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June 21, 2021

Dear Dr. van Allen,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript, “Enacted Extraversion as a Well-Being Enhancing Strategy in Everyday Life: Testing Across Three, Week-Long Interventions” for streamlined review at Collabra: Psychology. I want to begin by apologizing for the delay in getting this decision to you - somehow, your manuscript fell through the cracks in our system (we are still working out the kinks in a new system, and somehow I failed to catch your manuscript when it came in). I am very sorry for the delay, I will do my best to make the rest of the process smooth and efficient from here on out.

I have read your manuscript and cover letter, and my evaluation is quite positive. I appreciate the clear presentation of your studies and the caution with which you interpret your results. I have a few questions that remain. I therefore encourage you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology.

First, I would like to receive the full decision letter and reveiws from the previous journal. Your cover letter included a description and some excerpts of the points raised by the editor and reviewers, but for streamlined review we need to be able to see the full, original decision letter with reviews. I understand the editor has not given permission for us to publish the reviews, and we won’t, but it is still typical for authors to share this information privately with the next journal when requesting streamlined review. If you’ve gotten different instructions (e.g., from the previous editor, or someone else), please let me know - I don’t want to put you in an awkward position. Otherwise, you can simply print the email from the previous journal to a PDF file and save that and upload it with your revision.

Also, it would be great to see a version of your manuscript with tracked changes to show what has changed since the previous version. There was a filed titled “manuscript tracked changes” but for some reason I could not see the tracked changes. This is not vital, but if you are willing to share a version with tracked changes that would be great. (It might be an issue with the Scholastica system that erases the change tracking when I download the file, so if you don’t mind sending the file to simine@gmail.com, that would be great).

I’m hoping that with this information, I will be able to make a final decision on the next round relatively quickly, without seeking external reviewers. I can’t guarantee that, but I am optimistic. I also had a few concerns I’d like you to address in the next round as well, which I’ll list below.

1. Null results. As you acknowledge, your sample sizes do not give you enough power/precision to draw strong conclusions from your null results. However, I believe it is important that readers not wave them away - I really appreciate you reporting null results and I think it’s important that they get incorporated into the literature and into people’s conclusions. For that to happen, however, it is important to go beyond NHST and p-values, and report some kind of estimate of how strong the evidence is for the null. There are a few different ways to do this, including equivalence testing and Bayesian statistics. I’ll leave it up to you how to do this, but please give readers some sense of the strength of the evidence for absence of an effect, and calibrate your conclusions according to the results of these analsyes.
2. Social desirability/expectations. In your discussion, you do not address the possibility that the results were driven, at least in part, by participants’ expectations or by differences between conditions in social desirability. Do you think it’s possible that participants believed that the extraversion conditions were supposed to raise their levels of positive affect more, and that this belief may have influenced their responses, consciously or not? If so, do you think this is a threat to the external validity or application of these results to everyday life? (Perhaps any expectation effects would also translate to application of this intervention?) I expected to see some attention to this in the discussion, especially as the other similar studies you cite in some cases designed their conditions so as to minimize between-condition differences in social desirability.
3. In Study 1 you write that “Sensitivity analysis, conducted in G-Power (Erdfelder et al., 1996), suggest that at 80% power our sample could detect effects sizes of d = .90 and d = .41 for dependent and independent samples t-tests, respectively” - I am bit confused by this as I thought that, typically, power is higher for dependent tests than independent tests. This may be my mistake, but I just wanted to raise it in case there is an error here.

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,

Simine Vazire
Editor in Chief
Collabra: Psychology

**Author Response**
Aug 26, 2021

Dear Dr. Vazire,

Please find enclosed the revisions for our manuscript entitled “Enacted extraversion as a well-being enhancing strategy in everyday life: Testing across three week-long interventions”. We have responded to each of your helpful comments below.

**Comment 1**: Request for the full decision letter and reviews from the previous journal
**Response 1**: The full decision letter and reviews are attached

**Comment 2:**Provide version of your manuscript with tracked changes
**Response 2**: The issue with the tracked changes resulted from an error on our part and not the submission system. We have re-submitted a document with tracked changes and have also sent a copy to simine@gmail.com.

**Comment 3:**it is important to go beyond NHST and p-values, and report some kind of estimate of how strong the evidence is for the null. There are a few different ways to do this, including equivalence testing and Bayesian statistics. I'll leave it up to you how to do this, but please give readers some sense of the strength of the evidence for absence of an effect, and calibrate your conclusions according to the results of these analyses.
**Response 3**: We have implemented equivalence testing for our trait by condition interaction terms across the three studies. We used a newly developed technique for multiple regression equivalence tests (Udi & Counsell, 2020) and followed the authors guidelines for determining the smallest effect size of interest. Results for the equivalence tests have been added to each study section. Analysis is now available in an Rmarkdown document uploaded to OSF. Although the results of the equivalence tests did not influence our conclusions strongly, we have discussed the impact of these results on our sense of the strength of our null results in the discussion sections.

