would like to thank the editor and the two reviewers for again taking the time to review our Stage 1 manuscript. While there was only one comment to address this time, it is in regards to one of the most important section of the manuscript. We are grateful for the input, and hope that our revisions have made this issue clearer. Please find below the reviewer's comment, and a description of the action we have taken based on the issue.

In addition to the issue raised by the reviewer about Table 2, we have also made a few minor adjustments to the text throughout the manuscript to increase understanding, flow, and readability.

We have uploaded a second revision of the Stage 1 manuscript to https://osf.io/kr7se/.

Respectfully on behalf of all three authors,

Bjørn Sætrevik

Reviewer #1 (anonymous)

1. My major concern remains on the Design Table which is a RR requirement. In the present version, the authors have opted for listing only one outcome in the "Interpretation given different outcomes" while "Theory that could be shown wrong by the outcomes" contains the interpretation of the alternative ones. The first column should list all different outcomes and interpretations, and the second one link the various outcomes to existing theories.

Response:

Thank you for raising this important issue. We agree that the final two columns of the design table could be more complete in how the study and its various potential outcomes may relate to the hypotheses and to extant theory. We have now adjusted the columns to have separate rows for each hypotheses. We have used the first column ("Interpretations") to describe the mechanisms we believe may be involved, while we have eused the second column ("Theory") to list explicit, named theories for each outcome. Please see table in manuscript for the full changed text. This has also led to mentioning the "trait activation theory" more explicitly in section 1.3.2 of the Introduction:

> *"The trait activation theory posits that personality traits predict behaviour when the situation is relevant to the expression of those traits (Tett et al., 2021)."*

1. I do hope that the authors will provide detailed reporting of their pre-registered results, and in the case of additional exploratory analyses, these should be outlined clearly.

Response:

Thank you, that is indeed our intention. Any exploratory analyses will be clearly marked as such in the stage 2 manuscript. As discussed in our response to the previous peer review, we already have plans for some exploratory analyses, but in accordance with the RR model, we do not include them in the stage 1 manuscript.