

ARTICLE INFORMATION FORM (AIF)

Below, we ask you to provide some information on your manuscript in our custom-built Article Information Form (AIF). The AIF is modeled after [a consensus-based transparency checklist](#), enforces the standards of the journal, replaces the traditional cover letter, and lets editors quickly assess certain parameters of submitted papers. Importantly, any information contained in the AIF will not be shared with reviewers and is only accessible to editors. Most questions and statements require a response. However, further below are also several statements that pertain only to empirical papers reporting data; thus, several default responses are set to “N/A”. The AIF contains following eight sections:

- Authorships
- Reviewing
- Basic Information
- Best Practice in Reporting Standards
- Pre-Registration and Hypothesis Testing
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion

AUTHORSHIPS

Please list all authors of the paper below. Use the format “First name Last name” and delimit each author by a semicolon (e.g., Jane Doe; John Smith).

REVIEWING

If you wish a blind review where your names are undisclosed, please make sure that no information in the paper, accompanying supplements, or weblinks contain your names.

Understood

Potential Reviewers

Please suggest at least 3 reviewers that (a) are able to review your paper but (b) have no obvious conflicts of interests. We cannot guarantee that one of the listed persons will serve as a reviewer. (One per line; First Name, Last Name, Reason, Email Contact)

Optional: Please list any reviewers you oppose or that should not review your paper (e.g., because of obvious conflicts of interests, such as previous or current mentors), and indicate the reason(s) for this. (One per line; First Name, Last Name, Reason, Email Contact)

BASIC INFORMATION

Has the paper been previously submitted to, and rejected from, *Personality Science*?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Please provide its Paper ID Number here:

Has your paper been previously submitted to and rejected from at least one journal other than *Personality Science*?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Do you wish a streamlined review process (see <https://ps.psychopen.eu/index.php/ps/reviewing>)?

- Yes
- No

If Yes: I am also uploading a separate document with the original editorial decision letter (and reviews), plus our responses. (Please use the article component "Other" for this.)

- Yes

Has your paper been posted on a preprint server or website?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Please enter the website URL or DOI here:

Are you submitting this paper on behalf of a consortium or network?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Please state the name of the network or consortium.

Basic Parameters of the Paper

Word count of the abstract (max. 150 words):

Word count of the main text (excluding abstract, references, tables, figures):

Number of pages:

Number of references:

Number of tables:

Number of figures:

Do the word count, number of references, number of tables, and/or number of figures exceed the recommended limits listed [here](#)?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Please specify and provide justifications (max. 200 words):

Does any part of your paper report original or new analyses of empirical (qualitative or quantitative) data (regardless of whether the data are new or have already been used elsewhere)?

For non-empirical papers, many of the questions to come will not pertain and thus the default options (mostly "NA") can just be left as they are.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Have the data, or parts of it, already been published?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

If Yes, please explain why and how the data are reused:

What kinds of data were gathered? Please indicate all that apply.

- N/A
- Quantitative
- Qualitative
- Mixed-Method
- Other

Which design(s) was (were) used? Please indicate all that apply.

- N/A
- Cross-sectional
- Longitudinal
- Experimental
- Quasi-experimental
- Case Study
- Other

BEST PRACTICE IN REPORTING STANDARDS

Does any part of the paper report QUANTITATIVE WORK (excluding meta-analyses)?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

If Yes, does the paper follow relevant APA reporting standards ([JARS, Table 1-5](#))?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Does any part of the paper report a META-ANALYSIS?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

If Yes, does the paper follow relevant APA reporting standards ([MARS, Table 9](#))?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Does any part of the paper report a REPLICATION?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

If Yes, does the paper follow relevant APA reporting standards ([JARS, Table 6](#))?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Does any part of the paper report STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

If Yes, does the paper follow relevant APA reporting standards ([JARS, Table 7](#))?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Does any part of the paper report BAYESIAN ANALYSES?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

If Yes, does the paper follow relevant APA reporting standards ([JARS, Table 8](#))?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Does any part of the paper report primary QUALITATIVE RESEARCH (excluding meta-analyses)?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

If Yes, does the paper follow relevant APA reporting standards ([JARS-Qual, Table 1](#))?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Does any part of the paper report a QUALITATIVE META-ANALYSIS?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

If Yes, does the paper follow relevant APA reporting standards ([QMARS, Table 2](#))?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Does any part of the paper report the collection and integration of quantitative and qualitative data?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

If Yes, does the paper follow relevant APA reporting standards ([MMARS, Table 3](#))?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

PRE-REGISTRATION AND HYPOTHESIS TESTING

This section asks you about pre-registration and the kinds of hypotheses you tested. If multiple studies are reported and one was pre-registered while the other was not, then please only describe the pre-registered study here.

This paper is based on a Registered Report that has been accepted at *Personality Science* previously.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Please indicate the previous manuscript number here:

Prior to analyzing the complete data set, a time-stamped preregistration was posted in an independent, third-party registry. The paper contains a link to that pre-registration.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Please provide the link to the pre-registration here:

Please mark all that apply: The pre-registration contained ...

