

Response Letter (Round 2)

Title: Registered Report: Self-Control Beyond Inhibition. German Translation and Quality Assessment of the Self-Control Strategy Scale (SCSS).

Dear Prof. Dr. Dienes (editorial handling), Dr. Miles (review 1), Dr. Bürgler (review 2),

we thank you for your editorial handling and careful review of the updated manuscript. Corresponding to the perspective of the reviewers, we agree that the process has helped us to strengthen our design meaningfully and hope to have appropriately addressed the remaining points.

All raised points were very helpful and we hope to have a suitable report after integrating the thoughtful suggestions.

As in the previous round, we will give a comment-by-comment reply in the following paragraphs, going in chronological order.

We thank everyone involved again for their contribution to the project and have enjoyed their productive and engaged feedback style and input.

Best regards,

Leopold Roth (Corresponding author)

Comments Dr. Miles

Dear Dr. Miles,

thank you very much for your expertise and detailed feedback on our manuscript. Below, we will respond to each point you raised in the order of the review. We believe that the manuscript has considerably improved due to your suggestions.

Detailed Comments

“The introduction now more clearly explains and distinguishes the different aims and contributions of the study. Personally though I think some of what was cut out of the section “relevant self-control outcomes” I actually found useful and would prefer to see added back in! As Dr. Werner highlighted when advising how to cut this section down, it was slightly redundant to discuss the general predictive value of self-control individually for each behaviour. However, it was helpful to “emphasize evidence for strategies across domains (especially if there are differences like in Katzir et al.)”. There were some useful and interesting citations in this section suggesting evidence that different strategies might work for different behaviours, but these have now been cut out. To me these citations helped to strengthen the rationale for exploring all of those different behaviours in relation to the SCSS and I’d consider adding back in.”

Response: Thank you very much for your feedback on this section and we added a smaller section on this topic, reintroducing three key citations back into the manuscript under “The SCSS and Relevant Self-Control Outcomes”. We hope to have done it according to your expectations and belief it further justifies the current project and illustrates its usefulness.

“Aim 3, i.e. testing which strategies are relevant in different domains, has now been given a specific hypothesis in the design table and introduction; “All strategies are significantly related to all outcome measures”. Does this accurately describe what the authors expect? To me it seems like Aim 3 is quite exploratory - the authors generally believe the SCSS should explain a significant amount of variance in each of the outcomes (although I would not be surprised if this is not true for some variables that are less closely related to self-control, such as income), but don’t have specific hypotheses about which outcomes will be most strongly predicted, or which strategies will best predict different outcomes. But this hypothesis seems to explicitly predict no variation. There seems to be good reason to expect at least some variation across strategies and outcomes. For example, as the authors discuss in response to the other reviewers, acceptance may be a less effective strategy; as I suggest above, some

SCSS - Revision Letter (Round 2)

outcomes such as income are less closely related to self-control, so it would not surprise me if the SCSS does not predict everything. It seems a more exploratory hypothesis might be more appropriate.”

Response: Thank you very much for this clarifying comment. That is a very well thought point and we adjusted our hypothesis to be more exploratory, as suggested. The updated hypothesis is more closely oriented on the findings by Katzir et al. (2021) and assumes at least one significant relationship between strategy and outcome while controlling for the other strategies. This mirrors the original findings, which showed that the pattern of significant relationships varies by outcome. We are thankful that you recommended a reconsideration of the formulation.

“As a final minor point, the abstract does not really do justice to the contributions of the research, in my opinion. The abstract explains that the studies will further previous work on self-control strategies, but not why this is valuable or how it will usefully add to our knowledge. The contribution that I will find most personally interesting is not described at all in the abstract (i.e. the data will tell us whether some strategies are more helpful for some outcomes than others). So I might consider rewriting, but it's up to the authors how they want to present their study and I am happy to leave this decision to them.”

Response: Thank you for bringing up this point. We have added a sentence to the abstract (“This specifically aims to investigate which strategies are related to which outcome to deliver a closer look on diverging patterns of effects of self-control strategies.”) to pinpoint future readers to this strength of the project. We are very thankful for your external perspective on the project, which is sometimes lost as authors, after working on a manuscript for longer.

“I spotted one typo: 'goal-term goal' on p6 should presumably be 'long term goal'.”

Response: Thank you very much for your careful reading, we corrected this mistake.

Comments Dr. Bürgler

Dear Dr. Bürgler,

thank you very much for your expertise and detailed feedback on our manuscript. Below, we will respond to each point you raised in the order of the review. We believe that the manuscript has considerably improved due to your suggestions.

Detailed Comments

*“I only have one remaining **minor point** regarding the assessment of the model fit (p. 22): The authors now chose stricter cutoffs for all the fit indices (CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR) but there is still no reference or justification for these cutoffs. In the last round of reviews, I wrote that stricter cutoffs for the RMSEA and SRMR seem justified, as they align better with what Katzir et al. (2021) found in their original study (see Table 3, p. 6). However, in the same table, in none of the samples, their reported CFI and TLI would be at or above the stricter cutoffs of .95 that the authors now chose for their study. I don't think it makes sense to aim for such strict cutoffs for the CFI and TLI if the original study was nowhere close to them. As I've written in the last round of reviews, I don't necessarily think that one must adhere to the strictest cutoffs, but that they should be reasonably justified.”*

Response: Thank you very much for your positive feedback and recommendations on handling model-fit indices. As suggested, we have 1) changed the cut-offs from .95 to .90 and have added respective citations to all cut-offs. This adds further credibility to our study and we are very thankful for this perspective.

As another quick note, there seems to be a small typo on p. 6, where it reads "goal-term goal".

Response: Thank you very much for your careful reading, we corrected this mistake.