**Editor decision letter—Revise & Resubmit**
September 16, 2020

Dear Zachary Neal,

I have carefully read through your manuscript, “False positives using social cognitive mapping to identify children’s peer groups” that you submitted for streamlined review. I also read all reviews and the decision letter that you included in the submission. I agree that your manuscript has important strengths and also that there are some issues that need to be addressed. I therefore encourage you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology.

We have had extensive contact on the Discussion Board, so here I just summarize the main things left to do:

* Please include at least a paragraph in the discussion section about different operationalisations of peer groups (for which you are welcome to argue why yours is best)
* Please elaborate on the analysis for T=.5 you have conducted, specifically in the context of the Cairns & Cairns data. It would be good for readers to have at least an intuition on what it gains (in terms of false positives) but what it can potentially cost (for which the Cairns & Cairns is one of the few ways to illustrate)
* Please make explicit your attempts to contact the original creators and software developers of SCM 4.0. I have to say, as an outsider I find it hard to understand how a black-box program for which seemingly no-one knows how it works is the norm in a field, but as it is, the best that can be done here is to document for the reader you have done all you can to uncover this information.

In summary, I think this is a promising manuscript and, I hope you will revise it for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology. I look forward to receiving your revision.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office at editorialoffice@collabra.org.

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Sincerely,

Don van Ravenzwaaij

**Author response – separate file**

**Editor second decision—Accept**

**October 13, 2020**

Dear Zachary Neal,

I have now had a chance to read over your manuscript “False positives using social cognitive mapping to identify children’s peer groups”, along with the letter describing the changes you made. Thank you for your responsiveness to the concerns that I raised. I am happy to say that your paper is now officially accepted for publication in Collabra: Psychology. Congratulations on this excellent work, I think it will make an important contribution to the literature and I look forward to seeing it published! I hope your experiences with Collabra: Psychology have been positive and that you will continue to consider it as an outlet for your work.

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point. Our managing editor will contact you in case there are any pre-prodution file related questions. You will have an opportunity to check the page proofs before we publish your article. Thank you again for publishing in Collabra: Psychology.

Sincerely, Don van Ravenzwaaij Senior Editor Collabra: Psychology