

Dear Zoltan,

Many thanks for inviting a revision of our submission. We have made the necessary revisions (included in TRACK CHANGES). We eliminated the previous TRACK CHANGES to facilitate identifying the latest revisions.

In what follows, we provide responses to the editorial notes (in red font).

Sincerely,
Authors

PCI notes:

When revising your article, we remind you that:

1) Data must be available to readers, either in the text or through an open data repository such as Zenodo (free), Dryad (pay) or some other institutional repository. Data must be reusable, thus metadata or accompanying text must carefully describe the data;

2) Details on quantitative analyses (e.g., data treatment and statistical scripts in R, bioinformatic pipeline scripts, etc.) and details concerning simulations (scripts, code) must be available to readers in the text, as appendices, or through an open data repository, such as Zenodo, Dryad or some other institutional repository. The scripts or code must be carefully described so that they can be reused;

3) Details on experimental procedures must be available to readers in the text or as appendices;

4) Authors must have no financial conflict of interest relating to the article. The article must contain a "Conflict of interest disclosure" paragraph before the reference section containing this sentence: "The authors of this article declare that they have no financial conflict of interest with the content of this article.";

5) This disclosure has to be completed by a sentence indicating, if appropriate, that some of the authors are PCI recommenders: "X is a recommender at PCI Registered Reports.".

We have included a conflict declaration indicating that we have no financial conflict of interest.

The manuscript includes links directing readers to the preregistered power considerations, procedures, materials, data exclusion criteria, analysis plan plus the corresponding analysis script, supplemental material, and a Qulatrix qsf file to reproduce the procedure verbatim. We have also included the full appendix.

Recommender notes

First of all many apologies for the extraordinary delay on getting back to you on this manuscript (and your other one - you will hear about that soon). That was my fault for not keeping on top of it. I do have one review back from one of the original reviewers, who makes extensive comments but is very positive about the manuscript.

In dealing with the reviewer's comments, note that the Introduction, Method - and also the Design Table - should remain the same as Stage 1, except for changes in tense, or anything factually incorrect. You could add footnotes for further clarifications, noting these are Stage 2 additions. In the same way, the material in the Stage 1 "Analysis plan" onwards until the Results should be kept in. This section is vital for indicating the extent to which your non-significant results count (or rather do not count) against predicted results.

We have now included the analysis plan and the Study Design Table remains unchanged.

Some further points:

Results: Present descriptives clearly in terms of each cell of low vs high risk by low vs high benefit.

We have now included Table 2 which describes proportions disclosed and standard deviations for each information type (viz, risk x benefit).

2nd page of Results:

"However, contrary to predictions, the interaction term for risks and benefits was not significant, and the coefficient for risk was significant and negative."

A prediction is about the population states of affairs; here a non-significant interaction does not count against the prediction of the population state of affairs. Also this sentence implies a prediction was about risk; but the test for Risk does not feature in the Design Table. Include in the main results section only those tests you have indicated in the Design Table. The rest can go in a non-pre-registered section.

Similarly for discussion: You should be clear you have no grounds for either saying there was or was not an interaction, so the prediction is neither confirmed nor disconfirmed. So you have not failed to replicate the previous result of an interaction, in the sense you have provided no evidence that there was no interaction.

We have eliminated all prose indicating that we did not support the existence of an interaction. And ensured that our discussion remains steadfast to what we indicated in our hypotheses.

Reviews

Reviewed by Lorraine Hope, 10 Aug 2022 15:50

Overall, this manuscript makes an interesting and useful contribution to the literature - both in terms of advancing a novel methodology and exploring a challenging real world problem. I

applaud the authors for their initiative in this area - it's a difficult issue to address empirically and certainly not a straightforward area of work. I also appreciate the transparent approach, with a focus on replicability, taken in the work.

The findings open a number of new questions for future research - and these are well-noted in the Discussion. I look forward to seeing how this line of research develops.

All my remaining comments and suggestions are noted in the attached manuscript document (as either comments or edits). The vast majority concern increasing the clarity or precision of the writing. While it's up to the authors whether they take these on board or not, my main purpose in taking the time to provide this kind of feedback is to maximise the potential of this work being accessed by a wider (and meaningful) audience. I hope the authors will view this in the spirit intended.

Thank you for allowing me to interact with this interesting project.

Many thanks to the reviewer for assisting us to clarify aspects of the methodology.