Dear Prof. Chambers,

Thank you very much for the review process.

Following your instructions, we uploaded a clean version as a preprint and also included a tracked-changes version (that shows only the latest revisions in orange font) in the PCI RR system. Further, could you please advise us on the next steps of the publication process (we intend to publish the article at PeerJ)?

Kind regards

____

We addressed the final comments as follows:

Abstract. Re the sentence: "Due to the small sample sizes, our results are not statistically significant, but we can still observe clear tendencies." Statistically non-significant results can arise either because the null hypothesis is true or the test is insensitive. When relying on null hypothesis significance testing, we cannot know for certain which is the case (at least not without adding frequentist equivalence testing or Bayesian hypothesis testing), therefore I would like you to consider replacing the sentence above with a less deterministic statement about the potential reasons for non-significance: "Our results are not statistically significant, possibly due to small sample sizes and consequent lack of statistical power, but with some notable trends [that may inspire future hypothesis generation]." (the section in square brackets is a stylistic addition that you are free to omit, but I replaced "clear" with "notable" because non-significant trends are by definition unclear and it is a potential source of interpretative bias to overstate their importance.

Many thanks for pointing this out. We agree with the comment, and have modified the abstract accordingly..

Table 1 (p4). Please add a column to the far right of this table called "observed outcome" that briefly summarises the results and, in particular, states the degree of support for each hypothesis (H1, H2) in the second section (i.e. supported, not supported, with the statement based strictly on the outcomes of the preregistered analyses rather than any additional exploratory analyses). To make room for this table, I suggest moving the content in the "disproved theory" column to the Table caption (since it applies generally to all aspects of the study), and then this column can be removed from the table to make space for an "observed outcome" column.

We added the "observed outcome" column to the table. We kept the "disproved theory" column in the Table since there is enough room to keep all prior columns of the table. We hope this solution is acceptable.

p15: Explain padjusted in a footnote the first time it is used. I believe it is simply the alpha-corrected value following Holm-Bonferroni correction (?), which case padjusted should actually be reported as >.99 rather than =1 because a p value can never equal exactly 1.

Your understanding was perfectly correct. We clarified the adjustment and changed to the correct symbols (i.e., "=" to "> .99").

p15: replace "insignificantly" with "non-significantly" consistent with standard statistical parlence

We changed accordingly.