This is a review of a proposition of a study regarding how social media can provoke an “illusion of knowledge” – the feeling that we know more about a subject than what we actually know, with the additional idea that this effect is more important for emotional content than non-emotional content. I don’t have so many comments since the analysis/procedure are quite simple and elegant. Most of them concern the redaction of the hypotheses and a need for additional information about the procedure.

I am a bit confused by the discrepancies between the hypotheses, measures, and the procedure. First, I think it would be valuable to distinguish between Confirmatory and exploratory hypotheses. Second, at a point in the paper, it is said that additional variables with be used as control variables (the ones in appendix d). Then, in the statistical analysis table, they are not used. I would like to have a clear understanding of how and why they are used, maybe by creating additional hypotheses. I also do think that it would be valuable to have a hypothesis regarding the 4 groups of thematic in terms of knowledge/involvement (appendix A and Table 1). Table 1 indicates 4 groups but the study design is only about two groups (high emotion and low emotion thematic). Can you clarify the design or Table 1?

Appendix C: the links are not clickable.

Appendix d: It would have been great to have the Likert scales (1 to 5 / 1 to 7 …). They are not explained in the procedure also so they might at least have been said here.

It is difficult to understand what participants will see in the experiment. Would it be possible to have at least a screenshot of the newsfeed? Are the newspaper titles presented in random order or not? (it is not said through the method section). Can the participants only see the title – text or also a photo? Can they click on it to view the website for each link? We need to know more to improve the possibility to replicate the experiment.

Finally, it lacks some explanation regarding how the analysis will be performed: with R or another tool – will be the dataset/analysis available on OSF? And if not, why? I wish to emphasize that, as provided in the guideline: *PCI RR is a signatory of the Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) guidelines, which describe a series of modular standards for transparency and reproducibility in published research. In general, authors are required to make all study data, digital materials, and computer code publicly available (at Stage 2 submission) to the maximum extent permissible by relevant legal or ethical restrictions.*  While it is a stage 1 manuscript, I would like at least a statement regarding how data, material, and code will be available for stage 2, at best the use of a script on simulated data to understand how you will perform your ANOVAs and t-tests.

I do believe that all these remarks are minor and will encourage a minor revision of this article.

Adrien Fillon