General comment:

Dear Alexandra Masciantonio and co-authors,

Thank you again for all careful revisions. The work is now almost ready for IPA. I didn't send it for more external reviews, as the revisions generally respond to all requests comprehensively. I noticed a few very minor issues that still need to be fixed, but I believe you can tackle them quickly. Meanwhile, I prepare the IPA so that you should be able to receive it within 24h from the next version if everything goes as planned.

Response:

Dear Veli-Matti Karhulahti,

Once again, thank you for giving us the opportunity to resubmit our manuscript to PCI-RR, and for taking the time to ensure that it is as accurate as possible. We have responded to your comments below and have again highlighted in yellow the changes in the manuscript.

Best regards,

Neele, Anthony, and Alexandra

Comment 1:

1. As a response to R2's comment 9, the interpretation is now "We will also take effect sizes into account, in line with the chosen SESOI." This is good but since it's a formal registration of hypothesis, we need to be even more precise about what "in line with" means. I suggest the following, but you're naturally free to choose something else: "We reject H0 if the effect of time on valence is significant (p <0.05) and exceeds the size that the study was designed to detect (r > .21)." [adaptable to both H1/H2]

Response:

We would like to thank the editor for his helpful remark. In line with the interpretation we gave in section 3.2 Method of the SESOI, we have adapted the interpretation for hypothesis 1:

> **"We will reject H0 if the effect of time on valence is significant (p < 0.05) and exceeds the size that the study was designed to detect (r > .21). However, it is important to note that if a significant effect is observed with an effect size less than .21, we will not reject H1. Instead, we will interpret this as an indication that while larger effects are unlikely, smaller yet significant effects could still have theoretical and practical relevance." (p. 26)**

As well as for hypothesis 2:

> **"We will reject H0 for hypothesis 2 if the interaction between 'Type of social media' and 'Time' is significant (p < 0.05) and exceeds the size that the study was designed**

to detect (r > .21). However, it is important to note that if a significant interaction is observed with an effect size less than .21, we will not reject H2. Instead, we will interpret this as an indication that while larger interactions are unlikely, smaller yet significant interactions could still have theoretical and practical relevance. Furthermore, for hypotheses H2a and H2b, we will accept them if the specific contrasts within the interaction are significant (p < 0.05)." (p. 26)

Comment 2:

2. Currently alpha is marked as .5, please double check.

Response:

We have revised the document to ensure correctness.

Comment 3:

3. I apologise for not being clear in my previous request to add pilot effects. I was not referring to non-signigicant effects but group comparisons (d); currently there are only ANCOVAs but it would be valuble to report platform-specific effects too (they were significant). You're free to move any of the pilot information to a supplement if you're worried that the MS is getting too long.

Response:

This is our apology for not understanding, we made the changes. Here is an example:

> *"The Cohen's d for the pairwise comparisons for descriptive norms were d = -1.014 for Facebook vs. Instagram, d = 0.573 for Facebook vs. Twitter/X, and d = 1.588 for Instagram vs. Twitter/X. For injunctive norms, Cohen's d were d = -0.572 for Facebook vs. Instagram, d = 0.207 for Facebook vs. Twitter/X, and d = 0.779 for Instagram vs. Twitter/X." (p. 13)*

Comment 4:

4. Could you please edit p. 16 so that it doesn't include "RQ1" (can be confusing for readers since it's the same as RQ3 earlier) and add the word "exploratory" to make it explicit. Something like: "We therefore additionally explore our previously stated research question: Does positivity bias have an influence on emoji use?"

Response:

We revised the manuscript accordingly:

> *"We therefore additionally explore our previously stated research question:*
>
> *RQ: Does positivity bias have an influence on emoji use?"*

Comment 5:

5. On p. 16, could you please change the word "large" to "meaningful" so that "though not necessarily indicative of a meaningful effect" (because large doesn't mean anything unless connected life or theory).

Response:

We made the change.