- Theoretical background
- Hypotheses to be tested
- Research design to be implemented
- Methods and materials to be used
- Data-analytical strategies to be used
- Guidelines for the interpretation of findings

Any deviations from the pre-registration are clearly described and justified in the paper.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

If hypotheses were tested that were not pre-registered, this is made clear in the paper. These are labeled exploratory hypotheses in the paper.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

The paper clearly labels which hypotheses were confirmatory (i.e., pre-registered) and which exploratory (i.e., not pre-registered).

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Open Comments

METHODS

*This section asks you about your Methods section in the paper.
Note that the statements below capture the principle of transparent and full reporting
and thus should be implemented by each of your empirical studies.*

The paper adheres to full reporting standards as encapsulated in the 21-word solution by [Simmons, Nelson, and Simonsohn \(2012\)](#): "We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all manipulations, and all measures in the study."

- Yes
- No
- N/A

The Methods section of the paper fully describes ...

the rationale for the sample size used (e.g., an a priori power analysis).

- Yes
- No
- N/A

how participants were recruited and selected (e.g., eligibility criteria).

- Yes
- No
- N/A

if or what compensation was offered for participation.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

how participant dropouts or data exclusions were handled (e.g., replaced, omitted, etc.).

- Yes
- No
- N/A

if or how participants were assigned to (experimental or treatment) conditions.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

if or how stimulus materials were randomized.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

if or how participants, experimenters, and data-analysts were kept naive to potentially biasing information.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

if the study design, procedures, and materials allow independent replication.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

the measures of interest (e.g., original citation, response options, etc.).

- Yes
- No
- N/A

ethical measures taken and, if applicable, details (e.g., ID number) of institutional ethics committee or IRB approval.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

The paper – or openly accessible supplements (that are referenced or linked to in the paper) – fully discloses all information regarding any procedures and measures used.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

The paper indicates if (any portion of) the reported dataset has appeared in any other papers (submitted or accepted). It also describes the nature and degree of overlap(s) and unique contribution(s) of the current paper.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

The paper contains a link to openly accessible supplements (e.g., instructions, stimuli, test materials, original items, scripts, codebook for variables, study plan, etc.). These can be used to replicate the study.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Please provide the link to the open supplements here:

Comments about the Methods section

RESULTS

The Results section of the paper ...

describes protocols for data pre-processing (e.g., cleaning, discarding of cases and items, normalizing, smoothing, artifact correction).

- Yes
- No
- N/A

distinguishes explicitly between "confirmatory" (i.e., pre-registered) and "exploratory" (i.e., not pre-registered) analyses.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

describes how violations of statistical assumptions were handled.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

justifies all statistical choices (e.g., including or excluding covariates; applying or not applying transformations; etc.).

- Yes
- No
- N/A

reports the effective or actually used sample size (e.g., for each analysis, cell of the design, etc.).

- Yes
- No
- N/A

reports how incomplete or missing data were handled.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

reports all findings in simple past tense.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

reports basic descriptive statistics (i.e., central tendencies, variations, reliabilities, and intercorrelations) of all variables that are used in the analyses. Preferably, this information is integrated into a table in the paper. If it cannot be feasibly done, then it must be available in supplements which are referenced or linked to in the paper.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

reports effect sizes (e.g., d , eta squared) for all focal tests (not just p -values). Pearson's r and regression weights can count as effect sizes, but their relative magnitude(s) need to be discussed in the text.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

reports 95% confidence or credibility intervals of focal effect sizes.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

reports only exact p -values if p -values are given.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

reports analyses with and without the inclusion of control variables and clearly states if and how findings diverge as a function of including (or not including) control variables. If issues of word count arise, then some of this information may be relegated to a brief paragraph, while the bulk of analyses are presented in supplements which are referenced or linked to in the paper.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

reports for all scale scores used, if applicable, whether or how measurement models (e.g., with CFAs) fit the data as well as whether measurement invariance (across groups or time) needed to be established. Detailed information and all tests can be relegated to supplements which are referenced or linked to in the paper.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

The paper contains a link to openly accessible data (e.g., raw data, processed data, etc.) on which the analyses were based.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Please provide the link to the open data here:

The paper contains a link to openly accessible data-analytical scripts, code, or syntax (that is not copyright-protected). These can be used to reproduce the analyses of the paper.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Please provide the link to the open data-analytical scrips, code, or syntax here:

Comments about the Results section

DISCUSSION

The Discussion section of the paper ...

contains (a) a brief summary of the findings, (b) a careful discussion and interpretation of the findings (in light of previous literature), (c) implications and merits (theoretical, practical, societal, etc.), (d) limitations, and (e) prospects and future directions.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

carefully interprets the magnitude and relevance of effect sizes.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

provides a balanced discussion of the findings as well as their relative merits and limitations.

- Yes
- No
- N/A

clearly describes in the Limitations sub-section the Constraints on Generality (COG: [Simons, Shoda, & Lindsay, 2017](#)).

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Comments about the Discussion section