Dear Recommender and Reviewers,

Thank you again for all feedback. Our responses are below, as last time.

by Zoltan Dienes, 03 Apr 2023 14:08
The reviewers are largely happy with the paper, with some minor changes for clarification. Concerning the smallest effect size of interest, I prefer to work in raw regression slopes, as they reflect units one should be interested in unaffected by criterion reliability (https://online.ucpress.edu/collabra/article/7/1/28202/118660/Obtaining-Evidence-for-No-Effect), but you may wish to argue,as you have done, that you will not be claiming an effect of interest exists vs does not, in which case, defining what is of interest is moot. Nonetheless, in addressing Ferguson's point, you may wish to alert readers about these issues in forming their own conclusions about what meaningfully exists, given that readers may well jump to conlusions you are are wise enough not to!

Authors: We have directed readers and those with statistical data reuse interest to the noted sources in the Data Statement and Ethics section.

Reviews

Reviewed by Lukas J. Gunschera, 30 Mar 2023 11:35

I enjoyed reviewing this registered report and think the authors did well at implementing the suggested changes. I have added some minor comments below:

1) Participants from groups A-C will provide frequent diary-like entries over multiple years. The mere act of monitoring one's gaming activity may affect participants and their appraisal of their gaming. This is something that the data will be able to address, and it would be interesting to analyse and/or mention in the manuscript, given 'thoughtless' gaming may have distinct effects.

Authors: This is an important point and we have now addressed this in the section.

2) The authors mention that "following our critical Bayesian epistemology, each discovered taxon will be established with a confidence level (0-1), and when evidence accumulates, confidence can decrease or decrease" (p. 14). It does not become clear whether these confidence intervals are based on data or on the subjective judgments of the authors. Arguably, the latter is insufficient to be termed "Bayesian". In this case, the use of "Bayesian epistemology" is misleading, as it is traditionally used to refer to formal approaches of belief updating with high degrees of precision.

Authors: We discussed this in relation to another reviewer's comment in the previous round. In the light of these two points of respective feedback, we have decided to remove the reference to Bayes and rather express our trust in the findings simply as truthlikeness, which should be clearer.

Moreover, the addition of a confidence level raises the question what level of confidence is acceptable. Please specify how these confidence levels will be used to guide later interpretation.

Authors: This is a fair point, we have added descriptions.

3) Typo: “while 41.1 % think the Finns think gaming is harmful” (p. 23)

Authors: Corrected.

Reviewed by Christopher Ferguson Ferguson, 12 Mar 2023 00:25

I think these revisions mostly look good. The only exception is that the authors MUST have a SESOI (smallest effect size of interest) of minimum of r (or beta) of .10. I think the authors misunderstood me here...this has nothing to do with hypothesis testing or sample size, only avoiding misinterpreting noise for "true" effects. There's a risk of noise being misinterpreted below effect sizes of .10, as there's a general "hum" of garbage results below that effect size. This is true whether a study is exploratory or confirmatory. The only issue about sample size is that if the sample size is small, it won't be powerful enough to detect effects that low anyway. Again, please read Ferguson and Heene (2021) for an explanation for why this is critical. But this is an unambiguous MUST for me to sign off on this registered report.

Authors: We have further clarified that we will not report any statistical effects in this RR. In the Data Statement and Ethics section, we have further highlighted that anyone intending to use these data for statistical analyses should consult Ferguson & Heene (2021) and Dienes (2021).

Reviewed by Michelle Carras, 16 Mar 2023 12:23

The revised addresses all of our concerns well--I appreciate the opportunity to remain involved and very much look forward to your progress. The attached copy of your tracked changes version includes a few more comments for slight changes to wording that could be considered. Thank you again.

Authors: We have made revisions based on each comment, as requested.

***

One more warm thank you for all reviewers for their support with this long protocol. We are aware that commenting on a work of this length takes significant time, and we much value these volunteer time investments that helped us craft a clearer and more robust Stage 1 plan.