**Comment 4:**Social desirability/expectations. In your discussion, you do not address the possibility that the results were driven, at least in part, by participants' expectations or by differences between conditions in social desirability.
**Response 4:** To address this concern we have expanded the manuscript in the following way:
Added to Study 1 Methods: “Trait adjectives for both conditions were derived from Goldberg’s (1990) work on the big five and represent a breadth of facets for each construct. However, trait adjectives for the introversion condition were intentionally chosen for their positive connotations in order to minimize differences in social desirability between conditions. For example, aloof was chosen over unsociable, reserved over secretive, passive over submissive, and unflattering terms such as unadventurous, lethargic and joyless were avoided all together. This selection bias was employed to address the criticism that the language used to describe introversion and extraversion are themselves biased (Zelenski, Sobocko, & Whealen, 2014).”
Added to General Discussion: “Finally, although participants in all conditions received similar behavioural instructions, it is possible the behavioural adjectives of extraversion were more socially desirable than those for introversion and influenced participants’ expectations regarding the purpose of the study. Behavioural instructions in the introversion conditions were designed to counter this potential effect, however, it is unclear whether the study outcomes were influenced by social desirability.”

**Comment 5:** In Study 1 you write that "Sensitivity analysis, conducted in G-Power (Erdfelder et al., 1996), suggest that at 80% power our sample could detect effects sizes of d = .90 and d = .41 for dependent and independent samples t-tests, respectively" - I am bit confused by this as I thought that, typically, power is higher for dependent tests than independent tests. This may be my mistake, but I just wanted to raise it in case there is an error here.
**Response 5**: Yes, this was an error which has been corrected in the manuscript.

On behalf of the co-authors, thank you for considering this manuscript for publication in *Collabra*.
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**Editor Final Decision:** Revise & Resubmit

Aug 28, 2021

Dear Dr. van Allen,

Thank you for submitting a revised version of your manuscript, “Enacted Extraversion as a Well-Being Enhancing Strategy in Everyday Life: Testing Across Three, Week-Long Interventions” for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology. I appreciate your responsiveness to the points I raised in my previous decision letter. However, there are some issues that need to be addressed. I therefore encourage you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology.

Your description of the equivalence tests needs a bit of work. First, you cite Udi & Counsell (2020), but the correct reference (given in your references section) is Alter & Counsell (2021). This error suggests to me that the revisions having to do with equivalence tests may have been rushed and/or not checked as thoroughly as they should be. Second, and more importantly, I did not understand your justification for your Smallest Effect Size of Interest (SESOI). You state that you followed the recommendations in the Alter & Counsell paper, and that you “set our smallest effect size of interest to the lower bound of the 90% confidence interval associated with the smallest observed effect in the regression which was statistically significant (β = .55).” However, I could not find a recommendation like that in the Alter & Counsell paper. Instead, what I found regarding how to set a SESOI for interaction effects was “the SESOI associated with an interaction term is the minimum meaningful change of the simple slope for the relationship of interest per one-unit change on the moderator” (p. 43). Throughout the Alter & Counsell manuscript, they encourage thoughtful and clear explanations of how SESOIs are selected, but I did not see any specific recommendation similar to the one you said you followed. In addition, the Alter & Counsell paper makes clear the risks of setting the SESOI post hoc - they recommend always setting it a priori. Obviously this is not possible in your case, and I would like you to explicitly flag that you selected your SESOI post-hoc (feel free to explain that you did so after the editor asked for it, if you’d like). But most importantly, I’d like to be assured (and for readers to be appropriately assured) that you are selecting a reasonable SESOI, and that the process for how you selected your SESOI and why you chose it is clear, so that readers can decide if they agree that it is a reasonable SESOI.

Please make sure that you have proofread your manuscript before submitting, and that you have thoroughly vetted all of your claims. I know that revisions can sometimes be rushed, but this may be your last opportunity for major editing, therefore please make sure you are confident in all aspects of your manuscript prior to re-submission. I look forward to receiving your revision.

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,

Simine Vazire
Editor in Chief
Collabra: Psychology

**Author Response**Oct 25, 2021

No cover letter sent.

**Editor Final Decision:** Revise & Resubmit

Nov 7, 2021

Dear Zack van Allen,

I have now had a chance to read over your manuscript “Enacted Extraversion as a Well-Being Enhancing Strategy in Everyday Life: Testing Across Three, Week-Long Interventions”, along with the letter describing the changes you made. Thank you for your responsiveness to the issues raised in my last decision (and in our correspondence since then). I am happy to say that your paper is now officially accepted for publication in Collabra: Psychology. I think the way you weaved in cautions against over-interpreting null results, and your explanation for not using equivalence testing in the general discussion, are very clear and will help readers make calibrated interpretations.

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,
Simine Vazire
Editor in Chief
Collabra: Psychology