

Reply to 2nd PCIRR decision letter reviews #657:
Arkes (1996) replication

We would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for their useful suggestions and below we provide a detailed response to each item. We also provide a summary table of changes. Please note that the editor's and reviewers' comments are in bold with our reply underneath in normal script.

A track-changes comparison of the previous submission and the revised submission can be found on: <https://draftable.com/compare/IUfAxpsvxxXO>

A track-changes manuscript is provided with the file:

“PCIRR-S1-RNR2-Arkes-1996-replication-main-manuscript-trackchanges.docx”
(<https://osf.io/efa4j>)

Reply to Editor: Dr./Prof. Doug Markant

Thank you for submitting your revisions and response to the reviews for the Stage 1 registered report entitled “Revisiting the Psychology of Waste: Replication and Extensions Registered Report of Arkes (1996)”. Overall the revisions were comprehensive and highly responsive to the points raised in the reviews.

Thank you for the positive and constructive feedback and the invitation to revise and resubmit.

There are two remaining minor issues that I'd ask you to address [...] After these final points are addressed I expect to be able to quickly move on to a IPA for this submission.

1. In my view the procedure for attention checks should be documented in the manuscript well enough for a reader to judge the level of protection against low effort or automated responses, especially when it results in the exclusion of some participants. You point out in your response that failing the attention checks causes the survey to end and the participant is prevented from starting over. I would ask that you simply add this detail to the Procedure section rather than require a reader to consult the survey itself. The description also does not mention the "copy-paste" question, which I would note **does allow a participant to correct their response if they carelessly skip past it or don't follow the instruction, so it's not clear that this question is serving the same purpose as the others in screening out inattentive participants.**

Thank you for reiterating and clarifying. We now understand your previous point better. We did not consider that copy-paste question as an attention check, but rather as a simple consent, and since we were not including the consent form in our manuscript, we did not see it necessary to include more details on that part. The three consent questions that served as attention checks were the yes/no/not-sure choice rotated questions. We understand the need to be clearer about that entire procedure before the survey.

We changed from this previous paragraph:

Participants first indicated their consent, with four questions confirming their eligibility, understanding, and agreement with study terms, which they must answer with a "yes" and required responses in order to proceed to the study. Three of the four questions also served as attention checks, with the order of the options being rotated (yes, no, not sure).

To the following:

Participants first indicated their consent, with four questions confirming their eligibility, understanding, and agreement with study terms, which they must answer with a "yes" and required responses in order to proceed to the study. Three of the four questions also served as attention checks, with a randomized display order of the options (yes, no, not sure) - 1) "Are you able to pay close attention to the details provided and carefully answer questions that follow?", 2) "Do you understand the study outline and are willing to participate in a survey with comprehension checks?", and 3) "Are you a native English speaker born, raised, and currently located in the US?". These were followed by writing

or copy-pasting a statement indicating that they understand and agree and terms, which participants had to enter correctly in order to proceed, with as many attempts as needed. Upon completion of these steps, participants proceeded to begin the survey.

2. The other remaining issue is the plan to conduct analyses of order effects only in the case that you fail to find evidence for the hypotheses. I don't think order effects are akin to other extraneous factors like age and education—indeed you anticipated the possibility of order effects impacting the replication outcome by planning for follow-up analyses. I do, however, appreciate the concern that reporting all of these additional analyses from the outset would hurt the readability and interpretability of the paper, and agree that these costs may not be worth it considering that this is a nuisance factor unrelated to the theory being tested.

But part of the reason for raising this issue is that, just as you mention in your response, these analyses bring some additional analytic flexibility, and the current description of the "pre-registered" plan in the Order Effects section doesn't do much to limit that flexibility (specifically on the question of how a moderating effect of order would be tested). If you can provide more details about the plan for these tests at this stage then I would recommend including it now. If you choose not to, the expectation would be that these analyses are appropriately caveated as being exploratory in the stage 2 submission.

Thank you, we understand and accept.

We first changed the order effect paragraph to the following:

We, therefore, pre-registered that if we failed to find support for our hypotheses, we would examine order as a moderator, meaning that we will run the analyses first with the unsupported study displayed first and then with the unsupported study not displayed first, and report the differences between the two, and examine whether the confidence intervals of the effect overlap. To compensate for multiple comparisons and the increased likelihood of capitalizing on chance, we set the alpha for the additional analyses to a stricter .005.

To demonstrate what the code would be for that, we updated our code, see section “Order analysis” in the new 2024-04-09-Arkes-1996-data-analysis-v15-G.Rmd/html files.