

Dear Mr. Syed,

Thank you for your valuable comments and feedback; we greatly appreciate your insights and we have implemented the changes you suggested.

We would like to update you on a significant change in our participant recruitment method. We have decided to switch from Prolific to Bilendi (<https://www.bilendi.co.uk/>) as our survey agency for the following reasons:

- Pool size: in a recent simulation of payment, we realized that the current number of Italian residents on Prolific is about 2600. Since we are aiming to recruit around 1000 participants at T1 (with an expected attrition rate of 15% at T2), we are concerned that the recruitment through the platform might be delayed, and this could affect the timing of the experiment.
- Ensuring Representation: Bilendi has been chosen as it ensures that we have a more representative sample. Representativeness is of paramount importance to us, and Bilendi helps us achieve this goal.

We do not foresee this change as problematic for our preliminary screening. We will employ equivalence testing to verify the sensibility of the categorization, ensuring the quality and accuracy of our data.

We hope this change aligns with your recommendations, and we appreciate your understanding as we make these adjustments to enhance the quality of our research.

Best regards,

The authors

1. Although formal APA style is not required at PCI RR (but it may be required for some journals), it would help to organize the paper into sections akin to Introduction, Method, and Results/Planned Analyses. This would mean moving the hypotheses to the end of the Introduction section, having all methodological details (design, measures, sampling, etc.) together, and then providing the detailed analysis plan, linking back to each previously listed hypothesis. It is in this final section that you could also list your planned exploratory questions. In the current version, much of these details are interspersed, making the paper difficult to follow at times.

Authors' response:

Following your kind suggestion, we have reorganized the content to ensure a more logical flow. Additionally, we have decided to include a table of contents to facilitate navigation.

2. You variably refer to a pre-test, pre-screen, and preliminary data to refer to the process used to validate your classification system. This should be referred to consistently, and I suggest you use the term "pilot study." Pre-test, in particular, is confusing given that a reader could think that label is in reference to the T1 data collection.

Authors' response:

Thank you for your input. We prefer to refrain from using the term "pilot test" to avoid any mix-up with the concept of *pilot* (conducting a complete experiment on a smaller scale). However, we greatly appreciate the thoughtful suggestion for clarity improvement, and we have since adjusted our terminology accordingly, consistently using the term "preliminary screening" across the manuscript.

3. You propose conducting equivalence testing for several hypotheses, but never specify the effect size you will test against—it is necessary to specify a smallest effect size of interest when using this procedure.

Authors' response:

We have now specified our criteria for the equivalence testing. Specifically, we will examine whether the self-involvement mean of each topic falls within a specified range of +/- 10 points from the mean value in the preliminary screening. The same applies to exploratory questions comparing perceived

knowledge and to the post-hoc comparison of H1 between exposed and non-exposed topics.

4. What will you do if you are unable to get 800 participants? What is the minimum number of participants needed to ensure sufficient tests?

Authors' response:

The total of 800 participants is the minimum sample size we aim to recruit. For this purpose, we will employ Bilendi, a survey agency that will ensure the fulfillment of this goal by aiming to recruit 950 subjects. In the unlikely event that our recruitment service partner is unable to reach the minimum sample size of 800, we will disclose this information in the discussion, but still conduct the analyses as pre-registered.

5. Please double check that your figure and table references in text match the appropriate figure/table, as this is not always the case.

Authors' response:

Thank you for pointing that out, we checked and corrected the wrong matches.

6. Please be sure that the stated hypotheses in text match what is in the design table, e.g., H0 is not currently listed.

Authors' response:

We have now included H0 in Table 3.

7. Please be sure to state your inference criteria for all tests (e.g., $\alpha = .05$).

Authors' response:

We have now included the inference criteria in the planned analysis section.

8. Which demographics will be used to identify mismatched participants?

Authors' response:

To identify mismatched participants we will ask them the following questions both at T1 and T2:

- Gender
- Age
- Education

As Bilendi will not provide us with participants' demographic information, we will rely on this within-subject check to ensure consistency.

9. Based on Figure 2, intellectual humility will be assessed at T2, but it was not explained why.

Authors' response:

We plan to assess intellectual humility at T1 as well, together with the rest of the psychometric measurements. In particular, as an exploratory analysis, we would like to see whether it is detectable a shift in this measure between T1 and T2; it is not, however, of any interest to the main goal of the study. We included intellectual humility in the list of assessments on page 10, and in the list of exploratory questions on page 15.