Call for Comments in the Journal *Personality Science*:

Theme Bundle on "Rewarding Research Quality in Personality Science"

We are inviting comments for a Theme Bundle on "Rewarding Research Quality in Personality Science" in the journal *Personality Science* (https://ps.psychopen.eu/index.php/ps). The bundle will contain a target article by Leising et al. titled "Ten steps toward a better personality science - how quality may be rewarded more in research evaluation" (http://dx.doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.4963), several comments, and possibly a rejoinder by the authors. Each comment will receive its own abstract but belong to the Theme Bundle. In line with the journal's full open-access policy, all papers will be freely accessible to anyone at no cost to authors or readers.

Background

In their target article, Leising et al. outline ten steps that, in their eyes, can improve personality science. The first five steps focus on fostering consensus regarding (1) research goals, (2) terminology, (3) measurement practices, (4) data handling, and (5) the current state of theory and evidence. The other five steps focus on improving the credibility of empirical research through (6) formal modeling, (7) mandatory pre-registration for confirmatory claims, (8) replication as a routine practice, (9) planning for informative studies (e.g., in terms of statistical power), and (10) making data, analysis scripts, and materials openly available. The authors argue that the current, quantity-based incentive structures in academia stand in the way of implementing many of their outlined practices, which results in a research literature with sometimes questionable utility and/or integrity. As a solution, they propose a quality-based reward scheme that explicitly weights published research by its Good Science merits. Essentially, they argue that (personality) scientists should be rewarded primarily by the quality of their work.

Comments

Comments can focus on any aspect of the target article (e.g., on the bigger picture, specific steps, implications of the steps, limitations of applying certain steps, additional steps to consider, etc.). A comment can be supportive, critical, or mixed regarding the agreement or endorsement of the target article's ideas. In any case, it should be concise, constructive, and focused. ***The abstract should be limited to max. 150 words, and the main text should be no more than 1,000 words, with 10 references, 1 table, and 1 figure as a maximum.***

Submission and Timeline

Please send your comment as a simple Word file to personality.science.journal@gmail.com no later than **August 31, 2021**. Comments will *not* undergo external peer-review but will be reviewed and edited by Mario Gollwitzer and John Rauthmann. This includes the possibility of declining comments for publication. Once a comment is accepted, it will need to be formally submitted to the journal's submission system (more information will follow at that point to the authors).

Please feel free to circulate this call within your own professional networks. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact us.

With best wishes,

Mario Gollwitzer (Guest Editor; mario.gollwitzer@psy.lmu.de)
John Rauthmann (Editor-in-Chief; personality.science.journal@gmail.com)